Exploring Economic Solutions to Political Problems

The Influence of Human and Social Capital on Refugee

Entrepreneurship

Supervisor:

Anna-Lena Hoh

Chantal Verkroost

S1010668

c.j.verkroost@student.ru.nl

12 August 2019

MSc Political Science –

Conflict, Power & Politics

Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen

Abstract

The civil war in Syria has led to the displacement of millions of Syrians mainly hosted by Syria's neighbouring countries. This influx of refugees puts a serious strain on the resources of these host-countries, causing tensions between refugees and the host-community. Especially in neighbouring countries to conflict, there is potential for spill-over of the conflict. Therefore, it is important to implement policies aimed at the integration of refugees. Consistently identified as a means towards integration in general, and labour market integration specifically is entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship contributes to the financial independence of refugees as well as to the growth of the economy, therewith reducing the burden on host-country resources. However, not much is known about what is needed for entrepreneurial success among refugees. Therefore, this thesis examines the entrepreneurial success of Syrian refugee entrepreneurs through the analysis of a questionnaire distributed among 70 Syrian refugee entrepreneurs living in Syria's neighbouring countries. Within the framework of Giddens' structuration theory it assesses the influence of resources inherent to one's social network – social capital – and one's personal skills, competences and characteristics – human capital – on their entrepreneurial success. It finds that human capital and social capital can be enabling as well as constraining factors in achieving entrepreneurial success. Identified as the most important constraining factor for entrepreneurial success is operating within the ethnic market. The clear different influence of the ethnic market compared to the mainstream market suggests that refugee entrepreneurs benefit most from having contacts with natives. For refugee entrepreneurship to be successful and have its desired impact on integration it is preferred if entrepreneurial activities take place outside of the ethnic market. Therefore, in their support of refugee entrepreneurs, it is important for supporting organizations to focus on host-community network building.

Key words: Syrian Refugees, Integration, Labour Market Integration, Refugee Entrepreneurship, Human Capital, Social Capital, Ethnic Market

Table of Content

List of Tables

1. Introduction

The Syrian civil war has led to the displacement of millions of Syrians (UNHCR, 2019). This mass resettlement imposes a serious burden on refugees as well as refugee receiving countries. A growing unease about the implications of hosting these refugees within the European Union has led to the clear intention of hosting Syrian refugees in Syria's neighbouring countries. The influx of refugees into these countries can have negative implications (Akgünduz, Van den Berg & Hassink, 2015). Refugees impose a serious burden and compete with natives over scarce resources, most notably employment. The competition over scarce resources leads to tensions between refugees and the host-community, therewith increasing the chance of spill-over of the conflict into the host-country (Salehyan & Gleditsch, 2006). To successfully manage the inflow of refugees it is therefore necessary to develop policies that foster the integration of refugees into the host-society. Essential to integration in general, is integration into the labour market, because employment contributes to the livelihood of refugees and their participation in society. However, refugees face significant barriers in their search for employment and are often denied access to the labour market (Abbasian & Bildt, 2009, Chrysostome, 2010). A solution offered for this within the literature, and the focus of many supporting organizations, is entrepreneurship (e.g. Abbassian & Bildt, 2009; Ensign & Robinson, 2011; Fong et al., 2007; Gold, 1988; Kanas et al., 2009; Kloosterman et al., 1999; Kloosterman & Rath, 2001; Turkina & Thi Thanh Thai, 2013; Wauters & Lambrecht, 2006, 2008; Williams & Krasniqi, 2018) Entrepreneurship not only facilitates income generation among refugees while circumventing discriminatory practices within the general labour market, it also has the potential to make positive contributions to the economy of the host-country, therewith decreasing the burden refugees impose upon these countries (Jacobsen, 2002). Additionally, entrepreneurship is said to boost the integration of refugees (Wauters & Lambrecht, 2006, 2008). There is thus a clear beneficial impact of entrepreneurship on refugees as well as their host-countries. However, not much is known about what is needed for entrepreneurship among refugees to be successful. Therefore, this thesis identifies several resources that have been positively associated with entrepreneurship among migrants and tests whether these resources are similarly capable of explaining entrepreneurial success among refugees.

The framework used to explain the relationship between these resources and entrepreneurial success is Anthony Giddens' structuration theory (1984). This theory tries to explain the relationship between agency and structure, and claims that actors behave and make decisions within the context of structure. This structure influences their decisions, and in turn the decisions

of individuals influence the structure surrounding them. Structure is consistent of both rules and resources. The resources inherent to a network structure can be called social capital. The way these social capital resources are used by refugee entrepreneurs is dependent on their agency, which in turn is influenced by an individual's personal skills, competences and characteristics, or human capital. One's social network – social capital –, and skills – human capital – can either be constraining or enabling factors in achieving entrepreneurial success (Giddens, 1984; Lamba, 2003). It is commonly claimed that refugees lack human capital, because their skillset is not necessarily transferrable to their host-country (Lamba, 2003). Therefore, refugees are said to compensate for this by making use of their social capital (Coleman, 1990; Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993). However, conversely a refugee's social network, or lack thereof, can also can also be a constraining factor in achieving entrepreneurial success.

Previous literature identifies several factors related to human and social capital that influence migrant entrepreneurship. Firstly, regarding human capital, previous research finds considerable positive effects of host-country language skills (Marger, 2006; Wauters & Lambrecht, 2006, 2008; Williams & Krasniqi, 2018), education (Constant & Zimmerman, 2006; Williams et al., 2017), business training (Constant & Zimmerman, 2006; Kanas et al., 2009; Williams & Krasniqi, 2018) and previous business experience (Tienda & Raijman, 2004, Wauters & Lambrecht, 2006). Following Giddens' reasoning, these factors are expected to positively influence refugees' decision making, and therefore entrepreneurial success. However, these decisions are simultaneously dependent on structure. Therefore, the following factors, identified by previous research, and related to social capital will be taken into account: marital status (Constant & Zimmerman, 2006), family employees (Bizri, 2017; Fong et al., 2007) operating within the ethnic market (Chrysostome, 2010; Gomez et al., 2015; Rusinovic, 2008; Samnani, Boekhorst & Harrison, 2013; Waldinger et al., 1990) and operating within the mainstream market (Robertson & Grant, 2016).

To look at the influence of these human and social capital resources on entrepreneurial success, this thesis seeks to answer the following question: *What is the influence of human and social capital on entrepreneurial success among Syrian refugees?* To answer this question, this thesis will look at Syrian refugee entrepreneurs in Syria's neighbouring countries. It does so by a quantitative analysis of data gathered through a questionnaire distributed among Syrian refugees.

It is not straightforward to measure entrepreneurial success, which is a rather subjective term. Success can be quantified with many different factors, both financial as well as non-financial. It can be found in independence, a positive working climate or economic measures as company survival, profits and employee growth (Dej, 2010). Measuring entrepreneurial success among

refugees is not the same as for mainstream entrepreneurs, because it is not realistic to assume similar outcomes for both. Therefore, this thesis defines entrepreneurial success in terms of the desired outcome for refugees. The most basic desired outcome is financial independence. Additionally, to remain financially independent it is necessary for the company to survive. Therefore, entrepreneurial success here means that the business' costs are covered by its income, and it provides financial independence for the entrepreneur (Chrysostome, 2010).

This thesis contributes to the existing scientific literature in the field of migration and entrepreneurship in several ways. Firstly, the majority of literature focuses on migrant entrepreneurship, therewith not making a distinction between regular migrants, mostly pursuing economic wellbeing, and refugees (e.g. Kloosterman et al., 1999; Kloosterman & Rath, 2001; Fong et al., 2007; Abbassian & Bildt, 2009; Ensign & Robinson, 2011; Turkina & Thi Thanh Thai, 2013). A refugee is formally defined by the UNHCR (1951, p. 14) as 'someone who is unable to return to their country of origin owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion.' Several scholars state that the different conditions of flight cause for a significant difference between economic migrants and refugees, which influences entrepreneurship. Therefore, they should be treated separately (Cortes, 2004; Gold, 1988; Wauters & Lambrecht, 2006, 2008).

Secondly, the small amount of literature available on refugee entrepreneurship focuses on refugee entrepreneurs in developed economies, such as Canada, the United States or countries in the European Union (e.g. Gold, 1988; Wauters & Lambrecht, 2006, 2008; Fong et al., 2007; Williams & Krasniqi, 2018). However, the majority of refugees are hosted by developing countries (UNHCR, 2018). Looking at these countries is thus not only societally relevant, it is also expected that migration taking place between countries with different levels of development or countries with similar levels of development will impact entrepreneurial success differently. Syria and its neighbouring countries are all Lower- to Upper Middle Income Countries and fall under the category of developing economies (OECD/DAC, 2018). It is therefore expected that there will be more similarities among Syrians and natives in these countries, because the gap between their educational attainment will be smaller than in developed countries (UNDP, 2018).

Lastly, because defining entrepreneurial success is not straightforward, previous research in the field of entrepreneurship focuses mostly on either entrepreneurial intentions (Wauters & Lambrecht, 2006; 2008), or being an entrepreneur versus opting for regular employment (or being unemployed) (Turkina & Thi Thanh Thai, 2013; Williams & Krasniqi, 2018). However, the latter is not sufficiently capable of capturing entrepreneurial success, because the distinction is

twofold. Firstly, being an entrepreneur versus not being an entrepreneur captures entrepreneurial *ability*, which could be a substitute for entrepreneurial success. However, secondly, the distinction also captures entrepreneurial *intent*, because regular employment can still be an attractive option to refugees it is possible that a part of them do not have the intention of becoming an entrepreneur. However, this does not say anything about their ability, or their success.

The societal relevance of this research lies in the large amount of refugees hosted by Syria's neighbouring countries, posing a serious strain on their resources and leading to increasingly negative sentiments towards refugees (Akgündüz et al., 2015). Because the majority of today's migrants are refugees, it is essential for this group to be studied separately. Not in the least because refugees are seen to have worse labour market outcomes than regular migrants. They are more likely to be unemployed, and have a lower income, occupational quality and labour market participation (Fasani et al., 2018). Entrepreneurship has consistently been suggested as a solution in this regard, having a positive impact on refugees as well as the society at large. However, not much is known about the factors influencing its success. Therefore, this study can contribute to an understanding in this regard, helping supporting organizations to better target support for refugee entrepreneurs, so that refugee entrepreneurship can be effectively promoted as a developmental strategy.

This thesis is structured as follows. Firstly, the second chapter will outline the relevant literature on forced migration and its consequences for refugees as well as host-societies. It shows how literature has identified entrepreneurship as a potential solution to these problems, and then, using the framework of the theory of structuration, it dives deeper into the social and human capital resources that are expected to influence refugee entrepreneurship. Eight hypotheses are derived from this. Chapter 3 will shortly provide case background information about Syrian refugees and their labour market experiences in the region. Subsequently, Chapter 4 will present the data collection method, a conceptualization of the hypotheses, and an outline of the methodology used in this thesis. This will be followed by the results of the data analysis presented through three logistic regression models. Finally, this thesis will be concluded by an overview of limitations of the current study, a discussion of possible explanations for the results and recommendations for further research.

2. Literature and theoretical framework

2.1. Refugees as a consequence and a cause of conflict

The resettlement of refugees can be seen as a consequence as well as a potential cause of conflict. The living conditions in refugees' home country leave them with a difficult choice: to stay and risk harm or persecution, or to leave without any assurances about the conditions they will face in their future country of residence (Salehyan & Gleditsch, 2006). These difficult living conditions in both the home and the potential host-country impose a serious burden on refugees. They may lose all their assets prior to flight and often suffer from considerable war trauma (Salehyan, 2008). Much of the scholarly literature thus focuses on the impact of conflict on refugees. However, there is a growing body of literature looking at the potential impact of refugees on conflict (Lischer, 2005; Martin, 2005; Salehyan & Gleditsch, 2006; Salehyan, 2008). It is now widely accepted that refugees can place a considerable burden on receiving countries, specifically when resettlement occurs *en masse*. In these cases of mass resettlement of thousands of refugees in a relatively short period of time, we speak of an 'influx' of refugees (Jacobsen, 1996). These influxes can have several negative implications for receiving countries. Refugees can compete with natives over scarce resources, such as employment, land, and water (Martin, 2005) therewith drawing on limited social services (Haider, 2014). They can overwhelm existing infrastructures such as housing, schools and health facilities (Jacobsen, 2002). Furthermore, refugees can alter the ethnic composition of the receiving state, expand rebel social networks, and bring arms or potentially violent ideologies (Salehyan & Gleditsch, 2006). Therefore, analysis has shown that any or a combination of these negative externalities lead to a higher probability for spill-over of conflict from refugees' countries of origin into the host-country. This effect is most apparent when migration takes place to neighbouring states (Salehyan & Gleditsch, 2006).

The competition over scarce resources or conflicting ideologies can lead to tensions or even conflict between refugees and the native population. As hypothesized by the Group Conflict Theory, a certain in-group will gain negative sentiments towards a smaller out-group because of their battle over scarce resources (Blalock, 1967; Blumer, 1958). An increasing out-group, due to resettlement, can enhance the feeling of competition, and the level of threat the in-group perceives. An example of this is shown in Turkey, where sentiments towards Syrian refugees became increasingly negative, leading to the framing of refugees as a threat to the demographic composition of Turkey, as well as the distribution of government assistance and public services. While the number of Syrian refugees increased in the autumn of 2011, the city of Van, in the east of Turkey, experienced two earthquakes with considerable humanitarian consequences. Natives complained that the government did not do nearly enough in support of the victims of these

disasters, for which they blamed the Syrian refugees who, in their perception, receive all government assistance (Memisoglu & Ilgit, 2016).

However, refugees don't have to be a burden, and if managed right they can make positive contributions to host-countries. An example of this can be seen in Malawi, where civil unrest in neighbouring Mozambique caused an influx of almost 2 million refugees, pertaining to circa 10 percent of Malawi's total population. Malawi is naturally very poor in resources, but their management of this refugee crisis was very successful, preventing spill-over of the neighbouring conflict. Extensive integration efforts and access to land and employment led to a high engagement (of nearly 90 percent) of refugees in productive economic activities, therewith contributing to the local economy (Saleyan & Gleditsch, 2006).

2.2. Integration

To successfully manage influxes of refugees it is therefore necessary to develop policies that foster the integration of refugees into the host-society. Integration knows no universal definition, and is understood and used with widely different meanings, causing controversy around the term. Nevertheless, 'integration remains significant both as a stated policy goal and a targeted outcome for projects working with refugees' (Ager & Strang, 2008, p.167). One of the most commonly used and referenced frameworks for integration is that of Ager & Strang (2008). Four main integration outcomes are identified, namely: employment, health, housing and education. These are the main fields that refugee integration policies aim to improve upon. In order to do this, Ager & Strang (2008) argue that social connections are needed to drive integration at the local level. The most basic notion of integration at this level can be regarded the absence of conflict and presence of tolerance between refugees and members of the native population. A slightly more ambitious level of integration is the existence of a community in which people from different backgrounds actively interact. Three types of social connections can be identified. Firstly, social bonds describe our relationships with people most similar to us, often these are family members, or people from the same ethnic or religious background. Secondly, social bridges describe relationships with people different from us, in this case encompassing the relationship between refugees and people from the host-community. Finally, the third type of social connection, social linkages, describes our relationship with formal institutions (Putnam, 1993).

Previous research has shown that refugees highly value close relationships with family members, or social bonds, because it allows them to share their cultural practices. The engagement of refugees in social bonds has also been seen as positively influencing integration. These types of relationships prevent isolation, and form a basis for exchanging best practices in dealing with

refugee specific issues (Ager & Strang, 2008). However, a different strand of literature stresses the potentially negative effects of social bonds. The formation of so-called 'ethnic enclaves' can negatively affect social cohesion, because the frequency and need for interaction with the host-community is reduced (Fong & Ooka, 2002). This has the potential to reinforce the salience of cultural identity, and hamper integration. In the worst case this can lead to a polarization of society into distinct groups, which is seen to increase the potential for conflict (Aldrich & Waldinger, 1990; Rusinovic, 2008; Samnani, Boekhorst & Harrison, 2013).

Therefore, Muller (1998) stresses that social bonds are only beneficial to integration when they are complemented by relationships that can be characterized as social bridges. Studies have shown that both refugees and host-communities see the existence of social bridges as a sign of successful integration. When contact with host-communities reflects friendliness, this positively influences refugees' sense of safety and security. When contact goes beyond friendliness, and involves active participation from refugees as well as natives in, for instance, sport associations, education, or religious groups, this can bring longer-term social and economic benefits to the community (Ager & Strang, 2008). Moreover, the existence of social bridges in society is seen to reduce the potential for conflict (Samnani, Boekhorst & Harrison, 2013).

2.3. Labour market integration

Essential to integration, and consequently the most researched area of integration is employment or labour market integration (Ager & Strang, 2008). Refugees face significant barriers in their search for employment. They potentially lack valid credentials or education, have underdeveloped language skills, face discrimination in the labour market, or are denied the right to work by the host-country government (Abassian & Bildt, 2009; Chrysostome, 2010).

There are several negative consequences of the inability of refugees to find a job, not only for the refugees themselves, but also for the host-country.

Firstly, poor socioeconomic conditions such as unemployment, exclusion from access to services and infrastructure as well as over-crowded living conditions, may contribute to the likeliness of refugees to become radicalized (Haider, 2014; Hanafi & Long, 2010; Hutson, Long & Page, 2009). For instance, Leenders (2010) finds that extreme deprivation, including limited to no employment opportunities among Iraqi refugees fuelled grievances, especially among youths. Additionally, unemployment makes refugees a vulnerable group, which increases their chances of being recruited to join a militant group (Ferris, 2008). Especially when refugee resettlement takes place in neighbouring countries, this increases the potential for the spread of conflict through the extension of rebel networks (Salehyan & Gleditsch, 2006). However, these findings do not go uncontested, and some scholars find that there is little evidence for the correlation between poor

socioeconomic conditions and refugee violence. Instead, political factors such as conditions of flight and host-country responses are of greater importance (Lischer, 2005).

Secondly, when refugees don't have a source of income they will place a larger burden on the state's public resources. In turn, the surrounding population may feel disadvantaged when the government is seen to provide refugees with services instead of them. This can lead to negative sentiments towards refugees, 'scapegoating' refugees, and in the worst case an escalation of violence (Haider, 2014). Even when these negative sentiments are not present, integration of refugees into the labour market still offers benefits through a reduction of the costs of immigration(for instance by the contribution of refugees to the host-country through tax payment) (Moriano et al., 2010).

The labour market thus constitutes of a space where competition between the host-country and refugees is perceived strongly, and the potential for rising tension is apparent.

In some instances this feeling of competition may be justified, as refugees often work for low wages. Especially when resettlement takes place in neighbouring countries, the refugee work force is likely to have a similar educational background to the native population (Ceritoglu et al., 2015), therefore constituting a 'substitutable' group to the native population, rather than a 'complementary' one (Borjas, 1989). This is supported by Ceritoglu et al. (2015) who find that Syrian refugees in Turkey have considerably impacted the employment opportunities of natives, especially in the informal sector. However, studies conducted in Western countries, refute these findings, and see only marginal influence of refugees on natives' labour market outcomes (Borjas, 1989).

Additionally, researchers have begun to look at the opportunities that refugee labour forces can offer. This works twofold. Firstly, the presence of refugees can increase the overall welfare of the community by attracting funds of international humanitarian agencies, which can also benefit host-communities. For instance, these organizations provide resources such as employment for locals, or service contracts with local businesses (Jacobsen, 2002). Secondly, economic activities of refugees can greatly benefit the host-community, for instance through the establishment of small retail shops answering to a demand for consumer goods (Sude, Stebbins & Weilant, 2015). In this way, refugees can contribute to local economies instead of extracting resources from them. This can facilitate not only their integration into society and the labour market, but also reduce existing tensions over scarce resources (Wauters & Lambrecht, 2006, 2008). Because most of the literature on entrepreneurship focuses on migrants in general, and not on refugees specifically, the next section will provide an outline of the existing research on migrant entrepreneurship, later turning to literature with a specific focus on refugees.

2.4. Migrant entrepreneurship

The potential for entrepreneurship among migrants has been widely acknowledged. It has even been argued that migrants become entrepreneurs more frequently than natives (Ensign & Robinson, 2011). Migrant entrepreneurs can be defined as migrants who own and operate a business. The literature on migrant entrepreneurship originates mainly from the United States, where Chinese, Italians, Jews and many other migrant communities were seen to have a proportionally high involvement in entrepreneurial activities compared to natives (Light, 1972; Gold, 1988; Waldinger et al., 1990).

Five main theories were developed in an attempt to explain these disproportionally high numbers of entrepreneurs among migrants. Firstly, the *cultural model*, also known as the model of entrepreneurship-migration, states that resettlement takes place with the specific intention of starting a business in the host-country. Secondly, the *economic chances model* claims that migrant entrepreneurs respond to the demands of the newly established migrant communities by offering specialized products, because of their thorough understanding of the needs, tastes and preferences of this community (Ensign & Robinson, 2011; Wauters & Lambrecht, 2006). Thirdly, the *reaction model*, *disadvantage theory* or *blocked mobility hypothesis* explains migrants' shift towards entrepreneurship by their exclusion from the regular labour market, through discriminatory practices, a lack of language skills or cultural knowledge, or restrictions imposed by regulations. Therefore implying that these migrants become entrepreneurs out of necessity rather than opportunity (Borjas, 1986; Chrysostome, 2010; Gold, 1988; Jones et al. 2014; Raijman & Tienda, 2003). Fourthly, the *theory of entrepreneurship instinct* states that some migrants, similarly to some natives, see the advantages of self-employment over regular employment, and therefore want to start their own business. And finally, the *integration model*, proposed by Wauters & Lambrecht (2006), sees the desire of the migrant community to integrate into society as a driver behind entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship is thus seen as a vehicle to realize this goal. As Ensign & Robinson (2011, p.40) claim: 'entrepreneurship is probably the best way for an outsider group to gain the acceptance of the established community.'

The many benefits offered by entrepreneurship can offer an explanation for this. Entrepreneurship is a significant factor in economic development, contributes to job creation, and leads to innovation (Moriano et al., 2010, Turkina & Thi Thanh Thai, 2013). Furthermore, research shows that migrant entrepreneurial behaviour has a positive influence on the sectors of the host-community in which it takes place, thereby acting as a driver of the economic growth of the host-country (Fairlie, 2012). Additionally, examples show that entrepreneurship is a respected career path, and that host-communities come to embrace the products and services offered by migrant entrepreneurs. One needs only to look at the many Turkish kebab shops and Chinese

restaurants to see how migrants' entrepreneurial innovations become part of the mainstream. Thereby 'the clash between newcomers and the establishment results in an exchange of equals whereby meritorious innovations from outsiders are adopted in the mainstream' (Ensign & Robinson, p. 35), leading to 'bilateral assimilation' (p.35).

The distinct social embeddedness of migrant entrepreneurship can also be seen as a reason for its beneficial impact on integration. As previously identified in Ager & Strang's (2008) framework for integration, network structures, comprised of social bonds and social bridges, are crucial for the integration process of refugees as well as migrants. Similarly, extensive research on migrant entrepreneurship identifies the network structure of migrants as a crucial element of their business establishment (Bizri, 2017; Kloosterman et al., 1999; Salaff et al., 2006; Tienda & Raijman, 2004; Turkina & Thi Thanh Thai, 2013; Williams & Krasniqi, 2018), because these networks are seen to foster the exchange and generation of entrepreneurial ideas, provide financial resources and flexible employees who are willing to work long hours for low wages, and access to information and other networks (Bizri, 2017, Chrysostome, 2010, Coleman, 1988). However, early research in the field of migrant entrepreneurship explains migrant entrepreneurship solely through its embeddedness in networks consistent of co-ethnics (Light, 1972). This phenomenon has been referred to as the 'ethnic economy', in which the initial market for migrant entrepreneurs arises within the co-ethnic community, because of the competitive advantage migrant entrepreneurs have over native entrepreneurs in serving the needs of this group (Waldinger et al., 1990).

Running an ethnic business is negatively associated with integration, because operating within these markets consisting of ethnic entrepreneurs selling an ethnic product to a co-ethnic clientele reduces the need for and frequency of interaction with the host-community (Fong & Ooka, 2002). This contradicts the idea that migrant entrepreneurship is beneficial to integration and can be used as a strategy to achieve it.

However, more recent literature on migrant entrepreneurship stresses that is overly simplistic to see migrant entrepreneurship only in the context of this ethnic market. Migrants' business experiences are not only influenced by the direct network structure of co-ethnics, but also by the wider business context involving the mainstream market, and the extent to which this offers opportunities for the entrepreneur to move away from the ethnic market (Kloosterman et al., 1999). Therefore, it is important to look at the entrepreneurial success of migrants through a combination of both co-ethnic as well as host-country network structures.

2.5. Refugee entrepreneurship

While research on migrant entrepreneurship is widely available, there is a serious gap in the literature where refugees are concerned. Only few studies focus on refugees specifically (e.g. Bizri, 2017; Fong, 2007; Gold, 1988;; Wauters & Lambrecht, 2006, 2008; Williams & Krasniqi, 2018).

As previously identified, the narrative surrounding an influx of refugees is commonly phrased in a negative way, focussing on the burden refugees impose on host-countries, through the negative impact they have on scarce resources, such as land, water, housing, and employment. However, examples show that refugees can also benefit local economies. Jacobsen (2002) shows that refugees bring specific 'refugee resources' (p.578) to their host-countries. For instance, they attract humanitarian aid, and cause a considerable amount of media attention, capable of attracting attention to areas that are usually not in the public eye. Therefore, there is a serious opportunity for generating political leverage. But first and foremost, refugees bring with them 'human capital in the form of labour, skills and entrepreneurship' (p.577). For instance, in Buduburam, a Liberian refugee camp in Ghana, refugees started small businesses that built roads, replaced tents with houses, and established a telephone line to contact relatives; all innovations that local communities benefitted from.

The benefits of migrant entrepreneurship identified in previous literature, could thus very well be applicable to refugees as well. However, scholars state that it is not possible to simply treat refugees as part of the general group of migrants because there are several crucial differences between refugees and economic migrants, related to their reasons of flight and consequential for starting a business (Cortes, 2004; Gold, 1988; Wauters & Lambrecht, 2006, 2008). Therefore, several concrete differences between economic migrants and refugees can be distinguished. Firstly, refugees experience traumatic events because of the situation in their country of origin as well as during their flight to the host-country. The psychological problems associated with this can impact their self-reliance and consequentially, their self-employment. Secondly, due to refugees' unexpected flight they have had little opportunity to prepare for their stay in the host-country in advance. As a consequence, they often do not have the opportunity to bring along their valuables, such as financial capital and relevant certificates. Economic migrants, who at times flee with the specific idea of starting a business in mind, have more time to prepare, increasing the resources they bring. Related to this, are the different possibilities for refugees and migrants to return to their country of origin. Because refugees flee from persecution, it is not possible for them to acquire funds, capital or labour for their business from home. The latter is considered a distinct benefit for economic migrants, who make use of their diaspora networks. And finally, the social network of refugees in the host-country is likely to be less extensive than

that of regular migrants, because refugees often leave their home countries individually (Gold, 1988). Additionally, 'there is often no longstanding tradition of immigration from their country of origin to the host-country', further limiting their network (Wauters & Lambrecht, 2008, p.908). Therefore, more recently, studies are emerging that focus on refugee entrepreneurship specifically. Similar to the literature on migrant entrepreneurship, these studies suggest that firstly, there is a high willingness among refugees to become entrepreneurs (Wauters & Lambrecht, 2006). And secondly, that their social network is instrumental for starting their business (Gold, 1988; Bizri, 2017; Wauters & Lambrecht, 2008). However, as stated previously it is more likely for a refugee to be embedded in a rather limited social network than for regular migrants. Wauters & Lambrecht (2008) consequentially find that refugees in Belgium are insufficiently included in both home country as well as host-country networks, which often times causes them to stand alone. Therefore, it is stressed that networks alone are not sufficient in explaining refugee entrepreneurship, but that it is also important to look at the individual entrepreneur, and the way in which he or she is able to capitalize on existing opportunities (Wauters & Lambrecht, 2008). Fong et al. (2007) thus find that the personal characteristics of individual entrepreneurs have to be taken into account. However, as previously indicated it is also stated that refugees' personal skills might be less fit for entrepreneurship. Waldinger et al. (1990) describe the process of migrant entrepreneurship as self-selective, where those who decide to migrate naturally possess the abilities, preparedness and risk-taking that is necessary for entrepreneurship (versus those who stay home). This selective process does not apply to refugees, fleeing war or persecution. Therefore, it is expected that with limited social networks, as well as limited skills, starting a business will be more difficult for refugees than for regular migrants. However, research has also shown, that if successful, refugees' businesses can make the same positive contributions to the host-community as those of regular migrants. Therefore, it is necessary to understand what influences the entrepreneurial success of refugees. Therefore, the following section will give a short outline of Giddens' structuration theory, which will serve as a framework to understand how refugees' personal skills and social networks interact, and how they can be either constraining or enabling factors in achieving entrepreneurial success.

2.6. Structuration theory

The theory of structuration by Anthony Giddens (1984) tries to explain the relationship between agency and structure. His main argument is that all individuals, agents, have knowledge of society and of the consequences of their actions. Within the boundaries of the changing structural context around them, actors continually make decisions. The structure influences these decisions, and conversely these decisions influence the structure. This structure consists of both rules and

resources, upon which the individual draws to affect the intended outcome.

For refugee entrepreneurs, their social network can be seen as the structure in which they try to achieve entrepreneurial success. The resources inherent to this network can be called social capital (Portes, 1998), and consist of a variety of benefits such as cheap labour, information, clientele, etcetera. On the other hand, this social network naturally also consists of rules, such as the provision of 'mutual aid' to family and friends that can impose a burden on an entrepreneur's financial resources (Ensign & Robinson, 2011, p.41). Therefore, this structure of rules and resources can work enabling as well as constraining for refugee entrepreneurs in achieving entrepreneurial success (Coleman, 1988; Giddens, 1984). In short, social capital thus consists of some aspect of social structure, and facilitates certain actions of individuals within the structure (Coleman, 1988).

Besides structure, refugees use their agency to make decisions that influence their entrepreneurial outcomes. For instance, the development of the abovementioned social networks and the use of these networks for positive outcomes can be seen as a refugee's agency. This agency is affected by human capital resources, as 'human capital is created by changes in persons that bring about skills and capabilities that make them able to act in new ways.' (Coleman, 1988, p. 100). However, how these resources are used is, in its turn, impacted by rules, because there may be external barriers that prevent the usage of these resources, such as a lack of foreign credential recognition, or discriminatory practices in the labour market.

In short, 'a persons' actions are shaped, redirected, [and] constrained by the social context [consisting of] norms, interpersonal trust, social networks, and social organizations' (Coleman, 1988, p. 96).

Refugee entrepreneurship thus takes place within the ever evolving framework of structure and agency, in which social and human capital resources are used to affect the intended outcome, in this case: entrepreneurial success. Given that refugees' human capital may be ineffective within the foreign labour market, do their social networks make up for this loss? Or the other way around, are refugees' social networks (or lack thereof) a constraining factor in achieving entrepreneurial success? The next sections identify the aspects of social and human capital that have been identified by previous research as influential for migrant entrepreneurship. These will be tested here, to see if they are equally fit to explain success among refugee entrepreneurs.

2.7. Social capital

As defined by Portes (1998) social capital is a set of tangible or virtual resources that can be obtained through a network of social contacts, and used to achieve ones goals. To be able to start a business, an aspiring entrepreneur needs the right kind of resources, such as financial, human,

social or ethnic capital (Kloosterman, 2010). Migrants, in many cases lacking financial capital, and encountering problems with foreign credential recognition, compensate this by turning to their social networks, therewith relying on social capital when starting a business (Coleman, 1988; Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993).

Scholars propose several ways in which network structures influence migrant entrepreneurship. Similar to the literature on integration, a distinction is made between a network structure consisting of social bonds – relationships with those most similar to us, such as family, friends or co-ethnics, – or social bridges – relationships with those different from us, in this case the host-community. Both of these networks impact migrant entrepreneurship (Kloosterman et al., 1999). Starting with social bonds, the network of close social relations and family ties is seen to offer many resources, such as informal sources of finance and cheap labour (Chrysostome, 2010; Fong et al., 2017; Gomez et al., 2015; Kloosterman, 2010). An important aspect of these family ties is one's marital status. Previous literature identifies a positive relationship between entrepreneurship and the presence of a spouse (Fong et al., 2007; Lamba, 2003; Wauters & Lambrecht, 2006; Williams & Krasniqi, 2018). As Constant & Zimmerman (2006) note, there are several ways in which marital status influences entrepreneurial activities. Firstly, marriage brings stability, and the division of labour between spouses (e.g. between labour and caring for the household) can increase the productivity of entrepreneurs. Additionally, spouses can and often do help out within the business. Furthermore, in the case of a working spouse, entrepreneurs can rely on the stable income of their partner, freeing up the space to invest the entrepreneur's income in the business (Krasniqi, 2009). A spouse can thus be seen as a resource in one's social network, and is therefore expected to positively influence entrepreneurial success, represented in the following hypothesis:

H1: There is a positive relationship between the presence of a spouse and entrepreneurial success.

Besides the positive effects of a spouse, literature identifies one's family as an instrumental part of social capital (Coleman, 1988), and as a significant contributor to migrant entrepreneurship. Family members are often employed in the business (Bizri, 2017; Chrysostome, 2010; Fong et al., 2007; Walton-Roberts & Hiebert, 1997). The reliance on family members as a source of labour is considered a specific asset for migrant and refugee entrepreneurs, because family members often work for lower wages and for longer hours than would be accepted by regular employees (Gold, 1988). Furthermore, family members feel responsible for the success of the business, and are therefore willing to contribute their own assets to obtain this (Bizri, 2017). Therefore, family employees are a resource in one's social network, and therefore the employment of family members is expected to positively influence entrepreneurial success:

H2: There is a positive relationship between family member employees and entrepreneurial success.

Besides one's direct family, social bonds also consists of networks with co-ethnics. A distinct benefit of these networks is that migrants can benefit from the experience already acquired by the established migrant communities (Williams & Krasniqi, 2018). Therewith, the network provides a valuable source of information, for instance about store location, dealing with local institutions, or finding sources of finance. Additionally, other migrants or refugees can provide cheap labour, and similar to family members, are often willing to work for longer hours (Gold, 1988). Finally, it is said that aiming for an ethnic clientele offers migrant entrepreneurs with a competitive advantage over native entrepreneurs, because they are better aware of the needs of the community (Chrysostome, 2010; Nielsen & Riddle, 2010). However, the positive effects of the latter does not go uncontested, and the effects of operating within an 'ethnic market' are heavily debated. Firstly, using the established migrant community as a source of information might not be as beneficial to refugees as to regular migrants. As specified previously, there is often no longstanding tradition of migration from refugees' home countries to the host-country (Wauters & Lambrecht, 2008). Therefore, because this refugee resettlement is relatively new, the existing co-ethnic community is not 'established' to the same extent as a community of regular migrants. More importantly, Waldinger et al.(1990) stress that the ethnic market can seriously hamper opportunities for business growth, because the market in itself is limited in size, and its clientele is limited in purchasing power. Additionally, because many migrants start a business because of their exclusion from the regular labour market, out of necessity, this is likely to take place in a market where costs are relatively low. The business conditions in the ethnic market allow for the existence of small businesses that require relatively little investment. However, the 'push' towards these markets caused by exclusion leads to a 'proliferation' (p .23) of these small businesses, engaging in over-competition and resulting in a high failure rate.

Additionally, ethnic networks are often those of 'mutual aid' (Ensign & Robinson, 2011, p.41), leading to employment of underqualified or unnecessary personnel, obligations to extended family, as well as other obstacles hampering efficiency and capital accumulation, thereby reducing the entrepreneurs' profits and opportunities for expansion (Ensign & Robinson, 2011). Therefore, it is expected that these markets are constraining rather than enabling, and therefore negatively influence refugees' entrepreneurial success, represented in the following hypothesis:

H3: There is a negative effect of operating within ethnic markets on entrepreneurial success.

On the other hand, the benefits of a network structure consisted of social bridges are identified. For instance, operating in the mainstream market provides access to a larger group of customers,

less direct competition, and the possibility of charging higher prices (Gold, 1988). Furthermore, networking with the host-community is beneficial for the information position of migrants. It helps them in identifying opportunities, and acquiring knowledge about the demands of the host-community as well as the procedures and institutions involved in starting a business. Overall, it gives them access to contacts and support from the host-community (Turkina & Thi Thanh Thai, 2013). Furthermore, 'dealing with the mainstream market seems like the ideal situation for a newcomer to become accustomed to values and traditions of the new culture (Robertson & Grant, 2016, p.396).' Therefore, operating within this market has the potential to greatly benefit integration. Overall, it is expected to find a positive effect of operating within the mainstream market on entrepreneurial success:

H4: There is a positive effect of operating within mainstream markets on entrepreneurial success.

However, it must be noted that it is often difficult for migrants to start a business in mainstream markets, because there are different requirements and regulations for products or personnel Additionally, a lack of language skills or knowledge of cultural practices can be significant barriers in accessing this market (Waldinger et al., 1990). Therefore, in line with Giddens' structuration theory, refugees will not always be able to choose starting a business in the mainstream market because of the constraining rules of this structure. Therefore it is necessary to look at the human capital of refugees, which gives them agency to make use of the resources present in this network, and potentially circumvent these restrictions. Therefore, the next section will provide an overview of human capital resources that are expected to influence refugees' entrepreneurial success.

2.8. Human capital

A common claim is that a migrant's human capital might be of little value within a foreign labour market, because their specific skillset is not transferrable, due to a lack of recognition of foreign credentials or because there is a mismatch between a migrant's skills and the requirements of the labour market. Therefore, a migrant's social capital is used to compensate for a lack of other sources of capital, such as human capital (Coleman, 1990; Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993). As previously established, it is expected that refugees have more limited social capital as well as human capital. However, because this research looks at resettlement from Syria to its neighbouring countries, it is possible that the transferability of skills is greater than found in previous research focusing mostly on migration to developed economies. Syria and its neighbouring countries namely share similar levels of development and can all be classified as developing economies (OECD/DAC, 2018).

As previously stated, human capital refers to one's skills, competences and characteristics (Williams et al., 2017) One's network structure can only facilitate entrepreneurship to a certain extent, and for successful economic adaptation human capital is needed (Potocky-Tripodi, 2004). Previous research has identified several distinct human capital characteristics that influence (migrant) entrepreneurship.

Firstly, previous literature identifies the importance of host-country language skills. Not only are language skills instrumental for dealing with the necessary institutions when starting a business, such as the chamber of commerce or local government agencies, they are also crucial for accessing social capital and benefitting from the network of the native population (Marger, 2006; Wauters & Lambrecht, 2006, 2008; Williams & Krasniqi, 2018). Language skills are thus seen as a resource that greatly enhances the chance for refugees to make use of host-community networks, which are expected to be beneficial for entrepreneurial success. Therefore, host-country language skills are expected to positively influence entrepreneurial success:

H5: There is a positive relationship between host-country language skills and entrepreneurial success.

Secondly, a higher educational attainment is believed to be beneficial to entrepreneurship due to the increased ability for opportunity recognition and superior information set that comes with education (Constant & Zimmerman, 2006; Fong et al., 2007; Williams et al., 2017). Education helps the entrepreneur to better understand the challenges faced in starting a business in the host-country, and how to approach and overcome them. Therefore, education level plays an important role in the decision making process of migrant entrepreneurs (Chrysostome, 2010). However, Williams & Krasniqi (2018) find that educational attainment does not have an influence on entrepreneurial activities of refugees. This can be explained by the context in which their study took place. Namely, forced migrants from Kosovo starting a business in countries of the European Union or the United States. Quite possibly, education in Kosovo does not adequately prepare entrepreneurs for starting a business in a developed economy. Conversely, this research looks at Syrian refugees resettling in their neighbouring countries, all developing economies (OECD/DAC, 2018). The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) analyses the educational attainment of all countries yearly. Their Education Index, measured as the combined average of adult years of schooling and the expected years of schooling for children, shows that Syria rates relatively low (.412) when compared to Lebanon (.637), Turkey (.689) and Jordan (.711). However, countries such as the United States (.903) or Norway (.915) score much higher, indicating that there is a larger gap between the educational attainment of Syrian refugees and natives in developed economies, than between Syrian refugees and natives in developing economies (UNDP, 2018). Therefore, education is expected to be of greater importance here.

Following the theory of structuration, education is expected to influence the decisions refugee entrepreneurs make, because education increases their ability to recognize and act upon opportunities. Therefore, a higher educational attainment is expected to positively influence entrepreneurial success:

H6: There is a positive relationship between a higher education attainment and entrepreneurial success.

Additionally, scholars find that for starting a business in a foreign country, migrant entrepreneurs need to process large and complex business-related information such as information about market size, consumer products or reliable suppliers (Constant & Zimmerman, 2006; Kanas et al., 2009). This information is country specific, indicating that formal education in the host-country might not be sufficient for refugee entrepreneurs when starting a business. To overcome these drawbacks, it can be beneficial for refugees to participate in business training (Wauters & Lambrecht, 2008). This is supported by the findings of Williams & Krasniqi (2018) who find a significant positive effect of business training on refugee entrepreneurship. Therefore, business training helps refugees to overcome the initial restriction of insufficient human capital. Therefore, it is expected that business training will positively influence entrepreneurial success.

H7: There is a positive relationship between business training and entrepreneurial success.

Lastly, scholars have identified previous business experience as a major determinant for future entrepreneurial intentions as well as entrepreneurial success (Chrysostome, 2010; Fong et al., 2007; Tienda & Raijman, 2004, Wauters & Lambrecht, 2006). Previous business experience provides entrepreneurs with more clear expectations of what starting and running a business entails, which steps need to be undertaken and which pitfalls need to be avoided, again positively influencing the decision making of refugee entrepreneurs. Additionally, they will develop relevant managerial skills, learn how to establish relationships with relevant stakeholders, how to allocate human resource, and how to adjust to market demands (Chrysostome, 2010). Furthermore, if this previous experience takes place within the host-country, it comes with crucial knowledge about working permits and regulations for self-employment, and how to deal with host-country institutions (Kanas et al., 2009). The difference between host-country and home country experience will therefore be taken into account. Overall, previous experience is expected to positively influence the decision making of refugee entrepreneurs, and therefore their entrepreneurial success:

H8: There is a positive relationship between business experience and entrepreneurial success.

Having identified the resources inherent to one's social network as well as one's personal resources that are expected to influence refugee entrepreneurship, this thesis turns to a description of the case that is studied here, namely Syrian refugee entrepreneurs in Syria's neighbouring countries. It is recognized that 'conclusions about immigrant entrepreneurship largely depend on the context in which it occurs' (Bizri, 2017, p.850). Therefore, it is necessary to look at the resettlement experiences of Syrian refugees specifically.

3. Case background: Labour market experiences of Syrian refugees

In 2011, what began as protests against President Assad's regime quickly turned into a large scale conflict between the Syrian government, backed by Russia and Iran, and anti-government rebel groups, supported by the United States, Turkey, and Saudi Arabia.

In 2013, Islamic State began seizing Syrian territory, further exacerbating the conflict and putting it at the top of the international agenda (Council on Foreign Relations, n.d.). While an extensive analysis of the conflict is beyond the scope of this research, it is clear that this has led to the displacement of millions of Syrians.

Since the start of the conflict, 5,601,739 million (registered) refugees have fled Syria (UNHCR, 2019). Rhetoric surrounding these refugees became increasingly negative, leading to restrictive asylum procedures, especially within the European Union. In the summer of 2015, thousands of refugees were held up at European borders, or lost their lives at sea. These events led to the establishment of the EU Turkey Joint Action Plan in November 2015, to control the flow of refugees crossing the Mediterranean Sea. The EU's policy is thus clearly aimed at accommodating refugees in Syria's neighbourhood (Akgündüz et al., 2015).

After a four-year operation, Islamic State has been driven out of Syria and the Caliphate has fallen in March 2019. Unfortunately, this does not mean that the civil war has also come to an end. Bashar al-Assad remains in power, and Syria will most likely experience the same kind of stringent internal security measures that have triggered conflict in the first place, therewith sparking more civil unrest. Additionally, with Assad in power many Western countries are reluctant to provide the financial assistance needed for the reconstruction of Syria (Shatz, 2019). Therefore, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) finds that 'there are not sufficient guarantees or conditions in place to facilitate large-scale repatriation in safety and dignity' (p.29). Additionally, a premature large scale return of refugees could further destabilize the region (UNHCR, 2018). Therefore, it is unlikely that the millions of refugees are capable of returning to Syria any time soon (Shatz, 2019). It is thus necessary to move from humanitarian responses to sustainable development responses aimed at the integration of these refugees in their host-countries. The majority of Syrian refugees are hosted respectively in Turkey (3,614,108), Lebanon (929,624) and Jordan (662,010) (UNHCR, 2019) putting a serious strain on the resources of these countries (Akgündüz et al., 2015).

Several scholars have investigated the impact of the inflow of Syrian refugees on labour markets in Syria's neighbouring countries. For instance, studies show that Syrian refugees, who lack work permits, have a negative impact on Turkish workers in the informal sector. However, on the

other hand, wages in the formal job market are seen ton increase, leading to an increase in the average wage of Turkish employees (Del Carpio & Wagner, 2015; Ceritoglu et al., 2015). Furthermore, while Syrian refugees cause a slight increase in the price of housing and food, the employment rates of the native Turkish population are seen to be largely unaffected (Akgündüz et al., 2015).

Additionally, a study executed in Jordan shows that there is virtually no impact of Syrian refugees on labour market participation of the Jordanian population. While positive at first sight, this may actually suggest that government policies restrict Syrian labour market participation; that discrimination leads to Syrian exclusion from the formal labour market; or lastly, that there is a mismatch between refugees and available jobs (Fakih & Ibrahim, 2016).

Research in Lebanon, where the rate of refugees compared to the native population is highest (156 refugees per 1000 inhabitants)(UNHCR, 2018), shows that Syrian refugees have had a negative impact on employment and wages among Lebanese workers in the lowest segments, while only a marginal effect is found on high-skilled workers (David et al., 2019).

Overall, these labour market outcomes have led to increasingly negative sentiments towards refugees, and while Syria's neighbouring countries are lauded for their 'open-door' policies, local populations are not always supportive of the government's approach (Turner, 2015).

The majority of Syria's neighbouring countries have regulations in place through which Syrians can be granted work permits. However, the number of work permits actually granted is low. Figures from Turkey show that there are more than 1.7 million Syrian refugees of working age, but only 20,981 refugees have been granted a work permit since 2011, therewith only accounting for 1% of the total working population. Mostly, Syrian refugees thus resort to informal labour markets (estimated at between 500,000 and 1,000,000 in 2017). This is not only caused by a difficulty in obtaining work permits. Formal employment namely also causes Syrian employees to lose their competitive advantage over Turkish workers, because in the informal sector, Syrian employees can obtain employment more easily by accepting low wages. This is particularly true for low-skilled sectors. Here, the low wages of Syrian refugees are pressing on the overall wages. Because of these low wages, refugees are used as a substitute for local workers, therewith sparking hostility between refugees and natives, who argue having their jobs stolen by the Syrian labour force. Out of a fear of losing their source of income, Syrians accept these low wages and often precarious working conditions.

However, data from the Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey also shows that Syrians have become the largest group of foreign entrepreneurs in Turkey. There is an increasing trend in business establishment by Syrians, leading to the establishment of 1,764

businesses with Syrian partners in 2017. Important to note is that this only accounts for businesses that have formally been registered, and inclusion of informal businesses can greatly increase these numbers (İçduygu & Diker, 2017). The approximately 4000 formal businesses that have been established throughout the past four years are employing thousands of workers, of whom a great deal are Turkish natives. Most of these businesses operate in the restaurant, construction, trade, textile, real estate, travel and transportation sectors. The impact of these businesses on the Turkish economy is most notable in Gaziantep, in the southeast of Turkey, where the number of Syrian firms rose from three in 2010 to 600 in 2015. Therewith not only benefiting the local economy, but also boosting trade with Syria because of firms' links with counterparts in Syria (Karaspan, 2016).

This example shows that there is great entrepreneurial potential among Syrian refugees. Additionally, it offers distinct benefits. It prevents refugees from working under precarious conditions for low wages. They no longer act as substitutes for local workers 'stealing' the jobs of natives, but rather create job opportunities for natives. And finally, they contribute to the overall economy. Entrepreneurship can thus positively contribute to the livelihood of Syrian refugees as well as reduce their burden on host-countries. Therefore, more awareness is needed about the factors influencing entrepreneurial success among Syrian refugees.

4. Data and method of analysis

Having outlined the hypotheses that will guide this research, as well as the context in which they will be tested, the following chapter explains the case selection and methodology. It is divided into three section. The first section will discuss the case selection and data collection methods, followed by a section on the conceptualization of the variables, followed by the methodology.

4.1. Case selection and data collection method

This thesis entails a quantitative case study of Syrian refugee entrepreneurs in Syria's neighbourhood. This case was chosen to fill a gap in the literature on migrant and refugee entrepreneurship, which mostly focuses on migrants in Western developed economies. To show whether a similar relationship between human and social capital and entrepreneurship exists in the case of refugees in developing economies, it was decided to focus on Syrian refugees in the neighbourhood. Several factors highlight the importance of focussing on Syria's neighbouring countries. Firstly, they harbour the majority of Syrian refugees (UNHCR, 2019). Secondly, as neighbouring countries to the conflict they are most vulnerable for conflict spill-over (Salehyan & Gleditsch, 2006). And, finally, the relative similarities between Syria and its neighbouring countries in terms of economic development and educational attainment may positively influence refugee entrepreneurship (UNDP, 2018).

To assess the relevance of the hypotheses specified in Chapter 2, a survey was distributed to Syrian refugee entrepreneurs in Syria's neighbouring countries. This was executed with help from SPARK. SPARK is an international non-government organization that aims at 'develop[ing] higher education and entrepreneurship to empower young, ambitious people to lead their conflict affected societies into prosperity' (SPARK, n.d.). A large part of their work focuses directly on supporting migrant and refugee entrepreneurs, or entrepreneurs in post-conflict countries, in starting their businesses. SPARK offers financial assistance, runs business plan competitions, works together with microfinancing institutions and facilitates network building. SPARK has an extensive network within the Middle-East, with offices in Turkey, Jordan and Lebanon. Therefore, SPARK's network was used to distribute the survey among refugee entrepreneurs in the region.

The survey was available in English and Arabic, the latter being the main language of Syrian refugees. The translation was conducted by Hamzah Abboushi, project officer at the SPARK Amman office in Jordan, and a native Arabic speaker.[1] The survey was distributed online via

---

[1] The English and Arabic version of the survey are included in Appendix A and B.

Qualtrics and completed by 70 respondents. Because the survey was conducted within the network of SPARK and only measures experiences of refugees that have a business, the sample is not representative for the entire Syrian refugee population. Additionally, it is not representative of the entire population of Syrian refugee entrepreneurs, because it is possible that being part of the network of SPARK already has implications for the type of refugees that are included in this study. There may be significant differences between refugees that seek the help of supporting organizations or that can be reached through the network of this organization and those that cannot. For instance, this could already have implications for the extent of one's network. However, this study has an exploratory nature, and its goal is to find whether the relationships between human and social capital and entrepreneurship specified by previous literature are also present among Syrian refugee entrepreneurs. Because of this, no generalizations can and will be made about the entire population of Syrian refugees, or even of Syrian refugee entrepreneurs. However, the value of this study lies in exploring whether these relationships are present within the sample, and therefore the sample is considered valid for the goals of this research.

Of 70 respondents, 55 were male and 15 were female. The age of the participants was evenly distributed, with 50% being younger than 30, and 50% being 30 or older. Most respondents are currently living in Turkey (40%), followed by Jordan (28,6%), Syria (11,4%) and Lebanon (10%). The high number of Syrian refugees still living in Syria suggests that a considerable part of the sample is internally displaced, instead of resettled in a neighbouring country. Generally, it is expected that internally displaced face similar issues in terms of loss of social capital resources. However, their human capital may be of greater value. They speak the same language, and will have no or less problems with credential recognition. A large part of the sample has been living in the host-country for a considerable time, with 44,3% indicating that they have been in the host-country from 2 to 5 years, and 42,9% indicating they have been there for more than 5 years. Interestingly, 4,3% of the respondents say they have been living in the host-country for less than 6 months. Since all respondents in the sample currently own a business, this suggests that they have managed to set up an enterprise in an impressively short amount of time. Respondents are highly educated, with 35,7% indicating that they have a high school degree, and 48,6% indicating that they have a bachelor's degree.

The following section will outline the conceptualization of the dependent and independent variables.

<u>4.2. Variables</u>

4.2.1. Dependent variable

The dependent variable in this study is *entrepreneurial success*. Measuring entrepreneurial success is not straightforward as it includes multiple criteria, both financial and non-financial in nature. Success can be found in independence, achieving set goals, having a positive working climate, but also more economic measures such as: company survival, profits, employee growth, market share or return on investment. It is therefore suggested that evaluations of entrepreneurial success should combine both organizational and psychological factors (Dej, 2010). However, it is not realistic to use the same indicators for mainstream entrepreneurs as for refugee entrepreneurs (Chrysostome, 2010).

Because the most basic goal for entrepreneurship among refugees is identified as financial independence and company survival, this will be regarded here as success (Chrysostome, 2010). It was therefore decided to measure entrepreneurial success with three separate questions. Firstly: Are the costs of your business covered by its income? 0 – no, 1 – yes. This question is supposed to measure the businesses profitability. It is expected that when the costs of the business are not (yet) covered by its income, the business is not a source of revenue for the refugee but rather a cost, therefore not contributing to the financial independence of the entrepreneur. Furthermore, this indicates potential business failure. The second question is: Do you receive financial support? 1 – no, 0 – yes. And finally: Next to running your business, do you need an additional job to support yourself financially? 1 – no, 0 – yes. These questions intend to measure whether the entrepreneur in question is reliant on additional sources of financing besides their business. Thus, even when the costs of the business are covered by its income, this amount is not sufficient to live financially independent. For instance, because the business needs considerable investment, or income is only limited.

Because asking about financial support can be a sensitive question, it was decided to include the following answer category: 'do not want to say'. This resulted in 11 missing answers. Because of the already limited sample size, it was decided not to drop these respondents from the sample. Instead, the respondents were individually reviewed to take into account their answer regarding the costs and income of their business. Therefore, it was decided to include the respondents that indicated that their businesses costs were covered by its income in the category of 'no financial support' (N=6) and those that indicated that their businesses costs were not covered by its income in 'financial support' (N=5).[2]

---

[2] It is recognized that this is not the only possible classification of these missing answers. Another reasoning could be that those that have indicated 'do not want to say' are more likely to rely on financial support. However because 24 respondents indicated to receive financial support, it appears that respondents are quite open to admit to this. There is thus no reason to expect that all missing answers should be grouped under 'receiving financial support'.

An initial check of answers on all three questions shows that 88,6% of respondents has indicated that they need an additional job to support themselves financially. Because of the limited variance in responses, it was decided to leave out this question, and compose entrepreneurial success with the two additional questions only. However, this finding in itself is interesting, because it paints a picture of entrepreneurial activity as only one source of revenue, suggesting that in most cases it does not suffice as a mean to live financially independent. Additionally, this finding could suggest that refugee entrepreneurs do not move towards entrepreneurship because of their exclusion from the labour market, since they have successfully secured regular employment besides their enterprise.

In conclusion, entrepreneurial success is measured as a dichotomous outcome variable where success is considered to be achieved when 'Are the costs of your business covered by its income?' is answered with 'yes', and 'Do you receive financial support?' is answered with 'no', shown by the table below.

Table 1: Entrepreneurial success

	N	No	Yes
Are the costs of your business covered by its income?	70	27	43
Do you receive financial support?	70	41	29
Entrepreneurial success	70	40	30

4.2.2. Independent variables

This section will describe the measurement of the independent variables included in this study, focussing on variables related to social capital and human capital as well as control variables that are expected to influence refugee entrepreneurial success.

4.2.2.1. Social capital

The first variable, *marital status,* is measured with the following question: 'What is your marital status?' with the possible answer categories; 1 – married, 2 – living with partner (but not married), 3 – widowed, 4 – divorced, 5 – single or 6 – other. A check of the answers on this variable shows that 51,4% of the sample is married, and 37,1% of the sample is single. Because there is little variance in given answers, and the largest amount of respondents is in two categories it was decided to recode this variable into two possible answer categories, being 1 – married or living with partner, 2 – single. It was decided to include living with partner with those that are married, because the beneficial social capital received from this is expected to be similar, namely: possible help in the household, help within the business or an additional source of finance.

Secondly, *family employees,* was measured with the following question: How many family members are employed by your business, if any? Where respondents responses ranged from zero to fifteen family member employees. For this study the relevance here is not related to the amount of employees, but rather the presence of family member employees versus no family member employees. Therefore, the variable was recoded into: 0 – no family member employees, 1 – family member employees. Eight respondents indicated to have no employees in an earlier question and were therefore excluded from answering this question about family member employees. However, it follows logically that without any employees there are also no family member employees. Therefore, they were included into this former category as well.

The following variable is operating within the *ethnic market.* As defined by Rusinovic (2008) the ethnic market 'consists of entrepreneurs who sell an ethnic product and whose main clientele has the same migration background as the entrepreneur' (p.441). To measure operating within the ethnic market it was decided to focus on this last factor, because it is the clientele and not the product that is a determinant of the type of social capital acquired. Therefore, it was measured with the following question: Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statement: Most of my clientele consists of people from my home country: 1 – strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 – neutral, 4 – agree, 5 – strongly agree.

Subsequently, operating within the *mainstream market* was measured in the same way: Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statement: Most of my clientele consists of people from the host-country: 1 – strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 – neutral, 4 – agree, 5 – strongly agree. However it was later acknowledged that using a Likert scale for both of these questions was not suitable for their analysis, because the intention is to measure operating within the ethnic market (or mainstream market) versus not operating within this market. Therefore, it was decided to recode both variables into dummy variables with only two possible answer categories: 0 – no or 1 – yes. The most common divide here would be to include both 'agree' and 'strongly agree' in the yes category, while the other answers don't indicate presence of this type of clientele, therefore including them in the no category. However, an initial check of the responses on these questions shows that a considerable amount of respondents have indicated either agree or strongly agree in both the ethnic market as well as the mainstream market (N=25). This can probably be attributed to a wrongful interpretation of the question. In the strict sense it is not possible that *most* of the clientele is from the host-country as well as the home country of the entrepreneurs. To limit the amount of respondents that fall into both the ethnic market as well as the mainstream market category it was decided to only include

respondents that have answered 'strongly agree' in the yes category for both questions. Crosstabulations show that this reduces the amount of respondents in both categories to N=9.[3]

4.2.2.2. Human capital

Firstly, the *level of host-country language skills* is tested using the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (Council of Europe, n.d.). This framework distinguishes language skills between 6 levels of proficiency, ranging from A1, beginner, to C2, proficiency. For this research an answer category of less than A1 is also included, to capture the effect of not speaking the language on the entrepreneurial success of refugees. Therefore, the answer categories are as follows: 0 – no knowledge of the language, 1 – beginner (A1), 2 – elementary (A2), 3 – intermediate (B1), 4 – upper intermediate (B2), 5 – advanced (C1), 6 – proficient (C2). Respondents were expected to be familiar with this scale because it is more commonly used in surveys executed within the network of SPARK.

Secondly, *education level* is measured as the highest degree attained. Because there are many cross-country differences in education there are several ways of measuring. A common way is by opting for years of education instead of highest completed education, or by choosing the internationally recognized scale International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) (UNESCO, 2011). However, in this case, many of the respondents have previously taken part in surveys of SPARK, that have included a different scale of education level. For the sake of continuity and familiarity it was decided to use this same scale: 0 – less than high school degree, 1 – high school degree, 2 – vocational degree, 3 – bachelor degree, 4 – master degree or higher.

Furthermore, *previous business training* is measured with the following question: Have you ever taken part in a business training? 0 – no, 1 – yes, in my home country, 2 – yes, in the host-country. The next independent variable is *previous business experience,* measured with the following question: Have you previously owned a business in your home or host-country? 0 – no, 1 – yes, in my home country, 2 – yes, in the host-country. For both of these questions the difference between home country and host-country experience are taken into account because the literature suggests that the effects of both are different. While some scholars focus on the knowledge of the market one acquires through previous experience or training, which is country specific (Kanas et al., 2009), other scholars state that training in general will positively influence entrepreneurship (Williams & Krasniqi, 2018).

---

[3] Crosstabulations are included in Appendix C

4.2.2.3. Control variables

Several control variables will be taken into account that are expected to influence entrepreneurial success. Firstly, *age* is taken into account. An individual needs time, experience and skills to start a business, which is acquired throughout the years. Therefore, entrepreneurial success is expected to increase with age (Williams & Krasniqi, 2018). The following question is used to measure age: 'What year were you born?'. It was decided to group answers into categories. A check of responses showed that there is a 50/50 divide between those under 30, and those 30 and over, leading to the inclusion of these two age categories.

Secondly, women have a lower probability to consider entrepreneurship than men. Entrepreneurship remains a male-oriented career choice (Chrysostome, 2010), which can be explained through traditional role patterns still existing, or the more limited network that women have. The latter directly impacts the social capital resources available to women, and thus potentially influences their entrepreneurial success (Wauters & Lambrecht, 2006). Therefore, *gender* will also be controlled for, measured through the following question: Are you… 1 – male, 2 – female.

Furthermore, this study will take into account the effect of the *length of residency* on entrepreneurial success. The length of residency is expected to have a direct impact on the stock of social capital resources one acquires because one's network will increase over time. Furthermore, it is also expected to influence one's human capital, because entrepreneurs will have more time to acquire the skills necessary to start a business, for instance through language or business training (Caparros Ruiz, 2010; Williams & Krasniqi, 2018). Therefore, length of residency is represented by the following question: For how many months have you lived in the host-country? 1 – less than 6 months, 2 – from 6 months to under 1 year, 3 – from 1 year to under 2 years, 4 – from 2 years to under 5 years, 5 – 5 years or more. However, to limit the amount of answer possibilities in the model it was decided to recode this variable. It is most important for this variable to capture the difference between those that have only been in the country for a short amount of time, versus those that have been in the host-country for longer. Therefore, it was decided to recode into: 1 – less than 2 years, 2 – 2 years or more.

Lastly, the effect of one's *country of residence* will be taken into account. As previously stated, the majority of refugees is hosted in Turkey, Jordan and Lebanon. For all three countries, the large influx of refugees has manifested in its own way, and different asylum policies are in place. Turkey has been lauded for its open door policy towards refugees. However, while signatory to the 1951 Refugee Convention, outlining 'the rights of the displaced as well as the obligations of states to protect them' (UNHCR, 1951), it only grants these rights to refugees within the geographical limitations stated in the convention, namely only those coming from European

countries. For Syrian refugees this means they are officially classified as 'guests' and only granted temporary asylum (Memisoglu & Ilgit, 2016). Formally, there is legislation in place that regulates access to the labour market, namely the Law on Foreigners and International Protection (LFIP), adopted in 2014 and the International Labour Force Law (ILFL) adopted in 2016. However, under certain circumstances labour market access can be restricted, and many Syrians' access is being withheld (Tçduygu & Şimşek, 2016).

Lebanon and Jordan's policies towards refugees are heavily influenced by their history with Palestinian refugees, resulting in opposite strategies. Lebanon has experienced difficulties with Palestinian refugee camps turning into sites of radicalization and armed resistance. Therefore, their response to Syrian refugees has been to allow them to live in urban settlements rather than formal camps. Additionally, economically, Lebanon has relied on the presence of a low-wage Syrian labour force. The influx of refugees, and their non-encampment, has restored the level of Syrian participation in the Lebanese labour market. On the other hand, Jordan decided to house refugees in formal refugee camps, most notably Zaatari (approximately 80,000 refugees) and Azraq (approximately 18,000 refugees). This decision follows from their experiences with successfully managed Palestinian refugee camps, as well as the former non-encampment of Iraqi refugees which negatively influenced Jordan's ability to raise international financial aid for their presence. Additionally, Jordan has been trying to limit its dependence on foreign labour, resulting in restrictive labour market access. However, the refugee experiences in Lebanon are not exclusively positive, and conversely, those in Jordan are not exclusively negative. Sentiments towards refugees in Lebanon have deteriorated, fuelled by rising prices, competition for jobs, decreasing wages and the distribution of aid to Syrians closely located to poor Lebanese communities. This results in a strong opposition of the Lebanese public towards the government's approach, with 70 percent of the population in favour of establishing formal UNHCR camps for Syrians. On the other hand, in Jordan, a bailout system exists through which Syrian refugees can exit the formal camps if a Jordanian citizen acts as a guarantor of their whereabouts. Many Syrians have been able to use this system successfully due to the many family and friendship ties between Syrians and Jordanians. However, since 2014 it has been increasingly difficult to obtain bailout papers (Turner, 2015). These different local contexts are expected to influence the entrepreneurial success of refugees, therefore the questionnaire included the following measure of country of residence: What is your current country of residence? A check of the responses shows that the majority of respondents is currently living in Turkey (N=29), Jordan (N=20), Syria (N=8) or Lebanon (N=7). The remainder of respondents were grouped in the category 'other' (N=7) consisting of Andorra, Cyprus, Saudi Arabia, and Sweden. The answers

were categorized as follows: 1 – Lebanon, 2 – Syria, 3 – Jordan, 4 – Turkey, 5 – Other. The table below shows the descriptive statistics of the independent variables and the dependent variable:

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of dependent and independent variables

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
Dependent variable					
Entrepreneurial success	70	0	1	,43	,498
Independent variables					
Human capital					
Language skills	70	0	6	3,46	1,863
Education	70	0	4	2,21	1,102
Previous training	70	0	2	1,29	,854
Previous experience	70	0	2	1,16	,773
Social capital					
Marital status	70	0	1	,53	,503
Family employees	70	0	1	,50	,504
Ethnic market	70	0	1	,66	,478
Mainstream market	70	0	1	,51	,503
Control variables					
Age	70	1	2	1,50	,504
Gender	70	1	2	1,21	,688
Country of residence	70	1	5	3,29	1,118
Length of residency	70	1	2	1,43	,498

4.3. Methodology

To test the above-mentioned hypotheses this study executes three separate logistic regression analyses. The first model will check the effect of the control variables on entrepreneurial success. The second model incorporates the independent variables related to social capital, and lastly, in the third model, the variables associated with human capital are added. The logistic regression analyses will be executed to find the influence of multiple independent variables (X) on a dichotomous dependent variable (Y) (Entrepreneurial success versus no entrepreneurial success), while holding the other independent variables constant. This is represented in the following function:

$$Ln\ (P/1\text{-}P) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{languageskills} + \beta_2 X_{education} + \beta_3 X_{businesstraining} +$$

$$\beta_4 X_{businessexperience} + \beta_5 X_{maritalstatus} + \beta_6 X_{familyemployees} + \beta_7 X_{ethnic\ market} +$$

$$\beta_8 X_{mainstreammarket} + \beta_9 X_{age} + \beta_{10} X_{gender} + \beta_{11} X_{countryofresidence} + \beta_{12} X_{lengthofresidency}$$

Wherein Ln (P/1-P) is the logit of Y (entrepreneurial success), β0 represents the intercept, and β1 through β12 represent the parameters showing the effects of the independent variables – representing human and social capital and the control variables – on the dependent variable, entrepreneurial success. A positive parameter β, which is significant at the p<,05 level, shows an increased likeliness to achieve entrepreneurial success when one considers the independent variable. When β is negative, the likeliness decreases (Pallant, 2007).

A logistic regression analysis is chosen here because the data violates several assumptions that need to met in order to execute a standard Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression. Because of the dichotomous outcome variable, the assumption of linearity is violated. A linear line suggests that if you go high enough or low enough with a certain X, the probability will go below 0 and over 1. However, with a binary independent variable, this is not possible, as the only possible outcomes are 0 – no success, and 1 – success. Furthermore, the assumption of a normally distributed error term is violated, because the observations are not normally distributed from a linear regression line. This also entails that the errors are not homoscedastic, meaning they do not have the same variance. Consequentially, the coefficients of OLS are not a good representation of the effects and additionally, standard errors cannot be used to meaningfully test significance. Therefore, executing a logistic regression analysis solves the violation of these assumptions However, additionally, the assumption of no multicollinearity needs to be met, which means that the independent variables should be independent of each other. The independent variables should thus not measure the same thing (Pallant, 2007). To test whether the data matches this assumption a Pearson correlation of all independent variables was executed, which shows that the independent variables are not multicollinear, that is, they do not show strong correlations to one another.[4]

---

[4] The Pearson correlation of all independent variables is included in Appendix D. Guide to the r values: .00/.19 – no to very weak relationship; .20-.39 – weak relationship; .40-.59 – moderate relationship; .60-.79 – strong relationship; .80/1.0 – very strong to perfect relationship.

5. Results

This chapter will present the findings of the previously mentioned analysis, and tries to explain them using the framework provided by Giddens' structuration theory. The eight hypotheses will either be accepted or rejected. The first section will present the baseline model, including only the control variables. In the second section, the variables related to social capital are added to the model. Finally, in section three, the complete model, including human capital will be reviewed.

5.1. Model 1: Control variables

Firstly, to control for confounding factors, four control variables are included in the first model. Namely: *age, gender, country of residence and length of residency.* While the effects of these variables are not formally hypothesized there is a certain expectation about their relationship with entrepreneurial success as illustrated in the previous chapter. Table 3 shows the output of model 1.

Table 3: Model 1 – Control variables

	β	Sig.
Age		
Younger than 30		
30 and older	,418	,452
Gender		
Male		
Female	-,750	,288
Country of residence		
Lebanon		
Syria	-1,356	,256
Jordan	-1,648	,102
Turkey	-1,155	,224
Other	-1,041	,371
Length of residency		
Less than two years		
More than two years	,283	,746
Nagelkerke R-square	,116	
Model significance	,505	

Table 3 shows the influence of the control variables on the entrepreneurial success of Syrian refugees. First, the significance of the model to predict entrepreneurial success in comparison to the null model, without explanatory variables, is ,505. This means that the control variables together do not have significant power to explain entrepreneurial success (p<,05). This can also be seen when looking at the significance levels of all independent variables and their answer categories (Table 3: Sig.). Next, the table shows a relatively low adjusted pseudo-R^2 (Nagelkerke R-square: ,116). This shows that the model is capable of explaining approximately 11,6% of the variation in the outcomes. It is expected that the R-square is low, because the model, thus far, only includes control variables. Furthermore, in the field of social sciences it is not unusual to see these low scores (Allison, 2014).

To continue, an explanation of the results as shown in Table 3 will follow. The category β represents the regression coefficient, showing the increasing or decreasing likeliness of Syrian refugees to achieve entrepreneurial success in comparison to the reference category, which is the first category of all four independent variables. Sig. shows the significance level of these coefficients, and is significant at the level p<,05. Statistical significance shows the likeliness that a relationship between two variables is caused by something other than chance. When this level is below p<,05 this means there is (over) 95% chance that the relationship as observed is not caused by chance (Pallant, 2007).

Firstly, looking at *age,* it can be seen that the likeliness of achieving entrepreneurial success increases when refugees are older than 30, in comparison to those younger than 30. The effect is not very strong (,418) nor significant (,452). However, the relationship looks as expected following the reasoning that the necessary experience and skills to start a business increase with age (Williams & Krasniqi, 2018).

The second control variable, *gender,* shows that being female negatively influences the likeliness of achieving entrepreneurial success. Again, while the effect is not significant (,288) it does look as expected. Previous research has focused on the smaller likeliness of women pursuing a career in entrepreneurship (Lambrecht et al., 2004), due to traditional role patterns. The sample in this study, consisting of 55 males and only 15 females, indicates that such a reasoning may be valid. Furthermore, the scores in this table indicate that besides the lower probability of women to become entrepreneurs, female entrepreneurs are also less likely to achieve entrepreneurial success than male entrepreneurs. An explanation for this in light of social capital theory is that women have a more limited network (Wauters & Lambrecht, 2006), and therefore have less social capital resources available to them. However, because the sample in this study is not representative for the entire population of Syrian refugees or Syrian refugee entrepreneurs, an alternative

explanation is possible. Namely, that SPARK is not attracting or supporting as many female entrepreneurs as male entrepreneurs, causing for the disbalance of female respondents as well as their lower probability of success (as they might not have benefited from training or resources offered by SPARK). However, crosstabulations show that there is no reason to expect that females in the sample have benefitted less from training, as 27,4% of males and only 20% of females indicated to have no previous business training.

Additionally, the model shows the effect of *country of residence* on entrepreneurial success. In comparison to the reference category, Lebanon, the likeliness of achieving entrepreneurial success decreases for refugees in Syria, Jordan, Turkey or other countries. This suggests that Lebanon has the most favourable conditions for starting a business, while the negative effect of Jordan (β -1,648, Sig. ,102) is strongest, suggesting that Jordan has the least favourable conditions for starting a business. Looking at the differences that were identified between these countries, it is not surprising that Lebanon seems the most conducive environment for entrepreneurial success. As Lebanon has a longstanding tradition of migration from Syria (Turner, 2015), it is likely that it will be easier for Syrian refugees to build a network of co-ethnics that can be a helpful source of information (Wauters & Lambrecht, 2008). Furthermore, the strong dependency on the Syrian labour force in the past, and the desire to restore this Syrian participation again today, may lead to favourable policies conducive for business creation. Conversely, Jordan has wanted to limit its dependency on foreign labour, which may result in a more negative environment for business creation (Turner, 2015). This finding is also in line with previous findings explaining the lack of impact of Syrian refugees on the Jordanian labour market through the potential exclusion of Syrians due to labour market restrictions (Fakih & Ibrahim, 2016).

Finally, the *length of residency* has only a small positive effect (,283) on entrepreneurial success, while previous literature has consistently identified length of residency as an important driver for entrepreneurship because of its direct impact on the stock of human and social capital refugees possess (Caparros Ruiz, 2010; Williams & Krasniqi, 2018). This suggests that refugees do not build up their social or human capital over time, or that the environment they find themselves in does not allow them to do so.

However, none of the observed relationships in the model are statistically significant, meaning that there is a considerable chance that these relationships are coincidental.

5.2. Model 2: Social Capital

After looking at the effect of the control variables on entrepreneurial success, this section will look at the second model, which includes social capital. In light of Giddens' structuration theory one's social network can be enabling as well as constraining for entrepreneurial success because it entails both rules and resources. Therefore, Model 2 will look at the effect of *marital status, family employees, ethnic market,* and *mainstream market,* corresponding with *H(1)* to *H(4)*.

Table 4: Model 2 – Social Capital

	β	Sig.
Marital status		
Single		
Married or living with partner	-,745	,305
Family employees	,586	,356
Market		
Ethnic market	-2,112	,002
Mainstream market	,563	,359
Age		
Younger than 30		
30 and older	,850	,258
Gender		
Male		
Female	-,721	,352
Country of residence		
Lebanon		
Syria	-,168	,908
Jordan	-1,384	,203
Turkey	-,296	,775
Other	-,057	,965
Length of residency		
Less than two		
More than two years or more	,282	,783
Nagelkerke R-Square	,307	
Model significance	,077	
Step significance	,018	

Table 4 shows the output of Model 2, in which the effect of social capital on entrepreneurial success is considered. By adding the social capital variables to Model 1, the significance of the model is greatly improved and approaches statistical significance (from ,505 to ,077). When only looking at the significance of the social capital variables entered at this step, it can be seen that the contribution of social capital to the entire model is significant p=,018. This indicates that there is a highly significant chance that social capital influences entrepreneurial success. However, this does not show whether social capital and thus one's social network works as a constraining or an enabling factor. Therefore, it is necessary to look at the separate effects of the independent variables as hypothesized in Chapter 2.

Firstly, *H(1)* predicts a positive effect of one's *marital status* on entrepreneurial success due to the distinct benefits a partner offers, such as taking care of the household, helping out within the business, or providing an additional source of finance. However, this study finds a negative effect of being married or living with a partner compared to being single. However, this effect is not significant (,305). An explanation for this negative effect could be that the presence of a partner can be a rule in one's network rather than a resource. It could bring with it increasing responsibilities. For instance, related to being married is the presence of children (Krasniqi, 2009). The increased living costs associated with children and a family in general, can have an impact on an entrepreneur's reliance on financial support, included in the measure of entrepreneurial success. This is supported by Wong (1986) who finds that children have a positive effect on the wage of men in regular employment, but a negative effect on the wages of entrepreneurs, because small enterprises are often 'pseudo family businesses'(Bizri, 2017; Fong et al., 2007), and having children impacts the time and resources that can be spent on the business. To conclude, these findings lead to a rejection of *H(1)*.

Secondly, *H(2)* predicts a positive effect of *family employees* on entrepreneurial success, because family members often work for lower wages and longer hours than would be accepted by regular employees, and are therefore a distinct asset to migrant and refugee entrepreneurs (Gold, 1988). The effect of family employees looks as hypothesized, and the likeliness of achieving entrepreneurial success is greater when the entrepreneur has family members employed in his business. However, also here, the significance level (,365) is relatively low. The positive effect of family member employees suggest that not all bonding social capital has a negative effect on entrepreneurial success, and that family member employees can be considered a resource for refugee entrepreneurs. This contrasts the idea that refugee entrepreneurs hire unnecessary or underqualified personnel out of obligation to their family (Ensign & Robinson, 2011).

Next, *H(3)* will be evaluated, which argues that operating within the *ethnic market* has a negative effect on entrepreneurial success, because of the enormous competition amongst migrants selling similar products to the same clientele with relatively low purchasing power (Waldinger et al., 1990). Table 3 shows that there is a strong negative effect of operating within the ethnic market on the likeliness of achieving entrepreneurial success, and that this effect is highly significant (,002). While previous literature has identified positive as well as negative effects of the ethnic economy, the results from this study are overwhelmingly negative. However, these negative results only reflect the reliance on co-ethnic clientele. This does not mean that the use of co-ethnic social capital, or bonding social capital in general needs to be denounced. The ethnic market is namely only a part of the co-ethnic social capital one can acquire. Refugees can make use of co-ethnic social capital in the form of cheap labour or as an informal source of finance, the effects of which are not measured in this study. This finding clearly reflects the literature on migrant entrepreneurship that stresses that migrant entrepreneurship cannot be explained solely through its embeddedness in co-ethnic networks (Kloosterman et al., 1999). Because these markets actually have a strong negative effect on refugee entrepreneurs, it is necessary to explain entrepreneurial success by looking at the wider business context. This leads to the acceptance of *H(3)*.

After finding a strong negative effect of the ethnic market on entrepreneurial success, suggesting that entrepreneurial success needs to be explained by other network structures, this thesis turns to assess *H(4)*. *H(4)* argues that operating within the mainstream market has a positive effect on entrepreneurial success because the network consisting of people from the host-community, or so-called 'social bridges', is beneficial for the information position of refugees. Additionally, it allows entrepreneurs' access to a larger group of customers, less direct competition, and higher pricing (Gold, 1988). Table 3 shows a moderate positive effect of operating within the mainstream market on entrepreneurial success. This indicates that there are certain benefits to operating within these markets, but they cannot be called a driving factor behind an entrepreneur's success. But, especially compared to the strong negative effect of the ethnic clientele, it can be concluded that it is more beneficial for success to focus on host-community clientele. The relationship between the mainstream market and entrepreneurial success thus looks as hypothesized, however, because the effect is not significant *H(4)* is rejected.

In short, two variables have been identified as resources in one's social network, namely family member employees and the mainstream market. However, being married and the ethnic market can both be considered constraining factors in the network of Syrian refugee entrepreneurs.

5.3. Model 3: Human Capital

Lastly, this section turns to an explanation of the effect of human capital on refugee entrepreneurial success. Following Giddens' structuration theory, human capital influences an entrepreneur's 'agency', which influences the entrepreneurs' decision making, and therefore their entrepreneurial success. This section will look at the contributions of human capital to the model in general, as well as the individual variables associated with human capital: *language skills, education, previous business experience* and *previous business training*, represented by *H(5)* to *H(8)*.

Table 5: Model 3 – Human capital

	β	Sig.		β	Sig.
Language skills			**Marital status**		
No knowledge			Single		
Beginner	-,506	,828	Married or living with partner	-1,311	,220
Elementary	-1,517	,536	**Family member employees**	1,365	,161
Intermediate	,195	,932	**Market**		
Upper intermediate	-1,423	,533	Ethnic market	-2,650	,005
Advanced	-1,181	,630	Mainstream market	1,679	,068
Proficient	1,557	,480	**Age**		
Education level			Younger than 30		
Less than high school degree			30 and older	2,075	,195
High school degree	-2,854	,232	**Gender**		
Vocational degree	-5,117	,094	Male		
Bachelor degree	-4,602	,088	Female	,365	,769
Master degree or higher	-4,072	,167	**Country of residence**		
Previous business training			Lebanon		
No business training			Syria	1,604	,404
Home country training	-2,328	,091	Jordan	-3,872	,078
Host-country training	-,102	,909	Turkey	,100	,939
Previous business experience			Other	1,189	,516
No business experience			**Length of residency**		
Home country experience	,359	,726	Less than two years		
Host-country experience	,576	,576	More than two years	-1,192	,467

Nagelkerke R-Square	,502
Model significance	,136
Step significance	,406

Table 5 shows the output of Model 3 in which all hypothesized variables as well as all control variables have been incorporated. Looking at the significance of the variables added at this step (,406) it can be noted that human capital overall does not have a significant effect on refugee entrepreneurial success, which leads to a decreasing significance of the entire model to p=,136. This suggests that in general, social capital and thus one's structure is better fit to explain variation in entrepreneurial success than human capital, or one's agency.

Furthermore, it can be noted that adding human capital to the model has led to substantial differences in the coefficients and significance levels of several social capital and control variables compared to the previous model. For instance, the effect of the mainstream market on one's entrepreneurial success is seen to be much stronger in this model, and nearing significance (p=,068). This can be explained by the nature of a logistic regression analysis in which the effect of each independent variable is tested while the others are held constant. Because several variables were not yet controlled for in the previous model (language skills, education, previous business experience, previous business training), the existing effects of these variables are automatically included in the relationship between two variables that are included in the model. In this case, the relationship between the mainstream market and entrepreneurial success also included variation in terms of, for instance, language skills. When this variable is now added to the model, the variation in this variable is held constant, and is therefore no longer (falsely) included in the relationship between the mainstream market and entrepreneurial success, therefore changing the coefficient and increasing the significance level of this variable. It is normal that independent variables are correlated to a certain extent (Pallant, 2007), and the variables in this study have been tested for multicollinearity, which has shown no problems since correlations were all below the ,80 level.[5]

Next, this section will turn to the assessment of the hypotheses related to human capital. Firstly, *H(5)* expects that there is a positive effect of *language skills* on entrepreneurial success. Table 5 shows the effects of each level of language skills compared to the reference category, no language skills. Interestingly, only an intermediate and a proficient level of language skills lead to an increasing likeliness of achieving entrepreneurial success compared to no language skills. Conversely, having a beginner, upper intermediate or advanced level actually leads to a decreasing likeliness of achieving entrepreneurial success compared to having no language skills. Additionally, all these effects have low significance levels (,828; ,536; ,932; ,533; ,630; ,480). These low significance levels indicate that language skills do not play a considerable role in

---

[5] The Pearson correlation of all independent variables is included in Appendix D. Guide to the r values: .00/.19 – no to very weak relationship; .20-.39 – weak relationship; .40-.59 – moderate relationship; .60-.79 – strong relationship; .80/1.0 – very strong to perfect relationship.

entrepreneurial success. Additionally, the effects that can be seen are negative. It seems unlikely that language skills will have a negative impact on entrepreneurial success. Especially because of the inconsistencies that can be seen between the different categories of language skills (where some are positive and some are negative) this leads to believe that this relationship is caused by inconsistencies in the data. To conclude, the relationship between language skills and entrepreneurial success does not look as hypothesized, and *H(5)* is rejected.

To continue, *H(6)* argues that there is a positive effect of *education level* on refugee entrepreneurial success, because it enhances one's ability for opportunity recognition (Constant & Zimmerman, 2006). However, Table 5 indicates the opposite, and shows a strong negative effect of higher levels of education on entrepreneurial success compared to the reference category 'less than high school degree'.[6] These findings indicate that formal education is not positively related to entrepreneurial success, suggesting that, in line with Williams & Krasniqi (2018), the skills derived from education in the home country are not transferrable to the host-country labour market. However, here again, this only explains why education is not a significant driver behind entrepreneurial success, not why the coefficients are negative. Therefore, an alternative explanation can lie in the motivation of people with different levels of education. Previous research has found that people with higher education tend to prefer salaried employment over self-employment because they are more aware of the risks associated with entrepreneurship (Kanas et al., 2009). Additionally, due to their higher qualifications they may have greater probability of achieving success in the regular labour market than those with lower levels of education (Jimenez et al., 2013). Therefore, it is possible that the lack of recognition of their credentials within the host-country is of larger disadvantage to refugees with a higher education, than those that already lacked the necessary education in their home country. With this reasoning, those with lower education are therefore more likely to see entrepreneurship as an opportunity, while those with higher education are more likely to treat entrepreneurship as a last resort because their education is not recognized in the general labour market. These different motives supposedly have a different effect on entrepreneurial success. Where opportunity entrepreneurs start their business in response to a need they have identified within society, this does not have to be the case for necessity entrepreneurs who start their business as a survival strategy. This influences the potential for income generation and business growth (Marchand & Siegel, 2015; Wauters & Lambrecht, 2006). Therefore, *H(6)* is rejected.

---

[6] This reference category only includes two observations. Therefore, it has been tested to see whether recoding the variable into 0 – low education (consisting of less than high school degree and high school degree), 1 – high education (consisting of vocational degree, bachelor degree, master degree or higher) presents different results. However, because the results of this were also negative the original categories were retained.

Following, *H(7)* will be evaluated, which stresses that *business training* has a positive effect on entrepreneurial success. Because the skills needed for starting a business are said to be country specific, the difference between business training in the home country and the host-country is taken into account. Table 5 shows that both business training in the home country as well as the host-country are negatively associated with entrepreneurial success compared to the reference category 'no business training'. The negative effect of home country business training is stronger and more significant than that of host-country training. The strong negative effect of home country training suggests that entrepreneurial skills are different for each country, and home country training does not prepare an entrepreneur for starting a business in a foreign country (Kanas et al., 2009). An explanation for the negative effect of host-country training is offered by Lamba (2003) who finds similar results in a study about quality of employment among refugees in Canada. Lamba stresses that although these negative effects seem unlikely at first, the findings may reflect the impact of the time that was invested in this training. While the training may help improve current skills, it is possible that in the time invested in this training opportunities are missed and a smaller amount of time is invested in the actual business. Alternatively, it is possible that the content of these trainings in general is not of sufficient quality and does not prepare an entrepreneur adequately for starting a business. This is in line with Fong et al. (2007) who find that often existing training modules are not culturally appropriate for the refugee population, and start at a more advanced level than needed. However, it is also possible that the positive effect found by previous research is caused by a problem in their measurement of entrepreneurship. As previously explained, these studies look at being an entrepreneur versus opting for regular employment. The relationship between business training and entrepreneurship found in these studies can simply be caused by the likeliness that individuals will participate in a business training when they (want to) become entrepreneurs (versus the likeliness that they will participate when they do not have the intention to become entrepreneurs) (e.g. Williams & Krasniqi, 2018). Therefore, *H(7)* is rejected.

Scholars state that entrepreneurship is best taught through previous experience (Fong et al., 2007), therefore *H(8)*, expecting a positive relationship between previous business experience and entrepreneurial success will be evaluated. Looking at Table 5 it can be seen that while there is a negative effect of previous business training, there is indeed a positive effect of previous experience, suggesting that entrepreneurship is a trait that benefits most from 'learning by doing'. In line with previous research, it can be seen that the positive effect of previous experience in the host-country is the strongest and most significant. However, because of the relatively low significance levels neither can be accepted. Therefore, *H(8)* is rejected.

Overall, the human capital of refugees is not seen to increase their likeliness of achieving entrepreneurial success, with the exception of previous business experience. This suggests that structural factors negatively influence the extent to which refugee entrepreneurs can make use of their human capital resources to benefit their entrepreneurial activities.

To conclude, only hypothesis three is accepted, as this is the only relationship that looks as hypothesized and is statistically significant. Table 6 shows an overview of hypotheses and whether the relationship looks as hypothesized (RH=+) and is statistically significant (Sig.=+).

Table 6: Overview of hypotheses

	RH	Sig.
H1: There is a positive relationship between the presence of a spouse and entrepreneurial success.	-	-
H2: There is a positive relationship between family employees and entrepreneurial success.	+	-
H3: There is a negative effect of operating within ethnic markets on entrepreneurial success.	**+**	**+**
H4: There is a positive effect of operating within mainstream markets on entrepreneurial success.	+	-
H5: There is a positive relationship between language skills and entrepreneurial success.	-	-
H6: There is a positive relationship between education level and entrepreneurial success.	-	-
H7: There is a positive relationship between business training and entrepreneurial success.	-	-
H8: There is a positive relationship between business experience and entrepreneurial success.	+	-

However, it is possible that the low significance levels in this study are related to the relatively small sample. And therefore, while the results, with the exception of *H(3),* are not statistically significant, their influence on entrepreneurial success might be greater than these results show. Therefore, before turning to a discussion of the results, the following section will shortly discuss the limitations of this study, and its implications for the validity of this research.

6. Limitations

The limitations of this study are related to sampling and questionnaire design. Firstly, with regards to sampling, the amount of respondents in this study (N=70) is relatively low for a quantitative analysis. A smaller sample size can impact the observed significance levels, because the probability that an observed effect is actually present increases with more observations of a relationship.

Furthermore, when working with a small sample, there are problems with small-sample bias, which means that within a population, not all individuals of this population are equally likely to have been selected. This results in less accurate approximation from the sample to the actual population (Pallant, 2007). However, this is not considered a problem for the validity of this research, because the intention of this study is not to draw inferences from this model to the larger population. The nature of this study is exploratory, and the goal is to see if the hypothesized relationships are present in the sample.

Additionally, sample size influences the amount of independent variables that can be included in the model. Generally, it is said that for each independent variable at least ten observations are needed (Hosmer, Lemeshow & Sturdivant, 2013). In order to reach this threshold, it was considered to drop the control variables, which did not prove statistically significant, from the final model. However, having conducted the analysis without the control variables, it became clear that this did not alter the results significantly. Therefore it was decided to retain all the variables to show how they interact.

Furthermore, there are several limitations with regards to questionnaire design. A lack of clear focus in the beginning of this thesis has led to a lengthy questionnaire, which has reduced the amount of respondents that have completed it. Additionally, the amount of respondents would have been greatly increased if a different dependent variable would have been selected. The focus on entrepreneurial success limits the sample to refugees who currently own a business. Most studies on entrepreneurship focus on the likeliness of being an entrepreneur versus opting for regular employment (or being unemployed), therewith greatly increasing the amount of respondents available to them.

Lastly, the distribution of this questionnaire within the network of SPARK has several implications for the validity of the responses that were obtained. Firstly, as previously mentioned, the sample is not representative for the entire population of Syrian refugee entrepreneurs because many of them are not in touch with SPARK, or any other NGO supporting business creation, which can already imply a difference in the type of respondents that can be reached. But more

importantly, those that are present within the network of SPARK, and the larger network of aid agencies, are asked to fill out questionnaires very frequently. Therefore, it is believed that respondents suffer from a certain 'questionnaire fatigue', leading to a smaller time spent on answering the questions. This could greatly impact the extent to which this questionnaire has been filled out truthfully. Therefore the results of this study should be treated with some caution.

7. Discussion and conclusion

This thesis has sought to understand the entrepreneurial success of Syrian refugees by looking at the effects of human and social capital. As specified by Giddens' structuration theory (1984), agents make choices within an ever evolving structure. This structure influences their agency, and vice versa. Following this reasoning, it was expected that the social network of refugees entails resources as well as rules. The resources inherent to these social network can be classified as social capital. The agency of refugees determines how these social capital resources are used to influence entrepreneurial success. In its turn, the agency of refugee entrepreneurs is dependent on their skills and characteristics, or human capital, because these resources influence the choices individuals make. Therefore, both social capital and human capital can be enabling or constraining factors in achieving entrepreneurial success (Coleman, 1988).

Previous research has identified several aspects of human and social capital that influence migrant entrepreneurship. Additionally, literature on refugee entrepreneurship shows that refugees might be at a disadvantage compared to regular migrants, both in terms of human capital as well as social capital. Therefore, this thesis has sought to explore whether the resources and rules that influence migrant entrepreneurship similarly influence Syrian refugees' entrepreneurial success.

It was expected that human capital, in the form of language skills, education, business training, and business experience, would have a considerable positive influence on entrepreneurial success, because these skills are seen as enabling entrepreneurs to make better decisions regarding their business. However, the results of a logistic regression analysis of survey data of 70 refugee entrepreneurs have shown that as a part of human capital, only previous business experience positively influences the likeliness of achieving entrepreneurial success.

This suggests that the structure in which refugees' businesses operate negatively impacts the extent to which refugees can use their human capital resources to benefit their entrepreneurial activities. For instance, because the received business training does not prepare them for starting a business in their specific market. Or because their educational attainment is not recognized within the host-country.

Furthermore, it was expected that refugees heavily rely on their social capital when starting a business, and that these resources could compensate for the problems they encounter in terms of a lack of financial or human capital (Coleman, 1990; Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993). However, conversely social networks can entail rules that have the opposite effect. Additionally, refugees' social networks are expected to be more limited than those of regular migrants (Wauters & Lambrecht, 2008).

Therefore, this thesis has looked at the influence of social capital in the form of a spouse, family employees, the ethnic market and the mainstream market on refugees' entrepreneurial success. The findings suggest that social capital can be enabling as well as constraining dependent on the type of social capital one acquires.

Because of the strong negative effect of the ethnic market (measured as the presence of mostly home-country clientele), further research should identify why the ethnic market has a negative effect on refugees. Is this only the case because refugee clientele has a low purchasing power, or can it be stated that the use of co-ethnic social capital inherent to these markets, is not beneficial for refugees?

The considerable negative influence of refugees' human capital, as well as the strong negative influence of the ethnic market on entrepreneurial success reinforces the notion that refugees face significant barriers in starting a business (Wauters & Lambrecht, 2008).

However, these findings contradict the early literature on migrant entrepreneurship that explains this phenomenon solely through its embeddedness in social networks consisted of co-ethnics, mostly within ethnic markets (Light, 1972). The ethnic market niche that these scholars identify as crucial for the survival of immigrant entrepreneurs because of their competitive advantage (Chrysostome, 2010), is here seen to negatively influence Syrian refugee entrepreneurs. This potentially suggests that the 'size of the ethnic market is not large enough to generate a sufficient volume of sales to cover the costs incurred to operate the business', leaving the refugee's competitive advantage useless (Chrysostome, 2010, p.143).

The clear different influence of the ethnic market compared to the mainstream market suggests that refugee entrepreneurs benefit most from having contacts with natives (Kanas et al., 2009). However, it is not clear what drives this difference. Therefore, further research should study the mechanisms involved in the negative effect of bonding social capital versus the positive effect of bridging social capital. Not in the least, because this distinction is also crucial when looking at refugee entrepreneurship as a strategy for integration. Studies have shown that operating within the ethnic economy seriously hampers participation in social activities of the society at large, making the social costs of the ethnic market substantial (Fong & Ooka, 2002). This study shows that not only the social costs, but also the success of the business is negatively impacted by operating within this market. This points towards the necessity for network building with the host-community. Therefore, this should be the focus area of organizations supporting refugee entrepreneurs. For entrepreneurship to be successful and have its desired impact on integration and the reduction of tensions between refugees and host-communities it is preferred if

entrepreneurial activities take place outside of the ethnic market, for which network building with the host-community is essential.

8. References

Abbasian, S. & Bildt, C. (2009). Empowerment through entrepreneurship – a tool for integration among immigrant women? *CISEG Working Paper,* 6.

Ager, A. & Strang, A. (2008). Understanding Integration: A Conceptual Framework. *Journal of Refugee Studies,* 21:2, 166-191.

Akgündüz, Y., Van den Berg, M. & Hassink, W.H.J. (2015). The Impact of Refugee Crises on Host Labor Markets: The Case of the Syrian Refugee Crisis in Turkey. *IZA Discussion Paper,* 8841.

Blalock, H. M. (1967). *Toward a Theory of minority-group relations.* New York: Wiley.

Blumer, H. (1958). Race prejudice as a sense of group position. *Pacific Sociological Review,* 1:1, 3-7.

Borjas, G.J. (1989). Economic Theory and International Migration. *The International Migration Review,* 23:3, 457-485.

Bizri, R.M. (2017). Refugee-entrepreneurship: a social capital perspective. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development,* 19:9-10, 847-868.

Caparrós Ruiz, A. (2010). Self-employment or paid employment as the first job: Evidence from Spain by nationality. *International Journal of Social Economics,* 37:12, 951-969.

Ceritoglu, E., Burcu Gurcihan Yunculer, H., Torun, H. & Tumen, S. (2015). The Impact of Syrian Refugees on Natives' Labor Market Outcomes in Turkey: Evidence from a Quasi Experimental Design. *IZA Discussion Paper,* 9348.

Chrysostome, E. (2010). The Success Factors of Necessity Immigrant Entrepreneurs: In Search of a Model. *Thunderbird International Business Review,* 52:2, 137-152.

Coleman, J.S. (1988). Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *American Journal of Sociology,* 94, 95-120.

Constant, A., & Zimmerman, K.F. (2006). The making of entrepreneurs in Germany: are native men and immigrants alike? *Small Business Economics,* 26:3, 279-300.

Cortes, K.E. (2004). Are refugees different from economic immigrants? Some empirical evidence on the heterogeneity of immigrant groups in the United States. *The Review of Economics and Statistics,* 86:2, 465-480.

Council of Europe (n.d.). The CEFR Levels. Retrieved on 20 October 2018, from: https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/level-descriptions

Council on Foreign Relations (n.d.). Civil War in Syria. *Global Conflict Tracker.* Retrieved on, 3 August, from: https://www.cfr.org/interactive/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/civil-war-syria

David, A., Marouani, M.A., Nahas, C. & Nilsson, B. (2019). The economics of the Syrian refugee crisis in neighboring countries. The case of Lebanon. *AFD Research paper Series,* 2019-102.

Dej, D. (2010). Defining and measuring entrepreneurial success. In: Lukes, M. & Laguna, M. (2010) *Entrepreneurship a psychological approach.* University of Economics, Prague.

Del Carpio, X.V. & Wagner, M.C. (2015). The Impact of Syrian Refugees on the Turkish Labor Market. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper,* 7402.

Ensign, P.C. & Robinson, N.P. (2011). Entrepreneurs because they are Immigrants or Immigrants because they are Entrepreneurs? A Critical Examination of the Relationship between the Newcomers and the Establishment. *The Journal of Entrepreneurship,* 20:1, 33-35.

Fairlie, R.W. (2012). Open for Business: How Immigrants are Driving Small Business Creation in the United States. *University of California, Santa Cruz.*

Fakih, A. & Ibrahim, M. (2016). The Impact of Syrian Refugees on the Labor Market in Neighboring Countries: Empirical Evidence from Jordan. *IZA Discussion Paper,* 9667.

Fasani, F., Frattini, T. & Minale, L. (2018). (The Struggle for) Refugee Integration into the Labour Market: Evidence from Europe. *IZA Discussion paper,* 11333.

Ferris, E. (2008). *Iraq's Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons: The Untold Story.* Brookings-Bern Project on IDP, Refugee Watch.

Fong, E. & Ooka, E. (2002). The social consequences of participating in the ethnic economy. *International Migration Review,* 36, 125-146.

Fong, R., Busch, N.B., Armour, M., Cook Heffron, L. & Chanmugam, A. (2007). Pathways to Self-Sufficiency: Successful Entrepreneurship for Refugees. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work,* 16:1-2, 127-159.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gold, S.J. (1988). Refugees and small businesses: The case of Soviet Jews and Vietnamese. *Ethnic and Racal Studies,* 11:4, 411-438.

Gomez, C., Perera, B., Weisinger, J., Tobey, D. & Zinsmeister-Teeters, T. (2015). The impact of immigrant entrepreneurs' social capital related motivations. *New England Journal of Entrepreneurship,* 18:2, 19-30.

Haider, H. (2014). Refugee, IDP and host community radicalization. *GSDRC, University of Birmingham.* Retrieved on 18 October 2018, from: https://gsdrc.org/publications/refugee-idp-and-host-community-radicalisation/

Hanafi, S. & Long, T. (2010). Governance, governmentalities, and the state of exception in the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon. *Journal of Refugee Studies,* 23:2, 134-159.

Hosmer, D., Lemeshow, S. & Sturdivant, R. (2013). *Applied logistic regression (3rd edition).* Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Hutson, R., Long, T. & Page, M. (2009). Pathways to Violent Radicalization in the Middle East: A Model for Future Studies of Transnational Jihad. *The RUSI Journal,* 154:2, 18-26.

Iҫduygu, A. & Diker, E. (2017). Labor Market Integration of Syrian Refugees in Turkey: From Refugees to Settlers. *The Journal of Migration Studies.* 3:1, 12-45.

İçduygu, A. & Şimşek, D. (2016). Syrian Refugees in Turkey: Towards Integration Policies. *Turkish Policy Quarterly,* 15:3, 59-69.

Jacobsen, K. (1996). Factors Influencing the Policy Responses of Host Governments to Mass Refugee Influxes. *The International Migration Review,* 30:3, 655-678.

Jacobsen, K. (2002). Can refugees benefit the state? Refugee resources and African statebuilding. *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 40:4, 577-596.

Jiménez, A., Palmero-Cámara, C., González-Santos, M.J., González-Bernal, J. & Jiménez Eguizábal (2013). The Impact of educational levels on formal and informal entrepreneurship. *Business Research Quarterly,* 18:3, 204-212.

Jones T., Ram M., Kiselinchev, A. & Muchenje, L. (2014). Mixed embeddedness and new migrant enterprise in the UK. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development,* 26:6, 500-520.

Kanas A., Van Tubergen F. & Van der Lippe, T. (2009) .Immigrant self-employment: testing hypotheses about the role of origin- and host-country human capital and bonding and bridging social capital. *Work and Occupations,* 36:3, 181-208.

Karaspan, Ö. (2016). The Impact of Syrian Businesses in Turkey. *Brookings Institute.* Retrieved on 31 July 2019, from: https://www.brookings.edu/blog/future-development/2016/03/16/the-impact-of-syrian-businesses-in-turkey/

Kloosterman, R., & Rath, J. (2001). Immigrant entrepreneurs in advanced economies: Mixed embeddedness further explored. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,* 27:2, 189-201.

Kloosterman, R. & Van der Leun, J. & Rath, J. (1999). Mixed Embeddedness: (In)formal Economic activities and Immigrant Businesses in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research,* 23:2, 252-266.

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

Krasniqi, B.A. (2009). Personal, household and business environmental determinants of entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development,* 16:1, 146-166.

Lamba, N.K. (2003). The Employment Experiences of Canadian Refugees: Measuring the Impact of Human and Social Capital on Quality of Employment. *CRSA/RCSA,* 40:1, 45-64.

Leenders, R. (2010/2012). Getting the 'ladder of options' right – the illusive and real security fallout of the Iraqi refugee crisis. *Middle East Institute and Fondation pour la recherche strategique.*

Light, I. (1972). *Ethnic enterprise in America: Business and welfare among Chinese, Japanese and Blacks.* Berkely, Ca: University of California Press.

Lischer, S. (2005). *Dangerous Sanctuaries: Refugee Camps, Civil War, and the Dilemmas of Humanitarian Aid.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Marchand, K. & Siegel, M. (2015). Immigrant Entrepreneurship in Cities. *World Migration Report. International Organization for Migration.* Retrieved on 10 November, 2018, from: https://www.iom.int/sites/default/files/our_work/ICP/MPR/WMR-2015-Background-Paper-KMarchand-MSiegel.pdf

Marger, M.N. (2006). Transnationalism or assimilation? Patterns of sociopolitical adaptation among Canadian business immigrants. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 29:5, 882-900.

Martin, A. (2005). Environmental Conflict Between Refugee and Host Communities. *Journal of Peace Research,* 42:3, 329-346.

Memisoglu, F. & Ilgit, A. (2016). Syrian refugees in Turkey: multifaceted challenges, diverse players and ambiguous policies. *Mediterranean Politics,* 22:3, 317-338.

Moriano, J., Gorgievski, M., Laguna, M., Stephan, U. & Zarafshani, K. (2010). A Cross-Cultural Approach to Understanding Entrepreneurial Intention. *Journal of Career Development,* 1-24.

Muller, T. (1998). Immigration and Urban Areas: the United States Experience. In: *Immigrants, Integration and Cities. Exploring the Links.* Paris: OECD.

Nielsen, T.M. & Riddle, L. (2010). Investing in peace: the motivational dynamics of diaspora investment in post-conflict economies. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 89:4, 435-448.

OECD/DAC (2018). DAC list of ODA Recipients. Retrieved on 7 August 2019, from: https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/DAC_List_ODA_Recipients2018to2020_flows_En.pdf

Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS Survival Manual.* Open University Press.

Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology,* 24, 1-24.

Portes, A. & Sensenbrenner, J. (1993). Embeddedness and immigration: Notes on the social determinants of economic action: *American Journal of Sociology,* 98, 1320-1350.

Potocky-Tripodi, M. (2004). The role of social capital in immigrant and refugee economic adaptation. *Journal of Social Service Research,* 31:1, 59-91.

Putnam, R. (1993). The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Public Life. *American Prospect,* 13, 35-42.

Raijman, R. & Tienda, M. (2003). Ethnic foundations of economic transactions: Mexican and Korean immigrant entrepreneurs in Chicago. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 26:5, 783-801.

Robertson, D.W. & Grant, P.R. (2016). Immigrant entrepreneurship from a social psychological perspective. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology,* 46, 394-409.

Rusinovic, K. (2008). Moving between markets? Immigrant entrepreneurs in different markets. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research,* 14:6, 440-54.

Salaff, J., Greve, A. & Wong, S. (2006). Business Networks and Immigrant Entrepreneurs from China. In: Fong, E. & Luk, C. (2006) *Chinese Ethnic Economy: Global and Local Perspectives,* UK: Routledge.

Salehyan, I. & Gleditsch, K.S. (2006). Refugees and the Spread of Civil War. *International Organization,* 60, 335-366.

Salehyan, I. (2008). The Externalities of Civil Strife: Refugees as a Source of International Conflict. *American Journal of Political Science,* 52:4, 787-801.

Samnani, A.K., Boekhorst, J.A. & Harrison, J.A. (2013). The acculturation process: Antecedents, strategies, and outcomes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology,* 86, 166-183.

Shatz, H.J. (2019). The Syrian Civil War is Coming to an End. *RAND Corporation.* Retrieved on 3 August 2019, from: https://www.rand.org/blog/2019/04/the-syrian-civil-war-is-coming-to-an-end.html

SPARK (n.d.). Website. Retrieved on 3 October 2018, from: https://www.spark-online.org/

Sude, B., Stebbins, D. & Weilant, S. (2015). Lessening the risk of Refugee Radicalization. *Rand Corporation.* Retrieved on 9 November 2018, from: https://www.rand.org/pubs/perspectives/PE166.html

Tienda, M. & Raijman, R. (2004). Promoting Hispanic immigrant entrepreneurship in Chicago. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship,* 9, 1-22.

Turkina, E. & Thi Thanh Thai, M. (2013). Social capital, networks, trust and immigrant entrepreneurship: a cross-country analysis. *Journal of Enterprising Communities,* 7:2, 108-124.

Turner, L. (2015). Explaining the (Non-)Encampment of Syrian Refugees: Security, Class and the Labour Market in Lebanon and Jordan. *Mediterranean Politics,* 20:3, 386-404.

UNDP (2018). Human Development Reports. Education Index. Retrieved on 2 August 2019, from: http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/education-index

UNESCO (2011). International Standard Classification of Education 2011 (ISCED). Retrieved on 20 November 2018, from: http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/international-standard-classification-of-education-isced-2011-en.pdf

UNHCR (1951). *Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees.* Geneva: UNHCR.

UNHCR (2018). Global Trends Forced Displacement in 2018. Retrieved on 20 July 2019, from: https://www.unhcr.org/5d08d7ee7.pdf

UNHCR (2019). Operational Portal Refugee Situations. Retrieved on 23 July 2019, from: https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/syria

Waldinger, R., Aldrich, H. & Ward, R. (1990). *Ethnic Entrepreneurs. Immigrant Business in Industrial Societies.* Newbury Park: Sage Publications, Inc.

Walton-Roberts, M. & Hiebert, D. (1997). Immigration, entrepreneurship and the family: Indo Canadian enterprise in the construction of greater Vancouver. *Canadian Journal of Regional Science,* 20, 119-139.

Wauters, B. & Lambrecht, J. (2006). Refugee entrepreneurship in Belgium: Potential and practice. *The International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal,* 2:4, 509-525.

Wauters, B. & Lambrecht, J. (2008). Barriers to Refugee Entrepreneurship in Belgium: Towards an Explanatory Model. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,* 34:6, 895-915.

Williams, N. Huggins R. & Thompson, P. (2017). Social capital and entrepreneurship: does the relationship hold in deprived urban neighbourhoods. *Growth and Change,* 48:4, 719-743.

Williams, N. & Krasniqi, B.A. (2018). Coming out of conflict: How migrant entrepreneurs utilise human and social capital. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship,* 16:2, 301-323.

Wong, Y. (1986). Entrepreneurship, marriage, and earnings. *The Review of Economics and Statistics,* 68:4, 693-699.

9. Appendices

6 December, 2018

Dear respondent,

I am writing to ask for your help with an important survey I am conducting of migrant entrepreneurs. My name is Chantal Verkroost and I am working as an intern in the Monitoring & Evaluation team at SPARK. Besides this, I am a Political Sciences student at Radboud University Nijmegen. This survey is part of my graduation assignment.

I am conducting this survey to better understand the behaviour of migrant entrepreneurs, in order to improve the support offered by SPARK. I am hoping you could share some of your experiences in starting a business.

Therefore, I would greatly appreciate if you would answer the following questions. You have the option of answering in English and in Arabic by selecting the language in the top right corner. To take part in the survey, simply click on the following link:

The survey should take about 10 minutes to complete.

The survey is completely confidential and anonymous. Your answers will only be used in relation to this study, and not for other purposes.

Should you have any questions or comments, feel free to contact me at: c.verkroost@spark-online.org

I very much appreciate your help with this study.

Many thanks,

Chantal Verkroost

Intern M&E at SPARK

MSc Political Sciences

Radboud University Nijmegen

This survey will look into the behaviour of migrant entrepreneurs. Therefore, the next questions will help identify whether or not you are part of the population we are trying to study.

1. **Do you consider yourself a migrant?**

   ○ yes

   ○ no

2. **Do you consider yourself a refugee?**

   ○ yes

   ○ no

3. **Do you currently own a business?**

   ○ yes

   ○ no

This survey will look into your current and past experiences in running a business. To make sure everybody understands the concepts used in this survey, several explanations follow:

Home country	Your country of origin.
Host-country	Your country of current residence.
Business	Any entity engaged in economic activity, irrespective of its legal form. This can entail micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises.

First, I would like to ask you some questions about your business experience:

1. **Have you ever taken part in a business training in your home or host-country?**

   ○ yes, in my home country

   ○ yes, in my host-country

   ○ no

2. Have you previously owned a business in your home or host-country?

○ yes, in my home country

○ yes, in my host-country

○ no

3. In which sector does your business operate? Please choose the description that best matches your business:

○ Agriculture

○ Building and Construction

○ Culture and Media

○ ICT and Telecommunications

○ Training and Education

○ Clothing, fashion and textiles

○ Trade, Transport & Logistics

○ Healthcare

○ Tourism

○ Finance

○ Water, Sanitation, Waste Management

○ Energy

○ Food products

○ Retail

○ Sports

○ Mining

○ Jewellery and accessories

○ Environment

○ Paper Products

○ Electronics

○ Services

○ Other

4. Have you previously been employed in the sector your current business operates in?

○ yes

○ no

5. Are the costs of your business covered by its income?

○ yes

○ no

6. Next to running your business, do you need an additional job to support yourself financially?

○ yes

○ no

7. What is the total number of people employed by your business?

[　　　　] total number of employees

(IF 0, SKIP TO QUESTION 12)

8. How many people from your home country are employed by your business, if any?

[　　　　] number of people from home country

9. How many people from the host-country are employed by your business, if any?

[　　　　] number of people from host-country

10. How many family members are employed by your business, if any?

[　　　　] number of family members employed by your business

11. When starting your current business, did you receive financial support from any of the following?

	Yes	No
friends		
family		
NGOs (including charities)		
the government		
banks		
micro-financing institutions		
any other financial support		

12. Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Most of my clientele consists of people from my home country					
Most of my clientele consists of people from the host-country					

13. Why did you start your current business? For each of the following statements indicate to what extent you agree or disagree.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Because it was the only way out of unemployment					
Because I thought it would be a profitable activity					
Because I have difficulties in accessing the labour market					
Because I like to be my own boss					
Because I believe it elevates my social status					
Because I think there is a demand for my products/services					
Because I have experienced discrimination when applying for jobs					

14. What is the current level of your host-country language skills?

○ no knowledge of the language

○ beginner (A1)

○ elementary (A2)

○ intermediate (B1)

○ upper intermediate (B2)

○ advanced (C1)

○ proficient (C2)

Now, I would like to ask you some questions about your contact with other people.

15. To what extent to you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
On a daily basis, I mostly have contact with people from my home country					
On a daily basis, I mostly have contact with people from the host-country.					

16. To what extent are you a member or not a member of each of the following? Please indicate whether you are not a member, an inactive member, or an active member. The categories are shortly defined here:

Not a member	You have not registered or do not perceive yourself to be part of this organization.
Inactive member	You have registered, or perceive yourself to be part of this organization, but <u>do not</u> attend activities, or meetings organized by this organization.
Active member	You have registered, or perceive yourself to be part of this organization, and attend (some) activities and meetings organized by this organization.

		Not a member	Inactive member	Active member
a)	Religious organizations			
b)	Recreational organizations (including sport, art and music organizations)			
c)	Educational organizations			
d)	Labour unions			
e)	Environmental organizations			
f)	Professional associations			
g)	Humanitarian organizations			
h)	Youth associations			
i)	Women's groups			

(IF NO ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP, SKIP TO QUESTION 19)

17. In the organizations you have indicated to be an active member, do you mostly have contact with people from your home country, migrants (excluding those from your home country), or people from the host-country?

		People from my home country	People from the host-country
a)	Religious organizations		
b)	Recreational organizations (including sport, art and music organizations)		
c)	Educational organizations		
d)	Labour unions		
e)	Environmental organizations		
f)	Professional associations		
g)	Humanitarian organizations		
h)	Youth associations		
i)	Women's groups		

18. Generally speaking, would you say that most people from your home country can be trusted, or that you need to be very careful in dealing with them (for instance at work or in any of the previously specified organizations)? Please indicate on the scale below:

Complete trust				Complete distrust

19. Generally speaking, would you say that most people from the host-country can be trusted, or that you need to be very careful in dealing with them (for instance at work or in any of the previously specified organizations)? Please indicate on the scale below:

Complete trust				Complete distrust

Finally, I would like to ask you some questions about your background:

20. What year were you born?

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] (record year of birth in 4 digits)

21. Are you …
- ○ male
- ○ female

22. What is your marital status?
- ○ Married
- ○ Living with partner (but not married)
- ○ Widowed
- ○ Divorced/Separated
- ○ Single
- ○ Other

23. What is your country of origin?

_____

24. What is your country of current residence?

_____

25. For how many months have you lived in the host-country?

- ○ less than 6 months
- ○ from 6 months to under 1 year
- ○ from 1 year to under 2 years
- ○ from 2 years to under 5 years
- ○ 5 years or more

26. What is the highest degree you attained, if any?

○ less than high school

○ high school degree

○ vocational degree

○ bachelor degree

○ master degree or higher

○ other

27. Do you receive financial support?

○ yes

○ no

○ don't want to say

28. If yes, from which of the following do you receive support?

○ the government

○ NGOs

○ charities

○ friends

○ family

○ other

○ don't want to say

You have reached the end of this survey. Thank you very much for participating. I would like to remind you that if you have any additional questions, feel free to contact me at: c.verkroost@spark-online.org

spark   **Radboud University**

عزيزي المستجيب ،

أكتب إليكم لأطلب مساعدتكم في دراسة مهمة أجريتها لأصحاب الأعمال المهاجرين. اسمي شانتال فيركروست ، وأعمل كمتدربة في فريق الرصد والتقييم في منظمة سبارك. بالإضافة إلى ذلك ، أنا طالبة في العلوم السياسية في جامعة رادبود في نيميجن. هذا الاستطلاع جزء من مهمة التخرج الخاصة بي.

أقوم بإجراء هذا الاستطلاع لفهم سلوك رواد الأعمال المهاجرين بشكل أفضل ، من أجل تحسين الدعم المقدم من منظمة سبارك .آمل أن تتمكن من مشاركة بعض تجاربك في بدء عمل تجاري.

لذلك ، سأكون ممتنة للغاية إذا أجبت على الأسئلة التالية.

ل يجب أن يستغرق المسح حوالي 10 دقائق.

الدراسة سرية للغاية ومجهولة تماما. لن يتم استخدام إجاباتك إلا فيما يتعلق بهذه الدراسة ، وليس لأغراض أخرى.

إذا كان لديك أي أسئلة أو تعليقات ، فلا تتردد في التواصل بي على العنوان التالي:

c.verkroost@spark-online.org

أنا ممتنة جدا لمساعدتك في هذه الدراسة.

شكرا جزيلا،

Chantal Verkroost

سوف يبحث هذا الاستطلاع في سلوك رواد الأعمال المهاجرين. لذلك ، ستساعدنا الأسئلة التالية في تحديد ما إذا كنت جزءًا من السكان الذين نحاول دراستهم أم لا.

هل تعتبر نفسك مهاجرا؟

○ نعم فعلا

○ لا

هل تعتبر نفسك لاجئًا؟

○ نعم فعلا

○ لا

هل تمتلك شركة حالياً؟

○ نعم فعلا

○ لا

سوف يبحث هذا الاستطلاع في تجاربك الحالية والسابقة في إدارة الأعمال. للتأكد من فهم الجميع للمفاهيم المستخدمة في هذا الاستطلاع ، يرجى قراءة التفسيرات التالية بعناية:

الوطن	بلدك الأصلي	
البلد المضيف	بلد الإقامة الحالية.	
اعمال	ومتوسطة الصغر ومتناهية صغيرة مؤسسات إنشاء ذلك يستتبع أن ويمكن القانوني شكله عن النظر بغض ، الاقتصادي النشاط في يعمل كيان أي الحجم	

أولاً ، أود أن أطرح عليك بعض الأسئلة حول خبرتك العملية:

هل سبق لك أن شاركت في تدريب على الأعمال التجارية في وطنك أو في بلد مضيف؟

○ نعم ، في بلدي

○ نعم ، في البلد المضيف

○ نعم ، في كل من بلدي الأم والبلد المضيف

○ لا

هل سبق لك امتلاك شركة في وطنك أو في بلد مضيف؟

○ نعم ، في بلدي

○ نعم ، في البلد المضيف

○ نعم ، في كل من بلدي الأم والبلد المضيف

○ لا

في أي قطاع يعمل عملك الحالي؟ الرجاء اختيار الوصف الذي يناسب عملك بشكل أفضل:

○ الزراعة		○ منتجات الطعام	
○ البناء و الإنشاءات		○ التجزئه	
○ الثقافة والإعلام		○ الرياضة	
○ تكنولوجيا الاتصالات والمعلومات والاتصالات		○ تعدين	
○ التدريب والتعليم		○ المجوهرات والاكسسوارات	
○ الملابس والموضة والمنسوجات		○ بيئة	
○ التجارة والنقل والخدمات اللوجستية		○ منتجات ورقية	
○ الرعاية الصحية		○ إلكترونيات	
○ سياحة		○ خدمات	
○ المالية		○ آخر	
○ المياه والصرف الصحي وإدارة النفايات			
○ طاقة			

71

هل سبق لك أن عملت في القطاع الذي يعمل به مشروعك الحالي؟

○ نعم فعلا

○ لا

هل يغطي دخل مشروعك تكاليفه؟

○ نعم فعلا

○ لا

بجانب إدارة أعمالك ، هل تحتاج إلى وظيفة إضافية لدعم نفسك ماليا؟

○ نعم فعلا

○ لا

ما هو العدد الإجمالي للأشخاص العاملين في عملك ، إن وجد؟

[   ]

كم عدد الأشخاص من بلدك الأصلي الذين توظفهم شركتك ، إن وجدت؟

[   ]

كم عدد المهاجرون (باستثناء أولئك من بلدك الأم) الذين يتم توظيفهم من قبل عملك ، إن وجد؟

[   ]

كم عدد الأشخاص من البلد المضيف الذين يتم توظيفهم من قبل عملك ، إن وجد؟

[   ]

كم عدد أفراد عائلتك الذين تم توظيفهم من قبل عملك ، إن وجد؟

[   ]

72

عند بدء عملك الحالي ، هل تلقيت دعمًا ماليًا من أي مما يلي؟

نعم فعلا	لا	
		أصدقاء
		عائلة
		المنظمات غير الحكومية (بما في ذلك الجمعيات الخيرية)
		الحكومة
		البنوك
		مؤسسات التمويل الأصغر
		أي دعم مالي آخر

يرجى الإشارة إلى أي مدى توافق أو لا توافق على العبارات التالية:

لا أوافق بشدة	لا أوافق	لا أوافق ولا أرفض	موافق	موافق بشدة	
					معظم زبائني يتكون من أشخاص من بلدي
					معظم زبائني يتألفون من المهاجرين (باستثناء أولئك من بلدي)
					يتكون معظم زبائني من أشخاص من البلد المضيف

لماذا بدأت عملك الحالي؟ لكل من العبارات التالية الرجاء الإشارة إلى أي مدى توافق أو لا توافق:

لا أوافق بشدة	لا أوافق	لا أوافق ولا أرفض	موافق	موافق بشدة	
					لأنه كان السبيل الوحيد للخروج من البطالة
					لأنني اعتقدت أنه سيكون نشاطًا مربحًا
					لأنني أواجه صعوبات في الوصول إلى سوق العمل
					لأنني أحب أن أكون مديري الخاص
					لأنني أعتقد أنها ترفع حالتي الاجتماعية
					لأنني أعتقد أن هناك طلبًا على منتجاتي / خدماتي
					لأنني تعرضت للتمييز عند التقدم للوظائف

ما هو المستوى الحالي للمهارات اللغوية للغة البلد المضيف؟

○ لا معرفة للغة

○ المبتدئين (A1)

○ الابتدائية (A2)

○ وسيط (B1)

○ العلوي المتوسط (B2)

○ متقدم (C1)

○ بارع (C2)

الآن. أود أن أطرح عليك بعض الأسئلة حول اتصالك بأشخاص آخرين.

إلى أي مدى توافق أو لا توافق على العبارات التالية:

لا أوافق بشدة	لا أوافق	لا أوافق ولا أرفض	موافق	موافق بشدة	
					على أساس يومي ، لدي اتصال دائم مع أشخاص من بلدي
					على أساس يومي ، لدي اتصال دائم مع أشخاص من البلد المضيف

إلى أي مدى أنت عضو أم لست عضو في كل مما يلي؟ يرجى توضيح ما إذا كنت غير عضو أو عضو غير نشط أو عضو نشط. يتم تعريف الفئات هنا باختصار:

لست عضوا	لم تسجل أو لا تعتبر نفسك جزءًا من هذه المنظمة.
عضو غير نشط	لقد قمت بالتسجيل أو تعتبر نفسك جزءًا من هذه المنظمة ، ولكنك لا تحضر الأنشطة أو الاجتماعات التي تنظمها هذه المنظمة.
عضو نشط	لقد قمت بالتسجيل أو تعتبر نفسك جزءًا من هذه المنظمة ، وتحضر الأنشطة والاجتماعات التي تنظمها هذه المنظمة.

عضو نشط	عضو غير نشط	لست عضوا	
			المنظمات الدينية
			المنظمات الترفيهية (بما في ذلك منظمات الرياضة والفن والموسيقى)
			المنظمات التعليمية
			اتحادات العمال
			المنظمات البيئية
			الجمعيات المهنية
			المنظمات الانسانية
			جمعيات الشباب
			مجموعات نسائية

في المنظمات التي أنت عضو نشط فيها ، هل تتصل في الغالب بأشخاص من بلدك الأم ، أو مهاجرين (باستثناء أولئك من بلدك الأصلي) ، أو أشخاص من البلد المضيف؟

أشخاص من البلد المضيف	أشخاص من بلدي	
		المنظمات الدينية
		المنظمات الترفيهية (بما في ذلك منظمات الرياضة والفن والموسيقى)
		المنظمات التعليمية
		اتحادات العمال
		المنظمات البيئية
		الجمعيات المهنية
		المنظمات الانسانية
		جمعيات الشباب
		مجموعات نسائية

بشكل عام ، هل يمكنك القول بأن معظم الأشخاص من بلدك الأصلي يمكن الوثوق به ، أو أنك بحاجة إلى توخي الحذر الشديد في التعامل معهم (على سبيل المثال في العمل أو في أي من المؤسسات المحددة سابقًا)؟ يرجى الإشارة إلى الجدول أدناه:

الارتياب الكامل				ثقة كاملة

بشكل عام ، هل يمكنك القول بأن معظم الأشخاص من البلد المضيف يمكن الوثوق بهم ، أو أنك بحاجة إلى توخي الحذر الشديد في التعامل معهم (على سبيل المثال في العمل أو في أي من المنظمات المحددة سابقًا)؟ يرجى الإشارة إلى الجدول أدناه:

الارتياب الكامل				ثقة كاملة

بشكل عام ، هل تعتقد أن الناس من الدولة المضيفة لديهم مواقف إيجابية أو سلبية تجاه المهاجرين؟ يرجى الإشارة إلى الجدول أدناه:

سلبي بالكامل				إيجابي تمامًا

أخيرًا ، أود أن أطرح عليك بعض الأسئلة حول خلفيتك:

في اي سنة ولدت؟

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

أنت...

○ ذكر

○ أنثى

ما هو وضعك العائلي؟

○ زوجت

○ العيش مع شريك (لكن غير متزوج)

○ الأرامل

○ مطلق / منفصل

○ غير مرتبط / مرتبطة

○ آخر

ما هو بلدك الأصلي؟

_____

ما هو بلد إقامتك الحالي؟

_____

كم عدد الشهور التي عشت فيها في البلد المضيف؟

- ○ أقل من 6 أشهر

- ○ من 6 أشهر إلى أقل من سنة

- ○ من سنة إلى أقل من سنتين

- ○ من سنتين إلى أقل من 5 سنوات

- ○ 5 سنوات أو أكثر

ما هو سببك الرئيسي للانتقال إلى البلد المضيف؟

- ○ أسباب اقتصادية

- ○ أسباب أمنية

- ○ اعادة توحيد العائلة

- ○ الانتماء الثقافي مع الدولة المضيفة

- ○ آخر

- ○ لا اريد ان اقول

ما هي أعلى درجة حصلت عليها ، إن وجدت؟

- ○ لا يوجد درجة

- ○ أقل من المدرسة الثانوية

- ○ شهادة الثانوية

- ○ درجة المهنية

- ○ درجة البكالوريوس

- ○ درجة الماجستير أو أعلى

- ○ آخر

من أي مما يلي تتلقى الدعم؟

الحكومة
○

المنظمات غير الحكومية
○

مؤسسات خيرية
○

اصحاب
○

عائلة ○

آخر ○

لا اريد ان اقول ○

_____

لقد وصلت إلى نهاية هذا الاستطلاع. شكرا جزيلا لك على المشاركة. أود أن أذكرك أنه إذا كانت لديك أي أسئلة إضافية ، لا تتردد

في الاتصال بي على : chantalverkroost@spark-online.org

9.3. Appendix C – Crosstabulations ethnic and mainstream market

**Ethnic_market_4_5 * Mainstream_market_4_5
Crosstabulation**

Count

		Mainstream_market_4_5		Total
		,00	1,00	
Ethnic_market_4_5	,00	13	11	24
	1,00	21	25	46
Total		34	36	70

**Ethnic_market_4_5 * Mainstream_market_4_5
Crosstabulation**

Count

		Mainstream_market_4_5		Total
		,00	1,00	
Ethnic_market_4_5	,00	41	9	50
	1,00	11	9	20
Total		52	18	70

9.4. Appendix D – Pearson's correlation of independent variables

Correlations

		Age_Categories	Living_Region	Are you...	q28_meerdantweejaar	q25_rec	Family_members_ja_nee	q13_1_rec	Q13_3_rec	Level_Education_0_4	Language_Skills_0_6	Correct_Business_Training_no_home_host	Correct_experience_no_home_host
Age_Categories	Pearson Correlation	1	0,110	-0,104	,299*	,544**	-,257*	-0,060	0,229	,248*	-,371**	0,034	0,205
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0,363	0,390	0,012	0,000	0,032	0,621	0,057	0,038	0,002	0,782	0,089
	N	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70
Living_Region	Pearson Correlation	0,110	1	-0,229	-0,063	0,140	-0,101	0,046	-0,129	0,134	-,251*	0,019	-0,054
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,363		0,057	0,606	0,247	0,404	0,705	0,289	0,270	0,036	0,878	0,657
	N	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70
Are you...	Pearson Correlation	-0,104	-0,229	1	0,201	-0,065	-0,035	0,010	0,090	-0,039	0,040	0,111	-0,062
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,390	0,057		0,096	0,594	0,775	0,931	0,461	0,751	0,740	0,358	0,613
	N	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70
q28_meerdantweejaar	Pearson Correlation	,299*	-0,063	0,201	1	0,150	-,299*	-0,188	-0,032	0,036	0,233	0,180	0,134
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,012	0,606	0,096		0,214	0,012	0,120	0,794	0,766	0,052	0,136	0,268
	N	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70
q25_rec	Pearson Correlation	,544**	0,140	-0,065	0,150	1	-0,086	-0,200	0,056	,290*	-0,107	-0,087	0,044
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	0,247	0,594	0,214		0,480	0,097	0,647	0,015	0,378	0,475	0,716
	N	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70
Family_members_ja_nee	Pearson Correlation	-,257*	-0,101	-0,035	-,299*	-0,086	1	0,120	0,171	0,013	-0,139	0,101	0,056
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,032	0,404	0,775	0,012	0,480		0,321	0,156	0,915	0,251	0,405	0,646
	N	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70
q13_1_rec	Pearson Correlation	-0,060	0,046	0,010	-0,188	-0,200	0,120	1	0,081	0,004	-0,163	-0,005	-0,127
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,621	0,705	0,931	0,120	0,097	0,321		0,506	0,974	0,177	0,967	0,297
	N	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70
Q13_3_rec	Pearson Correlation	0,229	-0,129	0,090	-0,032	0,056	0,171	0,081	1	,269*	0,039	-0,077	0,050
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,057	0,289	0,461	0,794	0,647	0,156	0,506		0,024	0,747	0,526	0,681
	N	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70
Level_Education_0_4	Pearson Correlation	,248*	0,134	-0,039	0,036	,290*	0,013	0,004	,269*	1	-0,126	-0,035	0,113
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,038	0,270	0,751	0,766	0,015	0,915	0,974	0,024		0,298	0,772	0,352
	N	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70
Language_Skills_0_6	Pearson Correlation	-,371**	-,251*	0,040	0,233	-0,107	-0,139	-0,163	0,039	-0,126	1	0,008	0,100
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,002	0,036	0,740	0,052	0,378	0,251	0,177	0,747	0,298		0,949	0,409
	N	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70
Correct_Business_Training_no_home_host	Pearson Correlation	0,034	0,019	0,111	0,180	-0,087	0,101	-0,005	-0,077	-0,035	0,008	1	,282*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,782	0,878	0,358	0,136	0,475	0,405	0,967	0,526	0,772	0,949		0,018
	N	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70
Correct_experience_no_home_host	Pearson Correlation	0,205	-0,054	-0,062	0,134	0,044	0,056	-0,127	0,050	0,113	0,100	,282*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,089	0,657	0,613	0,268	0,716	0,646	0,297	0,681	0,352	0,409	0,018	
	N	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

9.5. Appendix E – Model 1

Case Processing Summary

Unweighted Cases[a]		N	Percent
Selected Cases	Included in Analysis	70	100,0
	Missing Cases	0	0,0
	Total	70	100,0
Unselected Cases		0	0,0
Total		70	100,0

a. If weight is in effect, see classification table for the total number of cases.

Categorical Variables Codings

		Frequency	Parameter coding			
			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Living_Region_1_5	1,00	7	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
	2,00	8	1,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
	3,00	20	0,000	1,000	0,000	0,000
	4,00	28	0,000	0,000	1,000	0,000
	5,00	7	0,000	0,000	0,000	1,000
q28_meerdantweejaar	,00	9	0,000			
	1,00	61	1,000			
Are you...	Male	55	0,000			
	Female	15	1,000			
Age_Categories	1,00	35	0,000			
	2,00	35	1,000			

Classification Table[a,b]

			Predicted		
			Economic_Success		Percentage Correct
Observed			,00	1,00	
Step 0	Economic_Success	,00	40	0	100,0
		1,00	30	0	0,0
	Overall Percentage				57,1

a. Constant is included in the model.

b. The cut value is ,500

Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 0	Constant	-0,288	0,242	1,419	1	0,234	0,750

Variables not in the Equation

			Score	df	Sig.
Step 0	Variables	Age_Categories(1)	0,933	1	0,334
		Living_Region_1_5	3,923	4	0,417
		Living_Region_1_5(1)	0,106	1	0,745
		Living_Region_1_5(2)	1,890	1	0,169
		Living_Region_1_5(3)	0,243	1	0,622
		Living_Region_1_5(4)	0,000	1	1,000
		Are you...(1)	2,043	1	0,153
		q28_meerdantweejaar(1)	0,383	1	0,536
	Overall Statistics		6,100	7	0,528

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	6,300	7	0,505
	Block	6,300	7	0,505
	Model	6,300	7	0,505

Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	89,307[a]	0,086	0,116

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Classification Table[a]

			Predicted		
			Economic_Success		Percentage Correct
Observed			,00	1,00	
Step 1	Economic_Success	,00	29	11	72,5
		1,00	16	14	46,7
	Overall Percentage				61,4

a. The cut value is ,500

Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	Age_Categories(1)	0,418	0,555	0,566	1	0,452	1,518
	Living_Region_1_5			2,758	4	0,599	
	Living_Region_1_5(1)	-1,356	1,195	1,288	1	0,256	0,258
	Living_Region_1_5(2)	-1,648	1,008	2,673	1	0,102	0,192
	Living_Region_1_5(3)	-1,155	0,950	1,478	1	0,224	0,315
	Living_Region_1_5(4)	-1,041	1,164	0,800	1	0,371	0,353
	Are you...(1)	-0,750	0,706	1,130	1	0,288	0,472
	q28_meerdantweejaar(1)	0,283	0,872	0,105	1	0,746	1,327
	Constant	0,590	1,189	0,247	1	0,619	1,805

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Age_Categories, Living_Region_1_5, Are you..., q28_meerdantweejaar.

9.6. Appendix F – Model 2

Case Processing Summary

Unweighted Cases[a]		N	Percent
Selected Cases	Included in Analysis	70	100,0
	Missing Cases	0	0,0
	Total	70	100,0
Unselected Cases		0	0,0
Total		70	100,0

a. If weight is in effect, see classification table for the total number of cases.

Dependent Variable Encoding

Original Value	Internal Value
,00	0
1,00	1

Categorical Variables Codings

		Frequency	Parameter coding (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Living_Region_1_5	1,00	7	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
	2,00	8	1,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
	3,00	20	0,000	1,000	0,000	0,000
	4,00	28	0,000	0,000	1,000	0,000
	5,00	7	0,000	0,000	0,000	1,000
Q13_3_rec	small amount host country clients	34	0,000			
	great amount host country clients	36	1,000			
Are you...	Male	55	0,000			
	Female	15	1,000			
q28_meerdantweejaar	,00	9	0,000			
	1,00	61	1,000			
q25_rec	not living together	33	0,000			
	living together	37	1,000			
q13_1_rec	small amount home country clients	24	0,000			
	great amount home country clients	46	1,000			
Family_members_ja_nee	,00	35	0,000			
	1,00	35	1,000			
Age_Categories	1,00	35	0,000			
	2,00	35	1,000			

85

Classification Table[a,b]

Observed			Predicted		
			Economic_Success		Percentage Correct
			,00	1,00	
Step 0	Economic_Success	,00	40	0	100,0
		1,00	30	0	0,0
	Overall Percentage				57,1

a. Constant is included in the model.

b. The cut value is ,500

Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 0	Constant	-0,288	0,242	1,419	1	0,234	0,750

Variables not in the Equation

			Score	df	Sig.
Step 0	Variables	Age_Categories(1)	0,933	1	0,334
		Living_Region_1_5	3,923	4	0,417
		Living_Region_1_5(1)	0,106	1	0,745
		Living_Region_1_5(2)	1,890	1	0,169
		Living_Region_1_5(3)	0,243	1	0,622
		Living_Region_1_5(4)	0,000	1	1,000
		Are you...(1)	2,043	1	0,153
		q28_meerdantweejaar(1)	0,383	1	0,536
	Overall Statistics		6,100	7	0,528

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	6,300	7	0,505
	Block	6,300	7	0,505
	Model	6,300	7	0,505

Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	89,307[a]	0,086	0,116

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Classification Table[a]

Observed			Predicted		
			Economic_Success		Percentage Correct
			,00	1,00	
Step 1	Economic_Success	,00	29	11	72,5
		1,00	16	14	46,7
	Overall Percentage				61,4

a. The cut value is ,500

Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	Age_Categories(1)	0,418	0,555	0,566	1	0,452	1,518
	Living_Region_1_5			2,758	4	0,599	
	Living_Region_1_5(1)	-1,356	1,195	1,288	1	0,256	0,258
	Living_Region_1_5(2)	-1,648	1,008	2,673	1	0,102	0,192
	Living_Region_1_5(3)	-1,155	0,950	1,478	1	0,224	0,315
	Living_Region_1_5(4)	-1,041	1,164	0,800	1	0,371	0,353
	Are you...(1)	-0,750	0,706	1,130	1	0,288	0,472
	q28_meerdantweejaar(1)	0,283	0,872	0,105	1	0,746	1,327
	Constant	0,590	1,189	0,247	1	0,619	1,805

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Age_Categories, Living_Region_1_5, Are you..., q28_meerdantweejaar.

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	11,897	4	0,018
	Block	11,897	4	0,018
	Model	18,197	11	0,077

Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	77,410[a]	0,229	0,307

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Classification Table[a]

			Predicted		
			Economic_Success		Percentage Correct
Observed			,00	1,00	
Step 1	Economic_Success	,00	30	10	75,0
		1,00	12	18	60,0
	Overall Percentage				68,6

a. The cut value is ,500

Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	Age_Categories(1)	0,850	0,752	1,278	1	0,258	2,340
	Living_Region_1_5			2,912	4	0,573	
	Living_Region_1_5(1)	-0,168	1,451	0,013	1	0,908	0,845
	Living_Region_1_5(2)	-1,384	1,087	1,623	1	0,203	0,250
	Living_Region_1_5(3)	-0,296	1,036	0,081	1	0,775	0,744
	Living_Region_1_5(4)	-0,057	1,299	0,002	1	0,965	0,945
	Are you...(1)	-0,721	0,774	0,867	1	0,352	0,486
	q28_meerdantweejaar(1)	0,282	1,024	0,076	1	0,783	1,326
	q25_rec(1)	-0,745	0,725	1,054	1	0,305	0,475
	Family_members_ja_nee(1)	0,586	0,635	0,851	1	0,356	1,796
	q13_1_rec(1)	-2,112	0,698	9,166	1	0,002	0,121
	Q13_3_rec(1)	0,563	0,614	0,840	1	0,359	1,756
	Constant	0,875	1,519	0,331	1	0,565	2,398

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: q25_rec, Family_members_ja_nee, q13_1_rec, Q13_3_rec.

9.7. Appendix G – Model 3

Case Processing Summary

Unweighted Cases[a]		N	Percent
Selected Cases	Included in Analysis	70	100,0
	Missing Cases	0	0,0
	Total	70	100,0
Unselected Cases		0	0,0
Total		70	100,0

a. If weight is in effect, see classification table for the total number of cases.

Dependent Variable Encoding

Original Value	Internal Value
,00	0
1,00	1

Categorical Variables Codings

		Frequency	Parameter coding (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Language_Skills_0_6	,00	4	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
	1,00	10	1,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
	2,00	7	0,000	1,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
	3,00	15	0,000	0,000	1,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
	4,00	10	0,000	0,000	0,000	1,000	0,000	0,000
	5,00	11	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	1,000	0,000
	6,00	13	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	1,000
Level_Education_0_5	1,00	2	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000		
	2,00	25	1,000	0,000	0,000	0,000		
	3,00	4	0,000	1,000	0,000	0,000		
	4,00	34	0,000	0,000	1,000	0,000		
	5,00	5	0,000	0,000	0,000	1,000		
Living_Region_1_5	1,00	7	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000		
	2,00	8	1,000	0,000	0,000	0,000		
	3,00	20	0,000	1,000	0,000	0,000		
	4,00	28	0,000	0,000	1,000	0,000		
	5,00	7	0,000	0,000	0,000	1,000		
Correct_experience_no_home_host	,00	16	0,000	0,000				
	1,00	27	1,000	0,000				
	2,00	27	0,000	1,000				
Correct_Business_training_no_home_host	,00	18	0,000	0,000				
	1,00	14	1,000	0,000				
	2,00	38	0,000	1,000				
Are you...	Male	55	0,000					
	Female	15	1,000					
q28_meerdantweejaar	,00	9	0,000					
	1,00	61	1,000					
q25_rec	not living together	33	0,000					
	living together	37	1,000					
Family_members_ja_nee	,00	35	0,000					
	1,00	35	1,000					
Q13_3_rec	small amount host country clients	34	0,000					
	great amount host country clients	36	1,000					
q13_1_rec	small amount home country clients	24	0,000					
	great amount home country clients	46	1,000					
Age_Categories	1,00	35	0,000					
	2,00	35	1,000					

Classification Table[a,b]

Observed			Predicted Economic_Success ,00	1,00	Percentage Correct
Step 0	Economic_Success	,00	40	0	100,0
		1,00	30	0	0,0
	Overall Percentage				57,1

a. Constant is included in the model.

b. The cut value is ,500

Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 0	Constant	-0,288	0,242	1,419	1	0,234	0,750

Variables not in the Equation

			Score	df	Sig.
Step 0	Variables	Age_Categories(1)	0,933	1	0,334
		Living_Region_1_5	3,923	4	0,417
		Living_Region_1_5(1)	0,106	1	0,745
		Living_Region_1_5(2)	1,890	1	0,169
		Living_Region_1_5(3)	0,243	1	0,622
		Living_Region_1_5(4)	0,000	1	1,000
		Are you...(1)	2,043	1	0,153
		q28_meerdantweejaar(1)	0,383	1	0,536
	Overall Statistics		6,100	7	0,528

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	6,300	7	0,505
	Block	6,300	7	0,505
	Model	6,300	7	0,505

Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	89,307[a]	0,086	0,116

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Classification Table[a]

			Predicted		
			Economic_Success		Percentage Correct
Observed			,00	1,00	
Step 1	Economic_Success	,00	29	11	72,5
		1,00	16	14	46,7
	Overall Percentage				61,4

a. The cut value is ,500

Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	Age_Categories(1)	0,418	0,555	0,566	1	0,452	1,518
	Living_Region_1_5			2,758	4	0,599	
	Living_Region_1_5(1)	-1,356	1,195	1,288	1	0,256	0,258
	Living_Region_1_5(2)	-1,648	1,008	2,673	1	0,102	0,192
	Living_Region_1_5(3)	-1,155	0,950	1,478	1	0,224	0,315
	Living_Region_1_5(4)	-1,041	1,164	0,800	1	0,371	0,353
	Are you...(1)	-0,750	0,706	1,130	1	0,288	0,472
	q28_meerdantweejaar(1)	0,283	0,872	0,105	1	0,746	1,327
	Constant	0,590	1,189	0,247	1	0,619	1,805

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Age_Categories, Living_Region_1_5, Are you..., q28_meerdantweejaar.

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	11,897	4	0,018
	Block	11,897	4	0,018
	Model	18,197	11	0,077

Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	77,410^a	0,229	0,307

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Classification Table^a

			Predicted		
			Economic_Success		Percentage Correct
Observed			,00	1,00	
Step 1	Economic_Success	,00	30	10	75,0
		1,00	12	18	60,0
	Overall Percentage				68,6

a. The cut value is ,500

Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1^a	Age_Categories(1)	0,850	0,752	1,278	1	0,258	2,340
	Living_Region_1_5			2,912	4	0,573	
	Living_Region_1_5(1)	-0,168	1,451	0,013	1	0,908	0,845
	Living_Region_1_5(2)	-1,384	1,087	1,623	1	0,203	0,250
	Living_Region_1_5(3)	-0,296	1,036	0,081	1	0,775	0,744
	Living_Region_1_5(4)	-0,057	1,299	0,002	1	0,965	0,945
	Are you...(1)	-0,721	0,774	0,867	1	0,352	0,486
	q28_meerdantweejaar(1)	0,282	1,024	0,076	1	0,783	1,326
	q25_rec(1)	-0,745	0,725	1,054	1	0,305	0,475
	Family_members_ja_nee(1)	0,586	0,635	0,851	1	0,356	1,796
	q13_1_rec(1)	-2,112	0,698	9,166	1	0,002	0,121
	Q13_3_rec(1)	0,563	0,614	0,840	1	0,359	1,756
	Constant	0,875	1,519	0,331	1	0,565	2,398

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: q25_rec, Family_members_ja_nee, q13_1_rec, Q13_3_rec.

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	14,599	14	0,406
	Block	14,599	14	0,406
	Model	32,796	25	0,136

Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	62,811[a]	0,374	0,502

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 6 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	Age_Categories(1)	2,075	1,603	1,676	1	0,195	7,966
	Living_Region_1_5			5,821	4	0,213	
	Living_Region_1_5(1)	1,604	1,923	0,696	1	0,404	4,975
	Living_Region_1_5(2)	-3,872	2,196	3,108	1	0,078	0,021
	Living_Region_1_5(3)	0,100	1,309	0,006	1	0,939	1,105
	Living_Region_1_5(4)	1,189	1,830	0,423	1	0,516	3,285
	Are you...(1)	0,365	1,242	0,087	1	0,769	1,441
	q28_meerdantweejaar(1)	-1,192	1,637	0,530	1	0,467	0,304
	q25_rec(1)	-1,311	1,068	1,507	1	0,220	0,269
	Family_members_ja_nee(1)	1,365	0,975	1,963	1	0,161	3,917
	q13_1_rec(1)	-2,650	0,954	7,721	1	0,005	0,071
	Q13_3_rec(1)	1,679	0,920	3,330	1	0,068	5,361
	Level_Education_0_5			4,217	4	0,377	
	Level_Education_0_5(1)	-2,854	2,386	1,430	1	0,232	0,058
	Level_Education_0_5(2)	-5,117	3,053	2,809	1	0,094	0,006
	Level_Education_0_5(3)	-4,602	2,701	2,902	1	0,088	0,010
	Level_Education_0_5(4)	-4,072	2,950	1,906	1	0,167	0,017
	Language_Skills_0_6			4,660	6	0,588	
	Language_Skills_0_6(1)	-0,506	2,329	0,047	1	0,828	0,603
	Language_Skills_0_6(2)	-1,517	2,449	0,384	1	0,536	0,219
	Language_Skills_0_6(3)	0,195	2,288	0,007	1	0,932	1,215
	Language_Skills_0_6(4)	-1,423	2,283	0,389	1	0,533	0,241
	Language_Skills_0_6(5)	-1,181	2,455	0,231	1	0,630	0,307
	Language_Skills_0_6(6)	1,557	2,206	0,498	1	0,480	4,743
	Correct_Business_training_no_home_host			3,316	2	0,191	
	Correct_Business_training_no_home_host(1)	-2,328	1,378	2,852	1	0,091	0,098
	Correct_Business_training_no_home_host(2)	-0,102	0,896	0,013	1	0,909	0,903
	Correct_experience_no_home_host			0,313	2	0,855	
	Correct_experience_no_home_host(1)	0,359	1,025	0,123	1	0,726	1,432
	Correct_experience_no_home_host(2)	0,576	1,031	0,312	1	0,576	1,779
	Constant	5,251	3,636	2,085	1	0,149	190,676

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Level_Education_0_5, Language_Skills_0_6, Correct_Business_training_no_home_host, Correct_experience_no_home_host.