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ABSTRACT

In the 21st century globalisation has contributed to the creation of the entrepreneurial society and city. The location of entrepreneurship has become an important factor in entrepreneurial studies and, moreover, for entrepreneurial success. Research has shown that the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam needs to be strengthened for businesses to grow, but solutions have not been found yet. In the region of Rotterdam immigrants make up a large part of the population and are very entrepreneurial. Immigrant entrepreneurs are considered as important agents for urban economic growth and competitiveness. Although studying immigrant entrepreneurs could be very informative to strengthen the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam, this is not done before. Therefore, in the present study, we analyse the entrepreneurial habits and experiences, and challenges regarding infrastructure, culture, and media, of immigrant entrepreneurs to find out to what extent immigrant entrepreneurs could contribute to the development of the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam. Hence, the following research question is posed: To what extent could immigrant entrepreneurship contribute to the development of the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam? In order to answer this question, a strategy of Grounded Theory orientated qualitative research is undertaken and ten in-depth interviews are conducted with immigrant entrepreneurs located in Rotterdam-Zuid. Furthermore, the entrepreneurial ecosystem is applied to Rotterdam-Zuid. By understanding the environment of the city, we build a list of unique behaviours or attributes that define the entrepreneurial habits and experience of immigrant entrepreneurs in Rotterdam-Zuid. A thematic analysis on the outcome of the interviews revealed that cross-cultural entrepreneurship is an important characteristic of immigrant entrepreneurship in Rotterdam-Zuid. It can be considered as a hidden economic potential, as it can strengthen: 1. The immigrant businesses regarding business development and growth; 2. The communities and networks of businesses and entrepreneurs; and, 3. The entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam-Zuid. Nonetheless, the entrepreneurial habits of the immigrant entrepreneurs also caused some limitations for business development and collaborations, such as the lack of creativity within ethnic communities and the importance of self-representation. Furthermore, the immigrant entrepreneurs face challenges regarding infrastructure and communication with third parties, resulting in a more negative entrepreneurial experience.
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Preface

The Rotterdam Immigrant Project is a multi-method multi-year research project lead by Dr Jeremiah P. Spence, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Global and International Communication at Erasmus University Rotterdam. The primary objective of the project is to develop a deep understanding of immigrants living in the Rotterdam Metropolitan Area, with a specific focus on the question of the relationships between: 1. Entrepreneurial habits, the media and cultural capital among immigrants; and 2. Media habits and acculturation among immigrants. To address these two questions, two separate approaches were pursued. In order to examine the question of entrepreneurial habits, a strategy of Grounded Theory orientated qualitative research was undertaken by a team consisting of two master’s students and one undergraduate student. In order to examine the media habits and acculturation question, a strategy of closed quantitative surveys was pursued by a team of one master’s student and eight undergraduate students (Spence, personal communication, May 29, 2017).
1. Introduction

At the end of the 20th century, it was predicted that globalisation would harm the regional economy. However, two decades later cities and policymakers around the world are looking for ways to become the next Silicon Valley. Herein, the importance of geographic proximity, regional clusters, small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), and entrepreneurial activity increased (Leitão, Lasch, & Thurik, 2011). In this regard, globalisation entails not only sales in foreign markets but also the use of foreign resources; e.g. human capital, intellectual property and ideas, and labour and natural resources (Carlsson & Mudambi, 2003).

Furthermore, Audretsch (2009) posits that innovative activities shift from within laboratories and corporations to clusters and regions. Thus, the success of innovation clusters and incubators is mostly due to the region in which they are embedded (Gibson & Mahdjoubi, 2014). Consequently, strategic policy measure emerged for regions (not for firms) to generate economic growth: The creation of the entrepreneurial society and the rise of the entrepreneurial city (Audretsch, 2009; Jessop, 2000; Stam, 2015). Also, the shift of the comparative advantage of high-wage countries towards knowledge-based economic activity caused that economic knowledge is less associated with corporations and more with innovative regional clusters such as Silicon Valley in California and the Cambridge Area in the United Kingdom (Leitão, Lasch, & Thurik, 2011). According to Porter (1990), nations have become more important due to global competition which is based on the creation and assimilation of knowledge. The competitive success is caused by differences in national values, culture, economic structures, institutions, and histories.

The increasing importance of the city in economic growth and entrepreneurial activity also counts for Rotterdam. In recent years, Rotterdam – the second biggest city of the Netherlands – has become increasingly popular as a touristic and business destination. Among others, The New York Times, The Wall Street Journal, Lonely Planet, and Rough Guides included the city of Rotterdam in their lists of must-visit destinations (Barone, 2016; DeSantis et al., 2014; Forster, 2015; Lonely Planet, 2016). They praise Rotterdam especially for the architecture and the port. As a result, the numbers in tourism are increasing for five years in a row – since 2011. Furthermore, the economy of Rotterdam profits from the popularity of the city. In 2015, the number of international investing projects increased from 45 to 65. This lead to 34.8 million euros in investments and 797 new jobs (Rotterdam Partners, 2016). Moreover, Forbes ranked the Netherlands 7th in their list of best countries to do business in 2017 (Forbes, 2016). These figures illustrate the perceived potential of Rotterdam, and the Netherlands, as a hub for entrepreneurship and innovation.
In 2014, the Municipality of Rotterdam, Port of Rotterdam Authority, Erasmus University of Rotterdam, and Rotterdam Partners collaborated to put Rotterdam more clearly on the map; national as well as international. The joint profile ‘Make it happen’ reflects the mentality of the city, the port, and the inhabitants: Pioneering, ground-breaking, and no-nonsense (Rotterdam Partners, n.d.). The initiative follows three themes: 1. Rotterdam as a connector for innovation and entrepreneurship; 2. Rotterdam as a society for pioneers; and, 3. Rotterdam as a discovery. The partners aim to attract highly educated, businesses, trade, visitors, and citizens. The project is also based on the DNA of the city: Internationally oriented, entrepreneurial, and raw (Rotterdam. Make It Happen, n.d.). In the communication and marketing activities of the city, this DNA is prominent (Rotterdam, n.d. A).

The identity of Rotterdam, being international and hard-working, can be traced back to the Second World War. Between May 10 and 14, 1940, Nazi-Germany bombed Rotterdam with at least 20 airstrikes. As a result, the complete city centre was destroyed including, among others, malls, shops, warehouses, offices, and banks (Brandgrens, n.d.). After the war, the Wederopbouw (Reconstruction) began in the Netherlands, and especially in Rotterdam. On the Coolsingel an advertisement was placed saying: ‘Get to work, Rotterdammers are not afraid of working hard’. The citizens were enthusiastic about the Reconstruction as there was an annual Reconstruction day, Reconstruction tours by the RET, Reconstruction exhibitions, and two magazines devoted to the Reconstruction. In 1954, Rein Blijstra wrote in the daily newspaper Het Vrije Volk: ‘It will be beautiful, Rotterdam will become a beautiful city’. He stated that Rotterdam would be spacious and get a world allure: Fast traffic, broad boulevards, and high buildings. Because of the drive for innovation and modernisation, architects did not recover but renewed the city; damaged buildings were demolished instead of rebuild. The Coolsingel became the central boulevard of the new city centre, and there was a separation of functions as only offices, shops, and centre-related buildings were allowed in the city centre. Besides, the roadwork had to be more efficient, and the first car-free shopping area in the world was realised, de Lijnbaan. In the 60s and the 70s people became critical of the business-like image of the city; consequently, some buildings were replaced by contemporary architecture (Wederopbouw Rotterdam, n.d.; Rotterdam, n.d. B). Moreover, in 1966 city councillor H.J. Viersen advocated a World Trade Centre, an international business centre as a catalyst for high-quality service and new logistics development. He acknowledged the one-sided economic character of the city (City Archive Rotterdam, n.d.).

International migration is a key contributor to globalisation in cultures and business (Xavier, Kelley, Kew, Herrington, & Vorderwülbecke, 2013). In 2012 there were worldwide more than 210 million international migrants, and the numbers are increasing. The potential
The employment of these immigrants is considered to be contributing to their socio-economic integration and as a catalyst for economic growth. Researchers (Xavier et al., 2013) argue that immigrants are more engaged in entrepreneurial activity than non-immigrants and that their attitude and motivation differs. For example, in 2014, 5.1% of the people aged 20-64 with a Bulgarian nationality started a business in the Netherlands, 4.2% of the Romanians, 3.0% of the Hungarians, and only 1.6% of the Dutch (CBS, 2016A; Appendix A). One of the main reasons for this is that immigrants are more vulnerable to unemployment than non-immigrants (OECD, 2001; Stören, 2001). Moreover, in the OECD (Organisations for Economic Co-operation Development) countries, non-Western immigrants face a larger risk of unemployment than Western immigrants. In 2016, 13.2% of non-Western immigrants were unemployed in the Netherlands, 7.2% of Western immigrants, and 4.9% of non-immigrants (CBS, 2017). In some cases, immigrants also earn less than non-immigrants. The OECD (2001) argues that the labour market varies with the relatively less skilled immigrants, and that age, gender, nationality, the level of education, training, experience, and mastery of the host country’s language are important factors for their vulnerability. Other issues related to immigrant unemployment are stigmatisation, social integration, exclusion, crime, racism, and discrimination. Entrepreneurship enables immigrants to avoid these barriers and ensures inclusion, interdependence, and participation. Research (Eraydin, Tasan-Kok, & Vranken, 2010) shows that immigrant entrepreneurs contribute to the urban economic performance and are important agents for urban economic growth and competitiveness. Moreover, globalisation, immigration, and multiculturality contribute to the rise of entrepreneurship without borders and cross-cultural entrepreneurship (Çelik, 2015). Rotterdam is called a migrant city as an increasing amount of immigrants are part of the city. After the Second World War only 1-2% of the population in Rotterdam was immigrant, however, in the 70s it was 8%, in the 80s 35%, in the 90s 41%, and in the 00s 46%. In 2016, almost half of the population of Rotterdam was immigrant (49.8%, i.e. approximately 316,000 inhabitants), meaning that at least one parent is born abroad (Rotterdam Buurtmonitor, 2016). The majority of the non-Western immigrants in Rotterdam are living in the areas Rotterdam-Zuid, Crooswijk, and Rotterdam-West (CBS in uw buurt, n.d.; Appendix C).

The history of Rotterdam after the Second World War including the Reconstruction, the increasing amount of immigrants, and the focus on entrepreneurship reflects the multicultural character, the international outlook, and the hard-working identity of the city, and explains the perceived identity of the city that is based on entrepreneurship. In the last decades, the city of Rotterdam is growing into a hub of innovation, entrepreneurship, and commercial excellence within the Netherlands. NLgroei, a collaboration between the Ministry of Economic Affairs,
NLevator, and the Chamber of Commerce, published a report showing that since 2008 the share of start-ups (e.g. SMEs) in the Netherlands is doubled to 9.5% (NLgroei, 2016). However, the report also indicates that start-ups do not become so easily scale-ups. Furthermore, the Erasmus Centre for Entrepreneurship found that in 2016 for the first time since 2008 there is a slight increase in the share of fast-growing companies in the Netherlands. The number of fast-growing companies (e.g. scale-ups) is an important indicator for the adaptive power of regional and national economies (Jansen, De Vos, & Lescher, 2016).

The outline above demonstrates the importance of entrepreneurship in the 21st century for cities and countries, the role of regions in entrepreneurial success, and the potential of immigrant entrepreneurs as agents for economic growth and competitiveness. The research by NLgroei and the Erasmus Centre for Entrepreneurship shows that the Dutch entrepreneurial ecosystem needs to be strengthened for businesses to grow. However, the research focusses solely on the question: What is the current state of the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam? The research does not address the question why businesses do not grow in Rotterdam. Also, no specific attention is paid to immigrant entrepreneurs although immigrants make up a large part of the population and are perceived as very entrepreneurial (Fairlie & Lofstrom, 2013). Moreover, as mentioned before, the success of the entrepreneurial society is partly due to differences in national values, culture, economic structures, institutions, and histories (Porter, 1990). Therefore, studying immigrant entrepreneurs could be very informative to strengthen the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam. The role of infrastructure and culture is integral to the success of entrepreneurs and new entrepreneurial enterprises. As immigrant entrepreneurs navigating between two worlds can be challenging, and infrastructure and culture play a significant role in this. They are nodes of communication that determine how we interpret the world and how we maintain the connection with our homeland. Research (Xavier et al., 2013) shows that immigrant entrepreneurs often maintain strong ties with their homeland community in the process of starting their business. In doing so, “the distinctiveness of migrants’ entrepreneurial propensity can be explained by considering both internal characteristics of the individual migrant, as well as the external environment of the host economy he/she operates in” (Xavier et al., 2013, p. 44).

The present study takes the previous research into account and goes one step further by exploring the immigrant entrepreneurial experience and habits in Rotterdam-Zuid, and their challenges related to infrastructure, culture, and media. The entrepreneurial ecosystem model is applied to Rotterdam-Zuid by examining the environmental variables, agents, and behaviours. By understanding the environment of the city and interviewing immigrant entrepreneurs, we can seek to build a list of unique behaviours or attributes that define the
entrepreneurial habits and experience of immigrant entrepreneurs in Rotterdam-Zuid. These can have the potential to strengthen the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam and contribute to the growth and development of businesses. Besides, incorporating immigrant entrepreneurs more explicitly in the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam could contribute to their feeling of incorporation into society. Moreover, by understanding the dynamic of acculturation and integration of immigrant into society, we could prevent the society from being divided. The following research (sub)questions are hence introduced:

**RQ:** To what extent could immigrant entrepreneurship contribute to the development of the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam?

**SQ1:** Within the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam-Zuid, what defines the immigrant entrepreneurial experience and habits?

**SQ2:** What challenges do immigrant entrepreneurs in Rotterdam-Zuid encounter regarding infrastructure, culture, and media?

The present study is structured as follows: Chapter 2 provides an overview of theory and previous research on the use of complex entrepreneurial ecosystems and agent-based modelling, (the combination of) immigration and entrepreneurship, and their relation to culture, infrastructure, and media. Chapter 3 provides the study’s research design by discussing the use of Grounded Theory, and the process of data collection and data analysis. Furthermore, the studied agents of the immigrant entrepreneurial ecosystem are addressed. In chapter 4, the results are presented, interpreted, and discussed in relation to the research questions and theory. The results are structured accordingly to the elements of the entrepreneurial ecosystem: Environmental components (external characteristics) and behaviours and attributes (internal characteristics). Lastly, in the conclusion, we answer the research question, provide a theoretical discussion on the implication of the research findings, discuss the limitations of the research, and offer suggestions for further research.
2. Theoretical framework

2.1 Complexity science

According to McKelvey (2004), complexity science is more suitable for entrepreneurial science than population ecology and evolutionary theory, as it focuses on order creation instead of equilibrium. The author makes a distinction between thin and thick descriptions: Thin descriptions are based on time-series, while thick descriptions are based on one point in time. McKelvey proposes a new kind of research called heterogeneous agent-based computational modelling to combine thin- and thick-description research. In doing so, he examines agents to produce theories about effective entrepreneurial practices: “Agent models allow scientists to capture much more of the complex causality present in typical entrepreneurial settings” (p. 314). Moreover, it helps to create more generalizable theories that have more scientific legitimacy and practical credibility. Hence, this method allows the researcher to examine the entrepreneurial practices of immigrant entrepreneurs.

Cilliers (1998) defines complexity as “arising through large-scale, nonlinear interaction” (p. 37). He states that connectionists networks are partly similar to complex systems, and, consequently, are models for complex systems. For the present study, the postmodern society of Rotterdam can be described and analysed as a complex system because it meets multiple characteristics. These characteristics are: Consists of a large number of elements that interact dynamically, the level of (nonlinear) interactions are rich and have a short range, there are loops in the interconnections, and the complex systems are open, have histories, and do not operate equilibrium (Cilliers, 1998). In the present study, the interacting elements are the immigrant entrepreneurs who undertake business and, in doing so, interact physically and by information exchange. The interaction is rich, meaning that the elements influence each other with their behaviour. Furthermore, the interactions have a short range, meaning that the information exchange mainly takes place in close distance (e.g. between neighbours). Loops in the interconnections entail that there is a possibility for feedback between the elements; this can be positive as well as negative (e.g. between entrepreneurs, between entrepreneurs and organisations). Open systems entail that the elements interact within their environment. It is often difficult to determine the border of a complex system as the interactions go beyond borders. Within the present study, we determined the borders to be on the edge of four neighbourhoods in Rotterdam-Zuid and to study the interactions within this area (Appendix D). This is called framing: “The scope of the system is usually determined by the purpose of the description of the system, and is thus often determined by the position of the observer” (Cilliers, 1998, p. 4). Furthermore, the complex system of Rotterdam-Zuid has histories,
meaning that the past is playing a factor in the current behaviour within the ecosystem; “Any analysis of a complex system that ignores the dimension of time is incomplete” (Cilliers, 1998, p. 4). Therefore, the history of Rotterdam since World War Two is discussed in the introduction of the present study. Lastly, the elements of the system only interact and respond to local information, and, thus, are not aware of the behaviour of the entire system. After studying the individual elements, we look at the complex structure of the system by finding patterns and interactions between the elements.

2.2 Complex entrepreneurial ecosystems and agent-based modelling

In Rotterdam, we can find a complex entrepreneurial ecosystem. A complex ecosystem consists of a large number of heterogeneous interacting components. To study this ecosystem, we use agent-based modelling and simulation of complex ecosystems: “An agent-based model is a simulation model that employs the idea of multiple agents situated and acting in a common environment as central modelling paradigm” (Siegfried, 2014, p. 18). Agent-based modelling and simulation gained popularity in the past decades. This type of analysis is required since we live in an increasingly complex world, and, as stated before, the entrepreneurial science focuses on order creation, not equilibrium (Macal & North, 2009; McKelvey, 2004). By using the individual-level focus of agent-based modelling, one can observe the diversity of attributes and behaviours between existing agents and the dynamic behaviour of the entire system (North, 2014). For the present study, it is especially useful to study immigrant entrepreneurs individually within the larger entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam. In doing so, the (effective) practices of immigrant entrepreneurs can be explored and assessed individually. Only then, the outcome can be used to define the entrepreneurial habits and experiences, including challenges and limitations, within the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam-Zuid.

Furthermore, Curci and Mackoy (2010) state that the entrepreneur is a more appropriate unit of analysis to examine the business-development process than the individual business. Eraydin et al. (2010) posit that immigrant entrepreneurs contribute to the urban economic performance and are important agents for urban economic growth and competitiveness. This approach of agent-based modelling is successfully used before to study entrepreneurial ecosystems (Mason & Brown, 2014; Spence, 2016; Stam, 2014).

The complex ecosystem consists of three components: Agents, environment, and behaviour (Siegfried, 2014). An agent is an “entity that is situated in some environment, and that is capable of autonomous action in this environment in order to meet its objectives” (Siegfried, 2014, p. 18). Within the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam, examples of agents are entrepreneurs, incubators, innovators, inventors, money people, talent, super
connectors, social actors, supergeneralists, and specialists (Spence, 2016). In the present study, the agents are the immigrant entrepreneurs of Rotterdam-Zuid (Appendix F). The second component, environment, is essential to the entrepreneurial ecosystem since the agents act within this environment and their actions are dependent or limited by this. The entrepreneurial behaviour, attitudes, and motivations are not only based on personal characteristics of the agent (i.e. immigrant entrepreneur) but are also shaped by the context of the recipient economy (i.e. Rotterdam, the Netherlands) (Suresh & Ramraj, 2012; Xavier et al., 2013). As a starting point for the present study, we gathered data about multiple environmental components that are essential for the entrepreneurial ecosystem. The list of environmental components is based on previous research about the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Austin, Texas (Spence, 2016; Appendix B). The third component, behaviour, is the result of the interaction between the agents within the environment (Siegfried, 2014). Cohen (2004) examines the applicability of the entrepreneurial ecosystem literature to the development of a sustainable community as a centre for entrepreneurial innovations. Herein, he focuses explicitly on the role of physical infrastructure and culture in the community of Victoria, British Columbia. Cohen quotes Spilling (1996) to emphasise the importance of the interacting agents in the entrepreneurial ecosystem:

“Economic development is a result of complex entrepreneurial processes. Many things are linked together; many ventures develop in close interaction with each other and with environmental factors. Furthermore, the development of communities requires more than just the development of a number of businesses: it is also about infrastructure, public institutions, and about firms that can match together in advanced production systems” (as cited in Cohen, 2004, p. 3).

Previous research (Malecki, 1997) has shown the results of the interaction between different components of the ecosystem, for example, there could be a cyclical process in which when actors are attracted to the area this subsequently lead to more successful start-ups. In other words, components of the ecosystem can influence the overall macroeconomic development of a region. Neck, Meyer, Cohen, and Corbet (2004) conducted interviews and performed a qualitative analysis to identify components that lead to more successful start-ups; they examined their interaction and influence on the macroeconomic development. In doing so, they found essential elements and their exact role in creating a hub for innovation and entrepreneurship: Incubators, spin-offs, (in)formal networks, physical infrastructure, and community culture. As well as Neck et al. (2004) and Cohen (2004), the present study focuses
on one specific geographic region, Rotterdam, because an entrepreneurial ecosystem is restricted to geographic boundaries and local environments. Start-ups rely on local networks of key actors, and, consequently, these networks have an important role in supporting and facilitating the entrepreneurship in a region (Prevezer, 2001). Moreover, as research by Neck et al. (2004) shows, community culture is the most important but also most difficult component to manage as it reflects the climate, collective interests, and spirit of a community; it is beneficial as well as critical. In the present study, infrastructure, media, and culture within the region Rotterdam is analysed as they relate to the creation of the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam-Zuid, and more specifically to the practices of immigrant entrepreneurs (see paragraph 2.7).

2.3 Immigrants

In the present study, the owners of the businesses are all first-generation immigrants. First generation immigrants include “individuals that were born outside the economy in which they now reside and have assumedly experienced migration themselves” (Xavier et al., 2013, p. 44). We have interviewed one second-generation immigrant as he is the son of the owner and works in the business as an employee and marketing manager. A second-generation immigrant is defined by Xavier et al. (2013) as an individual “whose mother and/or father were born outside the economy in which they now reside. It is assumed that their affiliations with their migrant communities exert influence on their entrepreneurial behaviour and attitudes” (p. 44).

In 2016, approximately 16,979,120 people were living in the Netherlands of which 3,752,291 were immigrants. To be more precise, there are 1,920,877 first-generation immigrants and 1,148,449 second-generation immigrants (CBS, 2016B). Rotterdam is called a migrant city as half of the population is immigrant. To be specific, 50.1% is autochthonous, 37.5% is a Western immigrant, and 12.2% is a non-Western immigrant (Rotterdam Buurtmonitor, 2016). The majority of the non-Western immigrants is living in the areas Rotterdam-Zuid, Crooswijk, and Rotterdam-West (CBS in uw buurt, n.d.; Appendix C). For the present study, the Rotterdam-Zuid area is taken as the research area because many immigrant businesses are located here (Appendix C).

2.4 Entrepreneurship

The concept of entrepreneurship is hard to define, and in the academic world, there is no complete agreement on this definition yet. Shane and Venkatraman (2000) argue that entrepreneurship cannot be defined in terms of who (enterprising individuals) and what (lucrative opportunities) only. This definition ignores the variation in the quality of
opportunities identified and lacks consideration of attributes of entrepreneurs that can influence the opportunities found. The authors propose to study the field of entrepreneurship with an examination of “sources of opportunities; the process of discovery; evaluation and exploitation of opportunities; and the set of individuals who discover, evaluate, and exploit them” (p. 218). By using the individual-level focus of agent-based modelling, we can study entrepreneurship accordingly. Fillis and Rentschler (2010) give a more economic definition of entrepreneurship: “The process of creating value for business and social communities by bringing together unique combinations of public and private resources to exploit economic, social, or cultural opportunities in an environment of change” (p. 2-3). More importantly, Fillis and Rentschler relate three essential aspects to entrepreneurship. The first aspect is innovation which entails how the entrepreneur finds the opportunity and starts a profitable business. The second aspect, risk-taking, entails the embeddedness of innovation into an organisation, society, or community. In other words, what is the willingness of the entrepreneur to succeed? The final aspect, proactiveness, relates to, for example, the desire to break with the traditional ways of doing things.

Furthermore, entrepreneurship is about phase transition (McKelvey, 2004). According to McKelvey, the entrepreneurial activity consists of two interconnected phases: 1. The start-up phase which has more entrepreneurial risks; and, 2. The BVSR managerial phase (blind variation, selection, and retention) which is more managerial. Advice-giving to entrepreneurs in the first phase is mainly aimed to reduce blind variation. The poorly founded advice in the first stage weakens the later stages (McKelvey, 2004) and can limit business development, success, or growth.

2.5 Immigrant entrepreneurs

Immigration has impacted the image of Dutch cities as there is an increasing amount of different nationalities on the streets. According to Kloosterman, Van Der Leun, and Rath (1999), the rising number of immigrant entrepreneurs also reflects this changing image. According to the authors, the immigrant entrepreneurs changed the Dutch cities as follows:

By revitalizing formerly derelict shopping streets, by introducing new products and new marketing strategies …, by fostering the emergence of new spatial forms of social cohesion …, by opening up trade links between faraway areas that were hitherto unconnected through so-called transnational communities …, and by posing challenges to the existing regulatory framework through being engaged in informal economic activities. (Kloosterman et al., 1999, p. 316)
According to Baycan-Levent and Nijkamp (2009), the increased rate of self-employed immigrants in the labour market is the most noticeable impact of migration from a socio-economic perspective. This entrepreneurial behaviour has led to what is called migrant entrepreneurship. As mentioned before, the reason that immigrants become entrepreneurs is that they are more vulnerable to unemployment than non-immigrants (OECD, 2001; Stören, 2001). In 2016, 13.2% of non-Western migrants were unemployed in the Netherlands, 7.2% of Western migrants, and 4.9% of non-migrants (CBS, 2017). However, immigrants do not always start their business solely because it is a necessity (e.g. unemployment), they can also have opportunity-driven motives (Xavier et al., 2013; Chrysostome & Lin, 2010). In their step to becoming an entrepreneur, we can distinguish structural and cultural factors. The factors are conditions that can cause opportunities as well as barriers to success (Baycan-Levent & Nijkamp, 2009). Structural factors entail, among others, social exclusion and discrimination, poor access to markets, and high unemployment. The cultural factors entail, among others, “specific values, skills, and cultural features including internal solidarity and loyalty, flexibility, personal motivation, strong work ethics, informal network contacts with people from the same ethnic group, and flexible financing arrangements” (p. 2-3). Besides, a combination of both factors could occur. Discrimination and social distance are also factors that contribute to the location of the immigrant business. According to, Mason, Reuschke, Syrett, and Van Ham (2015), these factors make it difficult or less attractive for immigrant entrepreneurs to start their business in neighbourhoods with mainly local inhabitants.

In 2012 there were approximately 1.2 million entrepreneurs in the Netherlands of which 16.1% was ethnic (9.2% Western and 6.9% non-Western) (Kloosterman et al., 1999). Between 2007 and 2014, one out of seven of the new-coming entrepreneurs in the Netherlands was not Dutch (i.e. approximately 130.000 out of 900.000 businesses). In 2014 there were 23.000 new entrepreneurs without a Dutch nationality, meaning one out of six new-coming entrepreneurs. Placing these numbers in perspective, in 2014, 5.1% of the people aged 20-64 with a Bulgarian nationality in the Netherlands started a business, 4.2% of the Romanians, 3.0% of the Hungarians, and only 1.6% of the Dutch (CBS, 2016A; Appendix A). Immigrant entrepreneurship mostly takes place in businesses areas with low barriers to entry (Kloosterman et al., 1999). According to Baycan-Levent and Nijkamp (2009), this is due to their lack of financial capital and appropriate human capital. To be more specific, immigrant entrepreneurship in the Netherlands occurs mostly in trade and repair (17%), business services (22%), and HORECA (11%) (Span, Doove, & Smit, 2014).
Research by Xavier et al. (2013) shows that start-ups founded by immigrants are on average more growth-oriented than start-ups founded by non-immigrants. Consequently, the authors posit that immigrant entrepreneurs should be taken seriously as contributors to economic growth and global competitiveness (Fairlie & Lofstrom, 2013; Kloosterman et al., 1999; Xavier et al., 2013). Kloosterman et al. (1999) also state that immigrant entrepreneurs are one of the driving forces for economic growth; national as well as regional. To assess the role of immigrant entrepreneurs, the authors use the concept of mixed embeddedness which involves social, human, and financial capital. This concept entails that immigrant entrepreneurs are embedded in their social networks as well as in the socio-economic and politico-institutional environment of the country of settlement. The authors posit that it is crucial to assess both sides to examine the success of immigrant entrepreneurs.

The socio-economic environment is frequently included in immigrant entrepreneurship research, but not much attention is paid to the role of the location (Rekers & Van Kempen, 2000). Nonetheless, in the 21st century, we are facing the creation of the entrepreneurial society and the rise of the entrepreneurial city (Audretsch, 2009; Jessop, 2000; Stam, 2015). The location contains multiple environmental components that contribute to the entrepreneurial experience of immigrant entrepreneurs, negatively as well as positively. For example, research by Blokland and Savage (2008) shows that starting a business in a familiar environment can boost the entrepreneur’s reputation and feelings of public familiarity. An examination of the role of the location and the municipality, and the presence of businesses, ethnic communities, and trade associations can contribute to the understanding of the immigrant entrepreneurial behaviour. Paying attention to this spatial context is what Rekers and Van Kempen (2000) call the spatial approach. By incorporating this aspect in research, comparable studies can be done between cities, and thus possible explanations can be found for differences between cities in (immigrant) entrepreneurial success (Rekers & Van Kempen, 2000). Rekers and Van Kempen posit that location matters and provide three factors that are important in the spatial approach: Economic development, population changes, and the urban environment.

2.6 Immigrant businesses

As discussed above, immigrant entrepreneurship is an important socio-economic phenomenon (Chrysostome & Lin, 2010; Eraydin et al., 2010; Fairlie & Lofstrom, 2013; Kloosterman et al., 1999; Xavier et al., 2013). Curci and Mackoy (2010) propose an Immigrant Business Enterprise Classification Framework that serves to organise immigrant-owned business into categories associated with different levels of business integration into a host
country’s mainstream business community. The framework derived from interviews with 199 structured interviews with Hispanic business enterprises in Indianapolis, Indiana. As illustrated in the table below (Table 1), there are four types of immigrant-owned businesses. The two categories are the market they serve and the products and/or services they offer; both (primarily) ethnic versus nonethnic. The lowest level of integration is reflected by category 1, the highest level of integration is reflected by category 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic products or services</th>
<th>Ethnic customers</th>
<th>Nonethnic customers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Highly segmented</td>
<td>(e.g. ethnic food market, bakery, retail store)</td>
<td>3) Market-integrated (e.g. ethnic restaurants, consulting, media firms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Product integrated</td>
<td>(e.g. real estate, medical firms, auto repair)</td>
<td>4) Highly integrated (e.g. convenience stores, construction firms, dry cleaners)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Immigrant Business Enterprises Classification Framework (Curci & Mackoy, 2010, p. 109)

Regarding category 1 and 2 in which the entrepreneur depends on co-ethnic customers, Ibrahim and Galt (2003) found that this dependence could restrict businesses in the long term as their potential for sustainable economic growth is limited. Consequently, Curci and Mackoy (2010) posit that future research is necessary “to explore the characteristics and business development challenges of immigrant-owned business across multiple levels of integration” (p. 109). In the present study, all levels of integration are included to examine whether there is a significant relation between the level of integration and the characteristics and (experienced) possibilities for business development (Appendix F).

Due to globalisation and multiculturality in cities, Çelik (2015) introduced cross-cultural entrepreneurship which means that entrepreneurs do not focus solely on their ethnicity regarding customers, employees, suppliers, and products and services. According to Çelik, it is becoming more attractive for entrepreneurs (in general) to generate growth outside their ethnic group. Moreover, he posits that cross-cultural entrepreneurship strengthens the economy as new opportunities arise for collaborations between different ethnicities. This statement is explored in the present study.

2.7 Culture, infrastructure, and media

Mueller and Thomas (2000) state that “since the culture of a country influences the values, attitudes, and beliefs of its people, we can expect variety in the distribution of individuals with
entrepreneurial potential across cultural contexts” (p. 68-69). As there is a strong influence of culture on entrepreneurship (Manimala & Wasdani, 2015), the present study incorporates the cultural environmental components: “It is culture that serves as the conductor, and the entrepreneur as the catalyst” (Berger, 1991, p. 12). Chrysostome and Lin (2010) use the concept of transnational entrepreneurship which increased due to globalisation. This concept applies to immigrant entrepreneurship as most businesses involve two or more environments simultaneously – their home country and their host country – and constantly shift between these environments (Chrysostome & Lin, 2010). Xavier et al. (2013) also found that immigrant entrepreneurs keep social ties with their homeland community. According to Chrysostome and Lin (2010), ties with family in their home countries influence all the stages of the internationalisation process: Aspiration to internationalise, choice of location, entry modes, and market development. Consequently, they pose the following question:

If the active participation and relative success of immigrants can be explained by the strength of their transnational family networks, the question to ask would be which immigrant communities have maintained stronger family relationships. For a non-immigrant entrepreneur without such a family network, the challenge will be how to tap into it instead of devoting energy to develop just any form of social capital when entering an international market. (Chrysostome & Lin, 2010, p. 81)

In the present study, we examine this question by exploring, among others, the cultural characteristics of immigrant entrepreneurship. Here for, both internal characteristics of the individual migrant and the external environment of the host economy is considered (Xavier et al., 2013). The entrepreneurial ecosystem and agent-based modelling are a guideline for the present study. Regarding the internal characteristics, according to Xavier et al. (2013), the cultural background of immigrants can have an impact on their entrepreneurial activities. For example, one’s decision to leave the home country relates to personal characteristics, such as locus of control, self-efficacy, and risk-averseness. Moreover, the cultural heritage has an influence on entrepreneurial attitudes. As a result, these personal characteristics can have a positive effect on the likelihood of engaging in entrepreneurial activities. Regarding the external environment, “immigrants are embedded in the economic, social, institutional and cultural environment of their host economy” (p. 43). This embeddedness could influence their ability to become an entrepreneur as well as the realisation of their intentions. Factors that can limit immigrant entrepreneurs in their new environment are, among others, formal and informal discrimination or stereotyping, lack of information about the labour market, and
language and cultural barriers. According to Xavier et al. (2013), this could lead to difficulties with institutions, banks, stakeholders, customers, and investors.

Woolcock (1998) discusses the relation between economic development and social capital. Woolcock states that in ethnic entrepreneurship literature it can be found that once an immigrant enters a new community, he gets access to financial and personal support to start a small business. As immigrants normally lack physical capital, recognised skills, and human capital (i.e., language skills), the immigrants use their social capital to launch the business. However, if the business is successful, it is hard to make the step outside their own homogenous and ethnic community. This requires a more complex economic exchange: Access to networks extending their ethnic community. Consequently, Woolcock concludes that social capital has benefits as well as costs, and should not be maximised but optimised.

According to Hofstede (1984), culture influences values, attitudes, and beliefs of people in society. He identified five dimensions of culture: 1. Power versus distance; 2. Uncertainty avoidance; 3. Individualism versus collectivism; 4. Masculinity versus femininity; 5. Long-versus short-term orientation. Values are affected by culture, and consequently, the behaviour is a reflection of culture. For people part of the culture, these values and behaviours are difficult to grasp. However, a person (e.g., immigrant entrepreneur) embedded in a new culture (e.g., Rotterdam) will experience these (different) dimensions (Hofstede & McCrae, 2004). Besides individual behaviour, this also applies to institutional behaviour. The subculture of an organisation reflects the national culture, professional subculture, and the organisation’s history. Nevertheless, professional subcultures are to some extent international as they have partly common behaviour (Hofstede, 1980). In the present study, we examine to what extent immigrant entrepreneurs in the Netherlands experience cultural differences in entrepreneurship.
3. Method

As explained in the preface, the present study is a component of a larger collaborative research project supervised by Dr J. P. Spence, consisting of two research focusses. Herein, two master students focussed on the relation between entrepreneurial habits, the media, and cultural capital among immigrants: 1. An exploration of entrepreneurial habits and experiences of immigrant entrepreneurs that could have the potential to strengthen the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam-Zuid (by Anouck Pijpstra). 2. An exploration of social capital and communication among immigrant entrepreneurs in Rotterdam-Zuid (by Dawn O’Connor). The project in its entirety provides a joined understanding of how the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam functions; this includes its challenges, limitations, opportunities, and strengths.

3.1 Grounded Theory

The research method used for the present study, thematic analysis, is based on Grounded Theory (Charmaz, 2006; Strauss & Corbin, 1994, 1998). Charmaz (2006) defines Grounded Theory as follows:

Systematic, yet flexible guidelines for collecting and analyzing qualitative data to construct theories ‘grounded’ in the data themselves. The guidelines offer a set of general principals and heuristic devices rather than formulaic rules. Thus, data form the foundation of our theory and our analysis of these data generates the concepts we construct. (Charmaz, 2006, p. 2)

Grounded Theory is an inductive method since the theory emerges from the data, instead of vice versa (Strauss & Corbin, 1994). Consequently, as a starting point for this research, data is gathered about the environmental components that are essential for the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam (Appendix A): “We construct these data through our observations, interactions, and materials that we gather about the topic or setting” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 3). Strauss and Corbin (1998) describe six characteristics of Grounded Theory: Step back and analyse situations critically, recognise tendency towards bias, think abstractly, be flexible and open, be sensitive to words and actions of respondents, and absorb and be devoted to the work process. After the data about environmental components is collected, the data is qualitatively analysed on patterns and relations to distract a research question. Using this method provides the opportunity to find gaps in the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam. Only by collecting
the data first, a theoretical analysis can start (Charmaz, 2006). The data collection continued once a gap in the data was found, and the research question was formed. This gap primarily emerged from studies on the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam by the Erasmus Centre for Entrepreneurship and NLGroeit. These studies indicated that the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam need to be strengthened. At the same time studies (Jansen, De Vos, & Lescher, 2016; NLGroeit, 2016) indicated that the number of fast-growing companies (e.g. scale-ups) is an important indicator for the adaptive power of regional and national economies. Besides, databases show that immigrants make up a large part of the population of Rotterdam and are very entrepreneurial (CBS, 2016A; Rotterdam Buurtmonitor, 2016). Here for, in the present study, the data collection continued with conducting in-depth interviews with immigrant entrepreneurs within the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam-Zuid. The interviews are held with ten immigrant entrepreneurs, as the Methodological Guidelines Thesis Research envisioned (Janssen & Verboord, 2015-2016). By understanding the agents’ statements and actions, we can make sense of the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam-Zuid (Charmaz, 2006). Also, we can locate habits, challenges, and limitations. By doing Grounded Theory, we can understand what happens in the research setting we join; the current entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam-Zuid (Charmaz, 2006). With the insight gained from immigrant entrepreneurs, the present study has the potential to inform the development of Rotterdam into a commercially successful centre for economic growth.

Important to note is that there is a critique of using Grounded Theory as a research method due to the “careless interview techniques and the introduction of bias” (Allen, 2003, p. 8). Although Glaser and Straus (1967, as cited in Jones & Alony, 2011) “recommended researchers [to] enter the field without preconceived or a priori ideas of the subject area, of what may be discovered, or where it may lead” (p. 102), it is impossible for a researcher to distance themselves of their previous knowledge and experiences. Instead, according to Jones and Alony (2011), researchers should disclose information that may affect their observation, interpretation, and understanding. This can be done by informing the reader where objectivity is at risk, and, by being aware of the bias as a researcher. We can distinguish two types of bias in using the method of Grounded Theory: Hawthorne effect and double hermeneutic. The Hawthorne effect entails “that people have a tendency to do things to please the researcher, and this can result in artificial result” (Jones & Alony, 2011, p. 103). To limit this bias, the respondents received a limited initial explanation of the interview focus before starting the interview (Fielding & Thomas, 2016). In doing so, they were able to answer the interview questions with an open mind and were not restricted to a particular research focus. The double hermeneutic bias “suggests that the subject of the research is influenced by the research and
by the researcher” (Jones & Alony, 2011, p. 103). It is important to note that there always is a subjective role for the researcher as he chooses the specific agents, areas, and environmental components for the study. This bias cannot be completely prevented. Instead, to limit this bias, it should be kept in mind while reading the present study.

3.2 Data collection and sampling

Rusinovic (2006) used multiple fruitful methods to recruit participants (i.e. immigrant entrepreneurs) in the Netherlands (e.g. Rotterdam): Key informants, snowballing, searching on specific locations (meetings, streets), and random selection (telephone book, the Internet, datasets). For the present study, first- and second-generation immigrant entrepreneurs from the Rotterdam-Zuid area are interviewed (N=10) (Appendix F). As in some cases the business owners did not speak Dutch or English or was not available for interviews, the manager was interviewed (N=2). The respondents are found by exploring the research area by bike, searching on Google Maps, searching online for news articles about immigrant entrepreneurs in Rotterdam-Zuid, and snowballing (Appendix C; Rusinovic, 2006). In total 36 business owners are approached personally, through email, by phone, and via Facebook Messenger. Ten business owners were willing to participate. The other business owners did not want to participate because they had no time to do an interview, were suspicious about the purpose of the research, or simply ignored various requests. Especially in the later stage of the research, the technique of snowballing is used to find respondents. This technique entails that “the researcher accesses informants through contact information that is provided by other informants” (Noy, 2008, p. 330). As explained above, the society of Rotterdam can be described and analysed as a complex system or connectionists network. The agents within the network are connected to each other. The technique of snowballing relies on the “dynamic of natural and organic social networks (Noy, 2008, p. 329) and is therefore suitable for the present study.

The sample includes first- and second-generation entrepreneurs. In the sampling, no specific attention is paid towards the ethnicity of the entrepreneurs as the central research topic is the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam-Zuid (i.e. the environment) and the behaviour of immigrant entrepreneurs in general. As Rekers and Van Kempen (2000) posit: “Analysis aimed at describing differences between groups does not shed light on the differences in opportunities and constraints that arise from the spatial context” (p. 56). Therefore, instead, attention is paid towards the distribution of respondents across neighbourhoods with a high density of businesses: Hillesluis (N=4), Bloemhof (N=3), and Zuidplein (N=2), and Afrikaanderwijk (N=1) (Appendix D).
For the analysis of the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam-Zuid, we start with an examination of the agents within that ecosystem. The internal characteristics of the respondents are outlined below (Xavier et al., 2013). Herein, attention is paid towards the personal background, the entrepreneurial background, information about the business, and the motivations for becoming an entrepreneur. An outline of the demographical information can be found in Appendix F. In Chapter 4, the environmental components and the behaviours and attributes of these agents are analysed to find the habits and experiences that define the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam-Zuid.

Yesildal Verzerzekeringen & Financieringen (1) is a consultancy business located at the Dordtselaan, Bloemhof. The business is set up in 1992 by Rashim Yesildal. Yesildal came to the Netherlands at the age of 4. His father was a gastarbeider, and the initial idea was to return to Turkey after a couple of years. However, the longer they stayed in the Netherlands, the harder it was to go back to Turkey. Yesildal has been entrepreneurial since a young age and had several businesses. He also worked as a Turkish translator for the Dutch insurance company where his father was insured. Because Yesildal attracted many Turkish clients, the company was interested in starting a business with him. However, as Yesildal did not like their way of doing business (e.g. being not honest and jealous), he decided to start his own business to which his Turkish clients followed him. This current business, Yesildal Verzekeringen & Financieringen, is an independent financial consultancy for insurance, financing, mortgages, pensions, saving, investing, and SME-advising. Besides this business, Yesildal also invested in a Turkish bakery located at the Dordtselaan.

Surifood (2) is a Surinamese restaurant located in the shopping mall Zuidplein. The business is set up in 2002 by Michael Yong. In 2014, Yong launched a second business in the shopping mall Zuidplein called Mr Suri that offers Surinamese food as well but only for takeaway. Yong is born in Paramaribo, Suriname, and came to the Netherlands at the age of 12 due to the economic-political situation in Suriname. Entrepreneurship is common in the family, and Yong got his experience in this sector from his parents who also owned restaurants in Rotterdam; in Noord as well as in Zuid. Although Yong did not intend to become an entrepreneur because of the unfortunate working hours, when the opportunity came along to start a restaurant in the shopping mall Zuidplein, he took it.

Seema Sharma (3) is a Hindi-Indian beauty salon located at the Dordtselaan, Bloemhof. The business is set up in 1997 by Seema Sharma. Sharma is a graduate beauty specialist from India. She came to the Netherlands approximately 30 years ago as her sister was already there and said that the prospects were much better in the Netherlands than in India. After five years she started – without any entrepreneurial background – a beauty salon specialised in the
Ayurveda treatment method; meaning, on a purely natural basis. The salon targets exclusively the Hindi population. Two years ago her son, Soemit Bihari, joined her in the business and covers the internal treatment and marketing. In June 2017 they are going to open a second beauty salon in The Hague as most of their customers are living there.

Tunkara Designs (4) is an African fashion design studio located at West-Varkenoordseweg, Hillesluis. The business is set up in February 2017 by Mohammed Tunkara. Tunkara is born in Sierra Leone but moved to the Netherlands due to the war. He got his education in fashion design in Rotterdam. Because he could not find a job, he moved to England and the USA. Eventually, in 2016, he returned to the Netherlands to start his own business. The business is in the early stage and developing. Tunkara already found his first customers and collaborates with African fabric shop Classic Diamond (7) and African Restaurant Mama Essi, both located in the Afrikaanderbuurt, Rotterdam-Zuid.

Latina Kapsalon (5) is a Latin hairdresser located at the Groene Hilledijk, Hillesluis. The business is set up by a Venezuelan woman and her daughter but is taken over by a couple from the Dominican Republic in April 2017. The previous owner wanted to start a delicatessen shop in Rotterdam-Noord, and her daughter did not want to do business on her own. Therefore, at the beginning of April 2017, they decided to sell the business to the Dominican couple who were working in the salon for two years. The daughter of the former owner is still working in the basement as a beauty specialist. Since the new owners do not speak Dutch or English, they have an intern-hairdresser from Chili, Teresa Piñada, helping with the communication with, among others, the bank and the municipality. Consequently, the interview is held with her. According to the respondent, it is hard to find a job in the Netherlands without speaking Dutch, but as a hairdresser, this is not a problem. This is the reason why the current owners decided to take over the hair salon.

Rincõn Latino (6) is a Latin bar located at Hillevelt, Hillesluis. The business is owned by Carmen Castillo since 2011. Castillo is born in the Dominican Republic and moved to the Netherlands in 1982. Previously she had a telephone office with a hairdresser in the back in Hillevelt. After nine years, a Surinamese-Hindi bar owner in the same street asked her to come work for him. As she knew many people in the neighbourhood, she attracted new customers to the bar. After ten years, the owner was bankrupt, and she took over the bar. In her opinion, she did not have a choice because she was too old to find another job. In 2011, she started the business with her own savings and got a loan from the landlord to pay the deposit and four-month rent. She turned the bar into a Latin bar as there were no Latin bars in the neighbourhood at the time. At the moment, however, there are more Latin bars, but she distinguishes herself by not specifying on a specific nationality such as Dominicans.
Classic Diamond (7) is an African fabric shop located at the Pretorialaan, Afrikaanderwijk. The business is set up in August 2016 by Lydia Oheneba. Oheneba is born in Ghana and came to the Netherlands at the age of 10. After 15 years she went to England for five years, then back to Ghana for two years, and came back to the Netherlands ten years ago. She received education in the Netherlands (havo and mbo level 4) and worked as an administrator at the municipality and Fortis Bank. Due to an illness, she could not work for a while, and when she returned, there were no job opportunities. When she found out that people living in the Netherlands and in Germany all go to Belgium to get African fabrics, she decided to start a shop in African fabrics in Rotterdam. With the help of UWV (Employment Insurance Agency), the municipality, real estate company VESTIA, and her brother who works at the bank, she wrote a business plan, got a loan, and found a retail space.

Publimedia (8) is a marketing agency located at the Groene Hilledijk, Hillesluis. The business is set up in 2011 by Anil Jagroep. Jagroep is born in Suriname but came to the Netherlands in 1975 at the age of 3.5. He worked for 17 years in consumer electronics, first as an administrator and later in marketing and sales in which he specialised himself. During the economic crisis Jagroep started job-hopping, but soon enough he realised that he wanted to become an entrepreneur. In 2009 he started as an entrepreneur, and although it was tough in the beginning, he found some clients. Nonetheless, he chose for certainty, and one of his clients became his employer after all. In 2011 Jagroep realised that this was not what he wanted and decided to become a full-time entrepreneur in 2012. He bought the advertising concept Publikaartje from a business associate. Recently he sold this concept and started a marketing-advertising consultancy called Publimedia. Besides being an entrepreneur, Jagroep is actively involved in the shopkeepers’ association of the Groene Hilledijk-Beijerlandselaan. In doing so, he joins the meetings with the municipality and other shopkeepers to improve the neighbourhood.

Biedronka (9) is a Polish supermarket located at Zuidplein. The business is set up in March 2016 by a Kurdish man. The manager of the supermarket is taking care of the day-to-day business as the owner is most of the time absent. Consequently, the manager is interviewed for this study. Besides the manager and the owner, all employees are Polish. There are approximately 18 Polish supermarkets owned by Kurdish people and competing in Rotterdam-Zuid within close distance.

Rosa’s Bloemenparadijs (10) is a flower shop located at Dordtselaan, Bloemhof. The business is set up in February 2017 by Sandra. Sandra is born in Suriname in 1966 and came to the Netherlands at the age of 9. She lived in The Hague from 1975 until 1986 after which she moved to Rotterdam with her husband. Sandra completed the mavo and worked as a sales
employee at Kentucky Fried Chicken and as an administrator at the Provinciehuis. At the time, Sandra had no entrepreneurial background but always had an interest in flowers and selling. After some encouragement of her sister, Sandra started selling flowers in front of two other shops at the Dordtselaan; a Tropical supermarket and a Hindi-Surinamese tobacco shop. After two years gaining entrepreneurial experience, Sandra decided to start her own flower shop in February 2017 at the Dordtselaan.

3.3 Interview procedure

In the present study, the method of unstructured or focused interview is used. According to Allen (2003), a “greater reliability can be placed on the data gathered in an interview over that gathered by a list of self-completion questions in a survey” (p. 8). The reason for this is that an interviewer can decide whether the respondent is a suitable candidate and the interviewer can react to what the respondent is saying. In the present study, the “interviewers simply have a list of topics which they want the respondent to talk about, but are free to phrase questions as they wish, ask them in any order that seems sensible at the time, and even join in by discussing what they think of the topic themselves” (Fielding & Thomas, 2016, p. 282). The list of topics is called the interview guide. This type of interview is very useful to discover unexplored things or sensitive and complicated subjects (Fielding & Thomas, 2016), such as the complex connections between agents. Therefore, the interviews in the present study took place on the basis of semi-structured questionnaires and are led by an interview guide (Appendix E). The interviews (N=10) are done individually (N=5) as well as with a Master student from the same project group, Dawn O’Connor (N=5). The interviewers had their own interview guide of which some questions overlapped (i.e. demographics and basic business information), and some questions focused on the individual research topics.

The outline of the interview guide consists of five sections. For each section, some questions, as well as detailed probes, are designed that emerged from the larger topics. These probes serve as checks during the interview (Fielding & Thomas, 2016). The interview guide is connected to the theoretical framework (Appendix E). Special attention is paid towards the start-up phase, the (potential) scale-up phase, the internal characteristics of the respondent, and the external environment in which the respondent is embedded (Chrysostome & Lin, 2010; Curci & Mackoy, 2010; Kloosterman, Van Der Leun, & Rath, 1999; Xavier et al., 2013). According to Suresh and Ramraj (2012) and Xavier et al. (2013), not only the internal characteristics of the respondent facilitate entrepreneurship but – more importantly – the ecosystem or environment in which the entrepreneur is embedded. The aim of the interviews is to understand the unique behaviours, attributes, and environments that define the
entrepreneurial habits, experiences, and challenges of immigrant entrepreneurs in Rotterdam-Zuid. Along the way, the interview guide developed as new topics emerged from the interviews.

The first part of the interview includes demographical information to get to know the respondents. Because the OECD (2001) argues that age, gender, nationality, the level of education, training, experience, language skills are essential factors for the self-employment of immigrants, these topics are included. The second part of the interview is about the entrepreneurial background of the respondent. Herein, the incentives to become an entrepreneur are discussed and (if applicable) the previous business experience (Baycan-Levent & Nijkamp, 2013; Xavier et al., 2013). The third part of the interview is about the respondents’ current business. The internal characteristics of the business and the respondent, as well as the external environment, are discussed (Carlsson & Mudambi, 2003; Gibson & Mahdjoubi, 2014). The interview guide reflects the interactive component of the ecosystem with questions regarding, among others, to what extent the agents collaborate outside and within their community. In doing so, we can explore how the businesses and the communities develop regarding infrastructure and production systems, and to what extent interaction influences the macroeconomic development of the region (Malecki, 1997). Furthermore, in-depth questions are posed about the role of culture in the business (Berger, 1991; Chrysostome & Lin, 2010; Kloosterman et al., 1999; Porter, 1990). The fourth part of the interview is about the process of starting the business including the challenges, responsibilities, received support, location, and region (Fillis & Rentschler, 2010; Kloosterman et al., 1999; Malecki, 1997; Prevezer, 2001). The fifth and final part of the interview is dedicated to future plans, and (potential) growth opportunities, challenges, and limitations (Xavier et al., 2013).

Interviewing is a relevant method to explore the research subjects’ experience, opinions, and activities. However, it can be difficult to get to the core (Hermanowicz, 2002). Therefore, Fielding and Thomas (2016) give two principles that inform research interviews: 1. Questioning should be as open-ended as possible; 2. Questioning techniques should encourage respondents to communicate underlying attitudes, beliefs, and values. Those questioning techniques entail, among others, projecting questioning, indirect questioning, or personalization of objects. However, probing and prompting also help to guide the conversation. For example, follow-up questioning (verbal and non-verbal) can be used to get a fuller response and to make comparisons between the different respondents. The interviewer could comment that they have heard others (anonymously) express a particular view, and ask what the respondent thinks about that (Fielding & Thomas, 2016). In doing so, also links between businesses are established. Hermanowicz (2002) proposes 25 strategies for a
successful interview; among others, converse, listen, explore meaning, probe, dare to be quiet, persist, word questions clearly, structure the questions, practice, respect, start strong, and end positively. The probes used, however, should be as neutral as possible, to create a calm environment (Fielding & Thomas, 2016). These strategies are kept in mind while preparing and conducting interviews.

The interviews are conducted face-to-face in the participants working environment (N=9) and via Skype (N=1), and took approximately 45-60 minutes with outliers to 90 minutes, as the Methodological Guidelines Thesis Research envisioned (Janssen & Verboord, 2015-2016). The interviews are conducted in Dutch (N=7) and English (N=3), depending on the preference and fluency of the respondent. With the approval of the participants, the interviews are recorded to transcribe them verbatim afterwards. Fielding and Thomas (2016) advise being careful with the initial explanation of the interview focus because this could limit the research outcome. The respondent might get too focused and will tell the interviewer what he or she thinks the interviewer wants to hear.

3.4 Data analysis

After the interviews are conducted, they are transcribed verbatim: “Verbatim interviews will help guide your analysis and probably reveal themes you had not thought of” (Fielding & Thomas, 2016, p. 291). Listening to the interview and transcribing it, is done directly after conducting the interviews. In doing so, notes about the interview, the setting, and the respondent can be added (Fielding & Thomas, 2016).

Qualitative analysis requires a systematic approach to the data in order to identify themes, and concepts (Fielding & Thomas, 2016). Therefore, the data is thematically analysed (Boeije, 2009) with the software programme Atlas.ti as well as manually. The coding process started with open coding, then axial coding, and lastly selective coding (Boeije, 2009). First, the software Atlas.ti is used for the open coding phase; i.e. to create an overview of the dataset. Initial codes are linked to the dataset, resulting in over 40 codes. After that, the codes are combined and grouped resulting in eight code sets. Subsequently, the dataset is analysed manually as this appeared to be easier for interpretations, making connections, and reduce codes. In doing so, the signalled themes were reduced to six themes, as the process proceeded. More specifically, the themes and the patterns found in one interview were compared and contrasted with other themes and patterns within and between interviews and examined on theoretically similar segments. The themes are classified into the components of the entrepreneurial ecosystem: 1. Environment; and, 2. Behaviours and attributes. During the coding process, memos are kept to be able to justify the research decisions in the analysis. The
final themes and concepts reflect the central message and core of the dataset and help to answer the research and sub-questions (Boeije, 2009).
4. Results

Rotterdam-Zuid is well-known as an entrepreneurial city as well as a multicultural city. In the following analysis, attention is paid towards the combination of the two and explores the immigrant entrepreneurial ecosystem in Rotterdam-Zuid. In the method section, the agents of the ecosystem are discussed. In this chapter, the environmental variables and the behavior and the attributes of the agents are analysed. By first understanding the environment of Rotterdam-Zuid, we can seek to build a list of unique behaviours or attributes that define the entrepreneurial experience and habits of immigrant entrepreneurs in Rotterdam-Zuid. This analysis provides a theoretical thematic analysis of in-depth interviews with entrepreneurs from Rotterdam-Zuid with an immigrant background. A total of ten interviews is conducted in April and May 2017 and included in this analysis.

4.1 Environmental components (external characteristics)

The ten respondents are distributed among areas with a high density of businesses (Appendix D): Zuidplein, Hillesluis, Bloemhof, Afrikaanderbuurt. In the interviews, the respondents are asked why they chose Rotterdam-Zuid and more specifically their neighbourhood to start their business. Furthermore, they are asked about their experience as an entrepreneur within this area (positive and negative), their vision for the future of this area, and the experienced and expected role of the municipality and other support organisations.

4.1.1 Reasons to choose the location

The interviewed immigrant entrepreneurs have provided multiple reasons to start a business in Rotterdam-Zuid. Three reasons – population, price, and familiarity – stood out in the interviews and are analysed below.

The population is the most-mentioned feature of the location that plays a significant role in the decision to start a business in Rotterdam-Zuid. Rekers and Van Kempen (2000) also see population changes as one of the “important factors that appear to have a potential effect on the start of (ethnic) enterprises” (p. 58). According to the authors, in cities with heterogeneous populations opportunities arise for business to offer specific demands; consequently, “small entrepreneurs, including ethnic entrepreneurs, have been able and willing to fill the niche” (p. 64). In Rotterdam-Zuid, the population has a comparable influence on immigrant entrepreneurship. All of the respondents experience their areas as very multicultural, and seven of them also provide this as a reason for starting a business in Rotterdam-Zuid. The respondents have different perceptions of how the multicultural population is beneficial to
them. Four of the interviewees chose the area because there are many people of their nationality, and three interviewees see the multicultural character of the area as beneficial for their business. For example, the owner of Classic Diamond chose the Afrikaanderbuurt specifically due to the high rate of Africans which is the target customer group: “Rotterdam-South is a lot of Africans, allochtoon [foreigners]. … So I think here I can find my customers”. The owner found the place via a housing cooperation that agreed on her vision: “They [Vestia] were also thinking about it, Afrikaanderwijk, why not African fabric?”. For Seema Sharma, the presence of people with their ethnicity, the Hindi population, plays a significant role as well. Moreover, it appeared that the Hindi population was very happy that someone of their cultural background was able to offer such a service. Sharma found an opportunity and demand and filled the niche in the market of Rotterdam-Zuid (Rekers & Van Kempen, 2000). Remarkably, Sharma noted that there are ethnicities clustering in the Dordtselaan. In 1997, Sharma started her business at 89A in the Dordtselaan where many African businesses were located. The African people hang outside her salon which held back the Hindi population to come in. Sharma decided to move to 202A in the Dordtselaan because there are mostly Hindi shops. Furthermore, the Polish supermarket Biedronka is located in Zuidplein because that is where their target customer group, the Polish population, is living. Ethnic clustering is taking place here too as eighteen Polish supermarkets are located in close distance to each other. The respondent noted that there are no Polish supermarkets in Rotterdam-Noord simply because the Polish population is not living there. Lastly, Kapsalon Latina located in the Groene Hilledijk perceives her area as a unique multicultural street including their target customer group, the South-American population. The manager of the business finds the city centre too expensive, and in her experience one has to speak proper Dutch. At the Groene Hilledijk, an entrepreneur does not have to speak or understand Dutch to be successful with the business. The fact that these four entrepreneurs chose for Rotterdam-Zuid because of the presence of their ethnic population is related to an economic development called agglomeration effects: “Spatial clusters of ethnic entrepreneurs can create multiplier effects: Ethnic enterprises within a neighbourhood or larger area can attract customers from other areas, but also other enterprises in their immediate surroundings” (Rekers & Van Kempen, 2000, p. 62). Malecki’s (1997) theory also applies to the described phenomenon in Rotterdam-Zuid as there is a cyclical process in which actors within an area are leading to more (successful) start-ups. Consequently, the behavior of immigrant entrepreneurs in the ecosystem can influence the overall macroeconomic development of Rotterdam-Zuid.

On the contrary, Yesildal Verzekeringen & Financieringen, Surifood, and Rincón Latino do not pay as much attention to one nationality. Instead, they see the multicultural character
of the area as beneficial for their business. As Yesildal puts it: “[My customers] is a mix, because we are living in Rotterdam-Zuid, there are a lot of foreign people … Multicultural, 180 cultures”. Rincón Latino chose Hillevliet because of the large multicultural population, she does not want to be surrounded by only one culture but prefers a mix as it enriches her business; she loves to meet and talk with people from all nationalities. Lastly, as Surifood is located in the central shopping mall Zuidplein where ethnic and nonethnic businesses are located, his customers are automatically a mix of cultures as well. Çelik (2015) calls this cross-cultural entrepreneurship as the entrepreneurs do not focus solely on their ethnicity regarding customers, employees, suppliers, and products and services. Çelik posits that cross-cultural entrepreneurship strengthens the economy as the community networks expand, and, thus, has a positive effect on the entrepreneurial ecosystem of an area. Whether this is the case in the present study, is discussed more in-depth in paragraph 4.2.2. Nonetheless, the agglomeration effect and cyclical process also applies to these businesses as they are attracted to the area due to the presence of the multicultural population (Malecki, 1997; Rekers & Van Kempen, 2000).

A second common reason for starting a business in Rotterdam-Zuid – mentioned by five respondents – is the low renting price for retail spaces. Especially in comparison with the city centre and Rotterdam-Noord, where the rent for retail spaces is extremely high, according to the respondents. In Rotterdam-Zuid only the respondent located in the shopping mall Zuidplein mentioned having high renting prices. Research (Baycan-Levent & Nijkamp, 2009; Kloosterman et al., 1999) already showed that immigrant entrepreneurs seek low barriers to entry due to the lack of financial and human capital. Although this research focuses particularly on their choice of market and products, it could also apply to the area in which they are starting their business. In the present study, it is notable that respondents intentionally chose for Rotterdam-Zuid due to low renting costs (i.e. a low entry barrier).

The third reason for why the respondents chose Rotterdam-Zuid to start their business, is familiarity. Familiarity means that the respondents lived or worked in the area for a longer period of time before starting a business there. Previous research (Prevezer, 2001) has already shown that actors rely on the local networks of key actors. In the present study, this means that the entrepreneurs depend on the presence of their previously established social contacts. For example, Seema Sharma chose the retail space at the Dordtselaan because she was living nearby for a couple of years already, and, thus, she knew the businesses and people living in the neighbourhood. Notable is that the majority of the target customer group of Seema Sharma lives in The Hague, causing that most of the customers commute between the two cities. To solve this problem, Seema Sharma is going to open a second salon in The Hague in June 2017. As they are going there because of the ethnic population, this is also an example of
agglomeration effects (Rekers & Van Kempen, 2000). Furthermore, familiarity is a reason that applies to the owner of Surifood, Michael Yong. Yong found his place in the shopping mall Zuidplein because his father frequently walked through the mall after work and visited an Indonesian restaurant. One day the owner asked him if he knew someone to take over his business. As Yong wanted to do something else at the time, he took this opportunity. The big advantage for him were the opening hours (meaning, closed after 6 pm) and the possibility of having a social life. In other words, his own and his family’s familiarity with the environment contributed to the launch of his business in this area. Lastly, Sandra of Rosa’s Bloemenparadijs chose the location due to familiarity. She had lived in the street since she came to Rotterdam in 1986 and worked at other businesses in the same street. During her time working in front of other businesses in the street, Sandra noticed a vacant shop and hoped to start a business there in the future once she had enough entrepreneurial experience. This happened in February 2017. In sum, all three of the respondents lived or worked close to their business location which helped them to launch a business there. The other entrepreneurs did not explicitly express this kind of familiarity as a factor that played a role in their decision to launch a business in Rotterdam-Zuid. However, the majority have been living or working in the Rotterdam-Zuid region for a longer period of time before starting the business.

In the present study, the variation between Rotterdam-Noord and Rotterdam-Zuid regarding the presence of ethnic clusters, the multicultural population, the experienced language barrier, and the price differences have appeared to be important factors in why immigrant entrepreneurs are more likely to start a business in Rotterdam-Zuid. This is in line with previous research (Mason et al., 2015) that shows that the experienced discrimination and social distance makes it difficult or less attractive for immigrant entrepreneurs to start their business in neighbourhoods with mainly local (i.e. Dutch) inhabitants, for example, Rotterdam-Noord. Moreover, Blokland and Savage (2008) show that starting a business in a familiar environment can boost the entrepreneur’s reputation and feelings of public familiarity.

4.1.2 The perceived and actual role of the municipality and support organisations

All of the respondents assign a role to the municipality when discussing their entrepreneurial experience in Rotterdam-Zuid. Rekers and Van Kempen (2000) describe local policy as an important factor for ethnic entrepreneurship. Local policy decisions define the conditions under which ethnic entrepreneurs start their business, undertake business, and develop their business. The authors make a distinction between passive and active local control. In the interviews for the present study, a passive role of the municipality emerged, as
immigrant entrepreneurs consider their role more as hardly supportive and lacking than leading. The role of the municipality is assessed in three domains which are analysed below: Maintenance of areas, entrepreneurial support, and general communication.

The first domain is the maintenance of the areas. Although all of the respondents are pleased with the location where their business is located and have no desire to move, a majority posits that there is room for improvement. More specifically, three areas of improvement regarding maintenance emerged from the interviews: Attractiveness, safety, and cleanliness. The respondents refer to each other’s neighbourhoods when they describe the ideal situation. In other words, the respondents’ perception of the current maintenance of the areas and how it should be, depends on in which neighbourhood they are located. Therefore, each area will be discussed separately. Herein, their opportunities for feedback are also included.

First, the Afrikaanderbuurt. The owner of Classic Diamond posits that the municipality should make the Afrikaanderbuurt more attractive by, for instance, hanging street decorations during Christmas-time and organising events. The owner makes a comparison with the Beijerlandse laan and the city centre where this is in her experience common. The owner has the possibility to share this feedback four times a year in the meetings with the shopkeepers’ association Winkeldriehoek Afrikaanderwijk. The projects and events organised by the shopkeepers’ association are occasionally sponsored by the municipality. Although the respondent started her business in August 2016, she has attended one meeting to share her feedback: “We went to the meeting, I said there is a lot that they can improve it, a lot”. However, on the question, whether the respondent feels that the municipality is listening to her feedback she says that nothing changed: “Well, the first time I went I can’t tell much about it because I didn’t see any changes. So, I don’t know what, they are going to something here, thinking about doing something, that one I can tell”.

Secondly, the Hillevliet. The owner of Classic Diamond refers to the Beijerlandse laan- Groene Hilledijk (Hillevliet) when asked how the ideal situation would be. Aforementioned is notable because the entrepreneurs in Hillevliet feel that the municipality is not giving priority to their area either and posit that the municipality should make it more attractive as well. Furthermore, in the experience of Kapsalon Latina and Publimedia, the Groene Hilledijk needs improvement regarding safety, wholeness, and cleanliness. According to Kapsalon Latina, there is not enough police in the street, and the fee for waste is too high. Although they pay a fee of €800, - per month for picking up the trash, the street is not clean. When discussing how and by whom this problem should be solved, the respondent refers to the municipality as they are currently not doing enough. The owner of Publimedia agrees that there should be paid more attention to safety, wholeness, and cleanliness in the street, but he assigns a more
important role to the shopkeepers’ association. Noteworthy, Kapsalon Latina had no knowledge about this association. The owner of Publimedia, Jagroep, posits that the municipality does not have to take care of it on their own, but they should take the lead and guide the entrepreneurs to contribute to the improvement of the street. The shopkeepers’ association of Beijerlandsebaan-Groene Hilledijk functions as a connector between the municipality, entrepreneurs, and other parties, and serves the interests of the local entrepreneurs. In association with the municipality, the shopkeepers’ association organises events and promotions, contributes to the cleanliness, wholeness, and safety, decreases vacancy, and balances sectors. There are meetings in which one representative of the municipality is present. In Jagroep’s experience, the municipality does listen to their feedback, but sometimes it feels like they are acting slow or unfair. He admits that the municipality has more areas to take care of, but he has the impression that the Beijerlandsebaan-Groene Hilledijk is not a priority of the municipality regarding financing, public tender, and outsourcing, and is considered as a source of regular problems. For example, according to Jagroep, the Groene Hilledijk is not really represented in Nationaal Programma Zuid, a project to improve the Rotterdam-Zuid region. At the moment, the municipality is helping with promotional activities by giving access to financing and human resources, but Publimedia and Kapsalon Latina would like to see that the municipality prioritises cleanliness, wholeness, and safety. In doing so, Hillevliet should become more attractive for entrepreneurs and people who want to live and/or shop there. At the moment, no changes occurred and only the renovation of the median strip is on the agenda to be implemented. Lastly, the owner of Rincõn Latino is working as an entrepreneur in Hillevliet since the 90s and experienced the changes the area went through in the last couple of years. Especially since 2012, she has seen the municipality improve the neighbourhood significantly regarding safety, infrastructure, and housing. In her opinion, the municipality can keep improving, but they already did a good job. In her area, there is to her knowledge, no shopkeepers’ association.

Third, at the Dordtselaan, Bloemhof, three businesses are interviewed: Seema Sharma, Yesildal Verzekeringen & Financieringen, and Rosa’s Bloemenparadijs. Seema Sharma and Yesildal Verzekeringen & Financieringen started their business on this street in the 90s while Rosa’s Bloemenparadijs started working here approximately three years ago. To start with, Yesildal has no specific suggestions for the improvement of Dordtselaan nor for the role of the municipality, just as Rincõn Latino. In this regard, the perception of entrepreneurs on the experienced and expected role of the municipality and the maintenance of the area seems to differ among entrepreneurs and the period of time they have been working in an area. However, to draw this conclusion, a bigger sample is needed. Seema Sharma and Rosa’s
Bloemenparadijs, however, share a different opinion than Yesildal about the Dordtselaan. Bihari, the respondent of Seema Sharma, does not fully understand the municipality’s vision for the Dordtselaan as the street is a random mix of shops and houses. He thinks that the municipality should use another system in which shops are downstairs and housing is upstairs, such as in the Paul Krugerlaan in The Hague. Bihari believes that this would improve the experience of the shopping lane and attract all kinds of people from Rotterdam and maybe even other cities. Rosa’s Bloemenparadijs agrees on this vision of Bihari, but she also admits that the municipality cannot force people to leave their houses. Bihari assigns a role to the municipality to be clear in what area is for shopping and what area is for housing. Furthermore, Bihari feels that Dordtselaan is not paid much attention to by the municipality. It is notable that he, just as Classic Diamond, refers to the city centre and the Beijerlandsestraat as areas that are more prioritised; although the respondents at Beijerlandsestraat also had the feeling of not being a priority of the municipality. Bihari has not given the opportunity to share his feedback with the municipality as there is no shopkeepers’ association for his street. However, in 2016, he was in contact with the municipality because the municipality wanted the entrepreneurs to standardise their lightboxes outside. As the entrepreneurs did not agree on this, a meeting was organised by the municipality to discuss the issue. With great disappointment, the entrepreneurs were not able to give feedback but instead told that they had to pay a fee if they did not change it. According to Bihari, there is no dialogue between the municipality and the local entrepreneurs.

Lastly, Zuidplein. The municipality is currently working on the development project Hart van Zuid to renovate Zuidplein and the neighbouring areas. The renovation includes the shopping mall as well as, among others, Ahoy, cinema, metro station, musea, and living areas (Hart van Zuid, n.d.). The respondents located in Zuidplein have no feedback for the maintenance of the area or the role of the municipality. At the same time, when asked about their opinion on Hart van Zuid, they do not have much knowledge about this project. For example, the owner of Surifood does not expect any harm or real benefits from the renovation and thinks that the changes will mostly occur outside the mall near Ahoy. However, they are also going to renovate the shopping mall itself. The manager of Biedronka has no knowledge about Hart van Zuid either; he only heard the name once via a friend. The respondents at the Dordtselaan also have no knowledge about this project although they are relatively close. In sum, it appears that the communication between the municipality, project developers, and entrepreneurs is lacking. However, the question whether this is due to the entrepreneurs, the municipality, project developers, or all of them, can only be answered by letting the other side (the municipality and the project developers) heard.
The second domain that emerged from the interviews regarding the role of the municipality and other organisations is the entrepreneurial support. When the respondents are asked about the entrepreneurial support from the municipality, none of the respondents can confirm that they have received this. If they need information, they search for this themselves via Google or go to other non-governmental organisations. Six out of ten respondents expected more support in the form of advice-giving and financing, and three respondents explicitly acknowledged that the municipality is doing their best. For example, the owner of Classic Diamond says: “I know that the gemeente [municipality] is trying, trying their best. Make it here like a busy place but apart from that I don’t know all the details, so I can’t tell much. … You know, more support will be better. … Advice and see if they can help or something. I don’t know, with everything, with ideas.” The owner of Rosa’s Bloemenparadijs was looking for entrepreneurial support since she did not have any entrepreneurial experience. Luckily, after she registered at the Chamber of Commerce, she received an email with an invitation for a course for starting entrepreneurs. However, the course did not meet Sandra’s expectations. She was told that a starting entrepreneur could ask a loan of family and friends to start a business. What she expected was a helping hand with credit because she was told that it would cost 30,000/40,000 euros, moreover, the municipality was planning to improve the Dordtselaan. To get a loan, she needed a business plan, but Sandra did not write this because the information she needed was too difficult to acquire and there were too many requirements in her opinion. Therefore, she decided to leave it and do it on her own. It is noteworthy that the other respondents did not mention this course. Furthermore, Sandra did receive some indirect support via the municipality by watching a short documentary for starting entrepreneurs on Rotterdam.nl, this was helpful to her. Sandra is not the only respondent that expected financial support from the municipality, Tunkara Designs and Rincón Latino shared the same expectation. Tunkara Designs, for example, posits: “Yes one of the only thing I would say to them [municipality] is like, yes the only thing for me to get loan you know. Yes, to get loan and to get contact to people … and invest it on materials and machines”. These respondents also approached the bank but could not get a loan since they need financial certainty (income). Due to the lack of support, Tunkara Designs finds it tough to start a business in the fashion industry in the Netherlands: “I think it’s a bit tough because the support is tough. I have no one to support me”. In contrast, the owner of Classic Diamond got support from an unexpected source. Because she has been ill and had to re-enter the labour market, she got in contact with UWV. After writing a business plan with the help of her brother who works at the bank, UWV gave her a loan to start her business. Besides, if she has any questions she can contact them directly: “They really helped me with everything … If I have questions,
I don’t have answer on it, I tell them fast, and then they reply me”. In sum, the majority of the respondents found it hard to get access to financial and personal support from the municipality and non-governmental organisations, and therefore, instead, used their social network. In addition to what Woolcock stated (1998), attempts to extend the social network does not only apply to the growing stages but also to the start-up phase. Moreover, in the present study, the entrepreneurs did not only fail to receive this support due to a lack of skills but also due to a lack of available resources.

Lastly, when discussing the experienced and expected role of the municipality, communication is a reiterating issue. Only four out of ten respondents have a shopkeepers’ association to their disposal, and one of them is not even aware of the existence. For example, at the Beijerlandseelaan-Groene Hilledijk, this contrast is clearly visible. The owner of Publimedia is a member of the shopkeepers’ association but the manager of Kapsalon Latina, located in the same street, has no knowledge about the role of the association although she has a reasonable amount of feedback. In her opinion, the municipality is inaccessible and does not provide enough information. Moreover, she posits that the information is only provided in English, Dutch, Arabic, and Turkish; not in Spanish. The manager states that it would be better if there is more support in the form of a translator or someone who can tell them about the rules (especially for entrepreneurs who do not speak Dutch). Xavier et al. (2013) and Woolcock (1998) stated already that the personal characteristics (e.g. not speaking the host country’s language) can have an effect on the entrepreneurial activities. For example, when “embedded in the economic, social, institutional and cultural environment of their host economy” (Xavier et al., 2013, p. 43), immigrant entrepreneurs can face difficulties with institutions, banks, stakeholders, customers, and investors. According to Publimedia, however, the shopkeepers’ association is offering these services, and, moreover, actively communicating with entrepreneurs in the street through newsletters, email, websites, and web portals. Publimedia posits that entrepreneurs who want to be informed can find information through multiple channels. However, in his experience not enough entrepreneurs are actively involved because they are too busy with their own business and do not have an eye for the outside world. In sum, although the infrastructure to communicate between the three parties (entrepreneurs, shopkeepers’ associations, and municipality) appears to be present, it is not used effectively; resulting in miscommunication. The lack of communication between the municipality and the entrepreneurs, from the perspective of the entrepreneurs, can also be seen in the entrepreneurs’ knowledge about the development projects for Rotterdam-Zuid, such as Nationaal Programma Zuid and Hart van Zuid. None of the respondents had a clear idea about what these projects entail or did not even heard about it.
4.2 Behaviours and attributes (internal characteristics)

By using the mixed embeddedness approach (Kloosterman et al., 1999) and the entrepreneurial ecosystem method (Siegfried, 2014), we can examine not only the environment of the actors but also the individual characteristics of the agents (e.g. behaviours and attributes), and their embeddedness in social networks and the socio-economic environment (Xavier et al., 2013). In the interviews, the respondents are asked about their previous business experience, the start-up phase, the (potential) scale-up phase, their future plans and growth opportunities, the role of culture, and their interaction with other businesses, customers, suppliers, and employees (i.e. networks and communities). By comparing the data of the interviews, we have found a list of unique behaviours and attributes that define immigrant entrepreneurship in Rotterdam-Zuid. We can distinguish the following four themes: Self-representation, (cross-) cultural entrepreneurship, networks and communities, and cultural differences. These themes are separately analysed below in relation to the theoretical framework.

4.2.1 Self-representation

Hofstede (1984) states that culture influences the values, attitudes, and beliefs of people in society. In other words, national culture can shape individual ethnic behaviour. Research by Van Der Leun and Rusinovic (2001) shows that “individual [immigrant] entrepreneurs are being driven by individualistic considerations. They definitely want to be their own boss. Tellingly, some of them had proper jobs but decided to switch to self-employment when the time seemed right” (as cited in Kloosterman, 2003, p. 172). For people embedded in a culture, the values and behaviours of that culture are difficult to grasp. However, if an outsider identifies the behaviour or attributes, it can be considered as a reflection of the culture (Hofstede & McCrae, 2004). This does not only apply to individual behaviour but also to institutional behaviour as the subculture of an organisation reflects the national culture, professional subculture, and the organisations own history (Hofstede, 1980).

In the interviews, a pattern emerged in which one person is a representative of the business. Seven out of ten respondents show this behaviour. The benefit of having one person representing the business to the outside world is that it generates trust in the relationships with customers and business associates. However, in two cases it also appeared to be a restriction to business development. This is discussed in-depth below.

In the beginning, Seema Sharma focused her advertisements on the beauty salon in general. In the last couple of years, the focus shifted to Seema Sharma as a person. The owner’s son posits that if you make one person in the business well-known to the outside
world, people will remember the business better and have more trust. Consequently, in the advertisements of their products and services in flyers, on television, and in newspapers there is always a picture of Seema Sharma herself. The respondent posits that in the Indian culture it looks good if you can start and build a business all by yourself and you are the big person. Having one person representing the business is giving the beauty salon more trust among the customer group, and the customers are always asking for her. From a survey done by beauty salon Seema Sharma among the customers, it turned out that the customers attach much value to Seema Sharma as their specialist; they give a 10 on a scale of 1 to 10. Nonetheless, there also appeared to be a downside. The beauty salon has currently only two employees, Seema Sharma and her son Soemit Bihari. Bihari says that if they hired additional employees the customers would still ask for Seema Sharma to advise them, speak to them, and treat them. Consequently, this limits them to grow the business. Instead of hiring more people or franchising, they are going to open a second branch in The Hague in June 2017. They will be open three days a week in The Hague and three days a week in Rotterdam. Although this is not very efficient, in doing so, they are able to expand their business. From the interview with Yesildal, the same theme and issue emerged. Yesildal started his business in 1992 and had 13 employees at the time. He was the representative of the business and attracted many customers and businesses. Similar to Seema Sharma, the customers wanted to be helped by Yesildal only. As Yesildal still wanted to have a bigger office, he let the customers believe that his employees were doing all the work: “What I did was … in the background I do the things. But in the past people came to the office and say to my employee at that moment 'he very good Imam, you done it, I couldn't do what you did, wow!'. And in the background I did it. But the people they must come to him they must asked to him. And that worked perfectly”. Yesildal as a trustworthy representative of the business also contributed to the relationships with insurance companies and banks as they forwarded new customers to him: “Also the insurance companies trusted me, I am really thankful for that. ... I could do more than other company, other agency. Like couple of banks, one bank ING, they have given me writing like we can do people who are have in the past troubles with paying but we believe him that it is solved you can lend the money again. … That was a huge possibility and I got clients from all around Holland”. In contrast with Seema Sharma, for Yesildal it was personally not important to be in the spotlight: “My key thing was, one of my big success was, from the beginning my way of thinking was, it’s not that I am important, it is important that what my company is doing”. Herein we can find a possible cultural difference between the Indian and Turkish culture. However, in the end, it turned out to be a growth limitation for Yesildal as well because he could not keep doing all the difficult things: “The point is, it was of course difficult because I can’t do anything
[everything]”. In its place, at the moment there are only three employees left and Yesildal started focussing on another way of doing business; not growing with more employees but by doing investments such as in a Turkish bakery at the Dordtselaan.

Rincõn Latino, Publimedia, and Biedronka do not have one person explicitly representing the business and doing all the work but the self-representation theme still applies to them because they use this instead of marketing and promotion activities. For example, Castillo’s (Rincõn Latino) current and previous business success is because she personally attracts customers. Castillo was asked by a Hindi-Surinamese bar owner to come work for him because she knew a lot of people in the neighbourhood. In turn, she became a representative of the bar, attracted more people, and made the bar a success again. In her current business, she also uses this method to attract new customers. The owner of Publimedia shares the same experience. In his perspective people buy from people, not from products or businesses. In doing so, he posits that it is important that customers are happy with him. The same counts for Biedronka, they do not need advertising. Instead, according to the manager, customers come to the supermarket because he is so friendly. In sum, these businesses do not need advertising, instead, they acquire new customers via (previous) satisfied customers (i.e. refills, word-of-mouth).

Since Rosa’s Bloemenparadis and Tunkara Designs started only in 2017, it is not clear yet to what extent this theme applies to their businesses. Nonetheless, Tunkara is acting as a representative of the business by wearing his products on the street as a form of promotion. And, the owner of Rosa’s Bloemenparadis says that after a busy start with Valentine’s day, Easter, and Mother’s day, she hopes to have some time to do what she really wants and that is being a representative of the shop; what this entails exactly, remains to be seen.

4.2.2. (Cross-)cultural entrepreneurship

As discussed in paragraph 2.6, Curci and Mackoy (2010) designed the Immigrant Business Enterprise Classification Framework to organise immigrant-owned business into categories associated with different levels of business integration into a host country’s mainstream business community (Table 1). This framework shows to what extent the businesses act within and outside their ethnic network. The respondents of the present study can be distributed into this framework (Appendix F). However, instead of only focussing on (non)ethnic customers and products and services, in this classification, the (non)ethnic background of employees and suppliers are also taking into account in order to grasp the entire entrepreneurial behaviour of the agents. In the present study, it appeared that there are differences among the agents to what extent they remain inside their ethnic network and/or
step into the socio-economic environment of Rotterdam-Zuid. In the analysis below, it is examined to what extent cross-cultural entrepreneurship applies to the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam-Zuid and how this could influence their opportunities for growth and development (Çelik, 2015; Curci & Mackoy, 2010; Ibrahim & Galt, 2003). Each level of integration is discussed separately.

**Level 1: Highly segmented (N=4).** Seema Sharma, Tunkara Designs, Rincōn Latino, and Biedronka are highly segmented as they target primarily the ethnic community (Hindi, African, South-American, Polish), offer ethnic products (Ayurveda, African design, South-American music, Polish products), and have ethnic employees. Moreover, for three of them, the suppliers also have the same ethnic background. In the interviews, it appeared that the ethnic communities of these businesses were very happy that someone (of their ethnic background) was able to offer an ethnic service or product, and, consequently, they attract ethnic customers from outside Rotterdam-Zuid or even The Netherlands. Seema Sharma has Hindi customers from the Benelux and England, Biedronka has Polish customers from Alexander Polder, and Rincōn Latino has South-American customers and business relations with Latin business from other cities in the Netherlands. The advertising of Seema Sharma is also focused primarily on their ethnic community. Via Hindi radio and television stations that broadcast in the Benelux and England, Seema Sharma targets only the Hindi population. Also, they promote themselves on cultural events such as the Milan Summer Festival in The Hague – the biggest outdoor Hindi festival of Europe – to reach as much as Hindi’s as possible. Besides the beauty service, Seema Sharma is offering their own Ayurvedic beauty products fabricated and supplied by a friend in India. They distribute this project themselves to Hindi supermarkets across the Netherlands. Biedronka also targets only their ethnic community and has products coming from Polish wholesale. Noteworthy is that the owners of all Polish supermarkets in Rotterdam, Schiedam, and The Hague are Kurdish. These Kurds do not have links with the Kurdish community and remain solely within the Polish community. Furthermore, Tunkara Designs is highly segmented as it is currently targeting the African population with African clothes made of African fabrics delivered by an African business. Moreover, he is working with African businesses in Afrikaanderwijk – African restaurant Mama Essi and African fabric shop Classic Diamond – by making the interior design and fashion for their customers. In the future, Tunkara Designs intends to reach a cross-cultural public, and, thus, shift to level 3. The owner says: “Some people from Suriname, and Antillean people because some like this. Yes, because some Dutch people they like that”, besides, he wants interns from different countries, such as the Netherlands, Afghanistan, and Poland. Lastly, Rincōn Latino organises theme parties for which she invites South-American students.
and businesses to give, among others, massages and workshops. These people she acquires via her ethnic network. However, the suppliers of Rincón Latino are cross-cultural as they are other ethnic shops in the neighbourhood (liquor store Mozaiek, Indian toko, or Surinamese restaurant) and Dutch wholesale (e.g. Heineken, Makro, Sligro).

Ibrahim and Galt (2003) found that dependence on the own ethnic network could restrict businesses in the long term as their potential for sustainable economic growth is limited. Curci and Mackoy (2010) posit that “the growth of immigrant-owned businesses in the highly segmented category is mostly related to the size of the immigrant community and the level of recent migration into a given area” (p. 110). This restriction is discernible in Rotterdam-Zuid.

The Polish community is only living in Rotterdam-Zuid, therefore, all Polish supermarkets are restricted to grow within his area and have to compete with the 18 other immigrant-owned businesses within this ethnic enclave (Curci & Mackoy, 2010). Seema Sharma is restricted as well to grow within the region in which their ethnic community is present; once the market is satisfied (e.g. Rotterdam-Zuid) they have to find other regions to target a larger part of the Hindi population (e.g. The Hague). Nonetheless, the owners of Seema Sharma, Biedronka, and Rincón Latino have no desire to step outside their ethnic community to expand their business, and continue performing ethnic entrepreneurship. Tunkara Designs, on the other hand, is in the early phase of development. His primary customers are African, but he intends to reach non-African customers as well in the long term, which will mean that he is leaning towards cross-cultural entrepreneurship, and will have more possibilities for economic growth.

Level 2: Product-integrated (N=1). At the second level of integration, we have only found a South-American hair salon. The business Kapsalon Latina is offering a nonethnic service (i.e. hairdresser). The manager posits that all customers are important to them and that it does not matter what their nationality is. Nonetheless, the customer base consists of mainly South-American people. The South-American customer base can be explained by the fact that Spanish is the most-spoken language in the salon and all the employees come from the Dominican Republic. The manager of Kapsalon Latina says that Dutch people most of the time do not dare to come in because they simply cannot understand what is said, and, for instance, Turkish customers do not come in due to the cultural differences (in the Turkish culture man and woman go to separate salons). Furthermore, the business has contacts with mostly South-American businesses, for example, the Colombian nail salon at Groene Hilledijk. As they both experience a lack of information, they approach each other occasionally with questions. Although the customers, employees, and products are mostly ethnic-bound, the supplier and service can be considered cross-cultural. The supplier of
Kapsalon Latina is an Iraqi man selling, among others, South-American products. In sum, Kapsalon Latina falls into the second level of integration but leans towards the first category as their knowledge about the Netherlands is lacking (e.g. language and information services): “[Highly segmented] businesses may be considered unsophisticated and informal, and business owners may not necessarily be knowledgeable of the host country business practices and networks … [and] be more likely to be fluent in the language of their country of origin” (Curci & Mackoy, 2010, p. 110). Nevertheless, Kapsalon Latina plans to expand into a beauty salon by adding manicure and pedicure. This is in line with Curci and Mackoy’s (2010) possible areas of growth for second level integrated businesses: “Businesses in this category can grow by expanding the array of mainstream products or services they provide to ethnic customers” (p. 110). Nonetheless, in this category, it appears that growth is still restricted by the ethnic customers and employees.

**Level 3: Market-integrated (N=2).** Classic Diamond and Surifood are classified as market-integrated businesses. They are offering ethnic products (African fabrics and Surinamese food) but target primarily nonethnic customers and have nonethnic suppliers. Classic Diamond’s suppliers are from the Netherlands, Belgium, and China. The customers of Classic Diamond are mostly from Rotterdam, but also from The Hague and Germany. While writing a business plan, the owner expected to have only African customers, but there appeared to be a multicultural audience: “I don’t have anything with Turkish and Moroccans, but Surinamese, oh that’s my best customers. The Antilleans, Surinamese, Curacao, they are my best customers. I mean I was surprised; I was thinking Africans will by my [customers], but no. … I didn’t expect them because in my plan I didn’t mention them, only African”. The owner also did not expect Dutch people to be part of her customer-base: “I have Dutch people coming in. Really, that’s so surprising”. The customers buy fabrics and use them for all kind of purposes, such as making clothes, interior design, and jewellery. Classic Diamond is doing promotion on channels targeting the ethnic community (social media and an African radio station in The Hague) and spreads flyers and complementary cards around for the nonethnic community: “In shops around, I went to market, share it also in the city [centre]”. Now Classic Diamond is aware of the potential multicultural customer, the focus and the goal shifted towards cross-cultural: “You know I want not only for Africans; I want it to become something that everybody can wear. You too, you can wear. … Other people wear African fabrics … like, have you ever seen Turks wearing African fabrics? That’s my future plan, that everybody wears, everybody has one African dress in their closet”. The owner tries to accomplish this by increasing the advertisements targeting the nonethnic communities: “I am trying; I am doing advert on them. So I am working”. In sum, extending outside the ethnic community regarding
customers enables Classic Diamond to develop the business while holding on to the ethnic products and service. Surifood has the same entrepreneurial experience in Rotterdam-Zuid. In Surifood’s experience, people from all ethnicities come to the shopping mall Zuidplein, and, therefore, he is not focusing on one ethnicity. The suppliers of Surifood are cross-cultural: Dutch wholesale and local cultural businesses. As Curci and Mackoy (2010) expected for market-integrated businesses, Surifood is competing with “business[es] providing other ethnic products or services to mainstream markets” (p. 111) that are also located in the shopping mall. The owner noticed that there is an increase of sandwich-bars in the shopping mall and that his share is decreasing. Consequently, his opportunities for growth is based on “the level of consumption of ethnic-related products or services by nonethnic customers” (p. 111), not on the size of the ethnic market. The only ethnic aspect of Surifood are the Surinamese-Chinese employees who do not all speak (proper) Dutch. The owner finds his employees via his social network of family, friends, and acquaintances. Surifood has been able to grow the business by opening another branch in the shopping mall. However, the owner is expecting a growth limitation in the future with the recruitment of ethnic employees. He experiences that fewer Chinese immigrants are coming to the Netherlands each year, leading to fewer potential employees, and he believes that second- and third-generation immigrants prefer to work at the popular sushi restaurants and do not work hard. Luckily, the current employees are very loyal, so he does not expect to face this problem in the short term. In sum, the businesses within this category can develop due to their nonethnic customers, while still offering ethnic products and services. However, having ethnic employees appeared to be a restriction on business development in the future.

**Level 4: Highly integrated (N=3).** In the present study, Yesildal Verzekeringen & Financieringen, Publimedia, and Rosa’s Bloemenparadijs are highly integrated into Rotterdam-Zuid. Their products and services (insurance, marketing, and flowers), customers, and suppliers are nonethnic. Yesildal describes his network as multicultural due to his location: “It is a mix because we are living in Rotterdam-Zuid there are a lot of foreign people, multicultural, 180 cultures. And it’s more like the mirroring of the population we have her as a client”. Publimedia and Rosa’s Bloemenparadijs are neither focusing on a particular ethnicity. It is important to note that for these businesses, it is easier not to focus on an ethnicity as the products and services are mainstream. According to Curci and Mackoy (2010), “[these businesses] compete head to head with mainstream businesses and thus must have appropriate business experience and sophistication” (p. 111).

To conclude, the analysis above of the four levels of integration shows that cross-cultural entrepreneurship provides more opportunities for business growth than ethnic
entrepreneurship. In Çelik’s (2015) concept of cross-cultural entrepreneurship, customers, products and services, employees, and suppliers are taken into account. Curci and Mackoy (2010) only focus on products and services and customers, but to answer their question whether the characteristics and business development challenges differ among multiple levels of integration, we have to add employees and suppliers. The analysis above shows: 1. Having ethnic employees is a restriction on business development (e.g. Surifood, Kapsalon Latina); 2. Businesses that offer ethnic products and target ethnic customers are limited to the size of the ethnic community (e.g. Biedronka, Rincón Latino, Seema Sharma) and are forced to expand to other areas in order to grow their business (e.g. Seema Sharma); 3. Businesses that offer ethnic products can grow by reaching a nonethnic customer group (e.g. Tunkara Designs, Surifood, Classic Diamond); and, 4. Businesses that are entirely cross-cultural, i.e. provide nonethnic products and reach nonethnic customers, experience no business development challenges (e.g. Yesildal Verzekeringen & Financieringen, Publimedia, Rosa’s Bloemenparadijs). In sum, there is a hidden economic potential for Rotterdam-Zuid in cross-cultural entrepreneurship. Although not all the respondents perform cross-cultural entrepreneurship for a hundred percent yet, a majority of the entrepreneurs (N=7) intends to do so. Cross-cultural entrepreneurship could strengthen the economy and provide new opportunities for collaborations between different backgrounds. Remaining inside the ethnic communities (i.e. segmentation) limits the possibilities for sustainable growth of the entrepreneur but also of the area Rotterdam-Zuid itself (Ibrahim & Galt, 2003).

4.2.3. Networks and communities

In the interviews, we discussed the usage of networks and communities in starting and undertaking business. To analyse the outcome of this part of the interviews, we use the concept of mixed embeddedness (Kloosterman et al., 1999). The immigrant entrepreneurs interact in the complex system of the postmodern society of Rotterdam-Zuid (Cilliers, 1998). Mixed embeddedness entails that immigrant entrepreneurs are embedded in their social networks as well as in the socio-economic and politico-institutional environment of the city of settlement, and involves social, human, and financial capital (Kloosterman et al., 1999). The present study shows that the type of embeddedness is to a great extent related to the development phase of the business (start-up or undertaking). However, first and foremost, it has to be noted that in contrast with what Chrysostome and Lin (2010) and Xavier et al. (2013) posit, in the present study, the entrepreneurs did not keep social ties with their homeland community. Consequently, answering their question on how non-immigrant entrepreneurs can equal their success without such social capital, is not relevant or applicable. In the start-up phase, we can
distinguish three reasons for entrepreneurs to rely on their social network or socio-economic environment: Financing, finding employees, and advice-giving. In the phase of simply undertaking business, we can distinguish two reasons for entrepreneurs to rely on their social network or socioeconomic environment: Finding employees and subcontracting. These findings are discussed more in-depth below.

In the start-up phase, the respondents mostly relied on their social network of friends, family, and acquaintances. First, the financing. All ten respondents primarily used their savings for starting the business. For five respondents this was the only financial resource (i.e. Tunkara Designs, Yesildal Verzekeringen & Financieringen, Kapsalon Latina, Rosa’s Bloemenparadijs, Publimedia). In addition to their savings, three respondents got a loan from friends and family (i.e. Surifood, Rincón Latino, Biedronka), one respondent received a small loan from the bank (i.e. Sharma), and two respondent received a loan from a third party (i.e. Rincón Latino, Classic Diamond). In sum, for financing half of the respondents relied on networks, of which two on their social network, two on the socio-economic environment, and one on both networks. However, three respondents who only used their savings searched outside their social network for financial support but did not succeed. They have been in contact with the bank but did not get a loan due to insufficient income, debts, or because it was too difficult to arrange. Woolcock (1998) has discussed the relation between economic development and social capital. He states that, as immigrants normally lack physical capital, recognised skills, and human capital, the immigrants use their social capital to launch the business. However, if the business is successful, it is hard to make the step outside their homogenous and ethnic community; this requires a more complex economic exchange with networks extending their ethnic community. Consequently, Woolcock concludes that social capital has benefits as well as costs, and should not be maximised but optimised. In this analysis, the reliance on social capital (N=3) have turned out not to be significantly bigger than on the socio-economic environment (N=3), as most of the businesses relied on their own savings. However, it has to be noted, that some respondents tried to extend their social network for financial support but that this was too difficult; in this regard, the theory of Woolcock applies. Second, finding employees. Five out of ten businesses have employees. All five businesses acquire their employees via their social network, and, thus, do not use employment agencies. Rincón Latino and Seema Sharma have only family working in the business. Surifood acquires new employees via his current employees and his parents’ business. And, the managers (i.e. employees) of Kapsalon Latina and Biedronka are approached by the owners with the question if they would like to work in their business. They knew the owners already via friends and acquaintances. In sum, all the businesses that have employees acquire
them via friends and family, and, moreover, only have employees of their ethnicity. Third, the entrepreneurial advice-giving. McKelvey (2004) emphasises the importance of advice-giving in the start-up phase. If the advice-giving in the start-up phase (in which more entrepreneurial risks occur) is weakened or lacking, the later stages and growth opportunities are at risk. In the present study, only four respondents have received advice from their social network or the socio-economic environment of Rotterdam. Two respondents (i.e. Surifood, Classic Diamond) received entrepreneurial advice from their family. For example, the mother of the owner of Surifood gave advice about running a restaurant as she has one herself, and the brother of the owner of Classic Diamond gave advice on the formalities of starting a business as he works at the bank. The owner of Classic Diamond says: “So after my brother helped me, we put our [business]plan together, and I took it to [UWV], and they like it … My brother helped me a lot … If problem I just contacted him fast, tell him, he tells me, and we can solve it”. Furthermore, two respondents (i.e. Classic Diamond, Rosa’s Bloemenparadijs) received advice from outside their social network. For example, the owner of Classic Diamond received advice from the UWV and brought her in contact with real estate company Vestia to find a retail space. Also, as discussed in paragraph 4.1.2., the owner of Rosa’s Bloemenparadijs was invited to a course for starting entrepreneurs by the Chamber of Commerce and the municipality. The other seven respondents did not receive entrepreneurial advice from friends, family, or non-governmental institutions. Although there are also (ethnic) business associations that can help in the start-up phase, noteworthy is that also not all of the respondents are looking for entrepreneurial advice from these kind of associations because they do not see the benefits (anymore). For example, Tunkara Designs and Rosa’s Bloemenparadijs, both in the start-up phase, are wondering what other people can do for them; Tunkara says: “I don’t have too many time to be a member of things. I don’t need to, I don’t need to be part of member things, I just need to focus in my production job.” Bihari (Seema Sharma) says that he is not visiting business associations anymore because he feels that he would be the one giving advice to the starting entrepreneurs. Hofstede & McCrae (2004) found that one of the dimensions of culture is ‘individualism versus collectivism’. Individualism “refers to the degree to which individuals are integrated in a group. In individualistic societies, the ties between individuals are loose: Everyone is expected to look after himself or herself and his or her immediate family” (Hofstede & McCrae, 2004, p. 63). In this study, being a member of a business association is of no value for the three entrepreneurs, instead they rather focus on themselves. The owner of Publimedia has mentioned that this problem applies to the shopkeepers’ association in Beijerlandsealaan-Groene Hilledijk as well, as he posits that many immigrant entrepreneurs have no eye for what happens outside their business. However, there
are also businesses that are open for entrepreneurial advice but did not find this or feel that it is not available. For example, the owners of Kapsalon Latina are relying on their manager for advice-giving, but this is not enough as she is not always there. The manager admits that she is searching for more support in the form of a translator or someone that can tell them about the law and most important things, but this is not available in her experience. Also, looking back, Yesildal posits that it would be good to have a coach who has experience in starting a business: “[A coach] knows where there is any falls but could be avoided … [For example,] not doing the changes at that point when it was demanded, you know, when I had 13 people they want also shareholder from the company. I must have thought about that”. Regarding Kapsalon Latina and Yesildal, entrepreneurial advice-giving in the first phase could have helped them reduce blind variation and strengthen their business in the later stages as they would be more aware of the most important things to arrange (McKelvey, 2004). In the present study, only one respondent is a member of a business association, and only four respondents have a shopkeepers’ association at their disposal (of which one respondent is unaware). Since a couple of years, Yesildal is a member of Musead, a Turkish business association. Musead organises meetings to talk about problems, what they can do for each other, and discuss demands for products and services. As Musead is a large organisation, operating in 52 countries, it is very beneficial for Yesildal Verzekeringen & Financieringen: “Musead is for me an eye-opener. … I can easily get contact in there [52 countries] as well”. Baycan-Levent and Nijkamp (2009) found cultural conditions that can cause opportunities as well as barriers to success. Two of these cultural factors “are informal network contacts with people from the same ethnic group and flexible financing arrangements” (p. 2-3). This is in line with the outcome of our analysis: In sum, in the start-up phase, 1. For financing the businesses rely mostly on their savings and are not likely to get a loan at an official institution; 2. For finding employees, the respondents relied completely on the social contacts within their ethnic network; and, 3. For advice-giving, the embeddedness in networks is more complex as it is not common within the studied sample.

In the second phase, undertaking business, the respondents still only use their social network to find employees. More interestingly, in this phase, collaborations arise between businesses. Six out of ten businesses are working with other businesses by subcontracting each other. Rekers & Van Kempen (2000) posit that “ethnic entrepreneurs can take advantage of subcontracting trends, for instance, by working within flexible schedule and with family or other low-paid labour” (p. 61). In the present study, subcontracting occurred within ethnic communities as well as across ethnic communities. The South-American and Polish businesses collaborate only within their ethnic community, while African businesses also
collaborate across ethnic communities. In the Hindi-Indian community subcontracting appeared not to be working. According to Rekers & Van Kempen (2000), the opportunities for subcontracting influences the ability to launch or develop a business. This is especially evident in the African community in which we interviewed two business. The first business, Classic Diamond, did not intend to cooperate with other businesses until her customers asked if she could make clothes of her fabrics. Consequently, by subcontracting, she was able to offer more services and develop the business: “The plan is actually I only sell the fabrics, but you know, customers come in and say can I make it here too, and then I think why not? You can make it here, which I don’t know how to sew, so I contact a friend.” She got a good sewer, but, unfortunately, she was living in The Hague, so it caused some difficulties on the long term. In the end, she got in contact with Tunkara Designs via her hairdresser: “And I just started with him, but I think all my customers are happy with his work”. The second business, Tunkara Designs, is, thus, collaborating with Classic Diamond, but also with African Restaurant Mama Essi by making the interior design. As he is in the start-up phase, he uses these subcontracts to launch his business, and, moreover, it contributes to the development of his business by not only focussing on his customers but also on business cooperations (Rekers & Van Kempen, 2000). However, Classic Diamond, in contrast with Tunkara Designs, has also three subcontracts outside the African community: First, with a Surinamese lady who is using her fabrics to make fashion: “I have event with one Surinamese lady but unfortunately I didn’t went. She was promoting my fabrics actually”. Second, a woman that makes jewellery from her fabrics: “Last there walked a lady here, she is also interested. She makes jewels with my fabric”. Third, she cooperated with the businesses Pretoria Bar (Dutch) and Aladin (Arabic) in the neighborhood. Pretoria bar had arranged some basic bags with the text ‘Cooler Toffer Afrikaanderwijk’ and ‘Support local entrepreneurs’. Classic Diamond delivered the African fabrics, and Aladin stitched the fabrics on the bags. The so-called Afri Tassies project was intended to promote the area, make consumers aware to buy local, and to encourage local entrepreneurs to support each other (Steve and Mario of Pretoria bar, personal communication, May 16, 2017). The subcontracts enabled these businesses in Afrikaanderwijk to not only launch and develop their businesses but also to contribute to the development of the area. This example proves the benefits of having (cross-cultural) business networks within an area as the complex interaction between the agents (i.e. cross-cultural entrepreneurs) in the entrepreneurial ecosystem contributed to the macroeconomic development. As Spilling (1996, Cohen, 2004) posits this development of communities acquires good infrastructure and public institutions. In this example, the informal networks and community culture within the neighborhood contributed to the development of a hub of entrepreneurship in Afrikaanderwijk.
(Neck et al. 2004). Furthermore, within the Latin community, Rincón Latino is collaborating with businesses, but only within their ethnic community. The Latin bar organises theme parties for which they invite Latin businesses and students from all over the Netherlands to give, among others, massages and workshops. Subcontracting helps Rincón Latino to develop the business, as theme parties attract the most customers. Noteworthy is that Seema Sharma tried to do something similar by organising photo shoots. For this, she tried to subcontract Hindi businesses in photography, fashion, and modeling, but no one wanted to cooperate. Seema Sharma blames the lack of creativity within the Hindi community for the low response rate. Rekers & Van Kempen (2000) state that “opportunities for subcontracting are dependent on the character and mix of companies within a spatial context” (p. 61). In the Indian community, there is copying behaviour among entrepreneurs: Bihari (Seema Sharma) sees a tendency for Indian businesses to provide almost identical products and services within close distance to each other. For example, in The Hague, the Hindi immigrant entrepreneurs start Indian clothing shops on the same street and next to each other, and, thus, satisfy the market in no time. Rekers & Van Kempen (2000) already theorised that ethnic entrepreneurs have a bigger desire to start a business in general rather than their desire for a particular sector. Consequently, they start a business in a sector they are familiar with. This has negative consequences for the relatively small Indian market in the Netherlands and also limits the opportunities for subcontracting. This copying behaviour has also emerged in the Polish supermarket community. According to Biedronka, all the Polish supermarkets are offering the exact same products in Rotterdam-Zuid. If a customer comes in and tells them that a product is missing – as it is available in the other supermarkets – the products are immediately ordered. However, one of the supermarkets has a bakery and supplies bread to approximately three other supermarkets. In doing so, there is subcontracting in the Polish community despite the lack of diversity and creativity. Copying behaviour and a lack of creativity, resulting in similar business, limits the opportunities for subcontracting, and, thus, can be considered as a factor that limits the opportunities for economic development.

4.2.4. Cultural differences

In the conducted interviews, seven respondents expressed their views on the differences with local Dutch entrepreneurs and second- and third-generation immigrant entrepreneurs. The majority of the respondents shared the same view on the differences with Dutch entrepreneurs. Their characterisation of the Dutch entrepreneurs and businesses are mostly negative. They mention the absence of flexibility (e.g. in discount, time, and last minute cancellations), their timid character (e.g. not open, not happy, and not warm), and their narrow
focus on the Dutch population. In contrast, they characterise immigrant entrepreneurs as being persistent. However, Seema Sharma and Publimedia posit that some immigrant entrepreneurs forget the practical matters and are too much emotionally engaged in their business. Even when it is not going well, they keep going and investing. This can turn out well, but can also be disastrous in the long term. The Western entrepreneurs, according to Seema Sharma, are more likely to quit when it is not going well, which also has downsides. Lastly, Tunkara Designs and Rincón Latina do not see that many differences, instead, they state that everybody is going through a difficult time. Tunkara says: “I just believe it’s the same. … It’s just the way you work things out. Yes, because they will give you the opportunity; not just like foreigners tried to make it her or Dutch people try to make it. We see everyone is trouble; not just the foreigners … Everyone is trouble to make a way out”.

Three respondents also made comparisons within their ethnic community between first-generation and second- and third-generation immigrant entrepreneurs, and, in doing so, assign mostly negative characteristics to the second- and third generation regarding entrepreneurship. Yesildal, for example, posits that the second- and third-generation actually cannot be called Turkish: “Of course, you get the third generation, the people who are no Turkish from age 18/20, they are Dutch … They are not Turkish, they talk Turkish, but they are Dutch.” Surifood posits that second- and third-generation migrants prefer to work at the popular sushi restaurants and do not want to work that hard. Lastly, Bihari, however, experienced that he, as a second-generation immigrant, is more aware of opportunity costs and do not have a risk of having to invest his own capital or taking a loan. These perceived differences seem to imply that entrepreneurship among the next generations cannot be compared to the first-generation immigrant entrepreneurs regarding persistence and willingness to succeed. Fillis and Rentschler (2010) relate three essential aspects to entrepreneurship: Innovation, risk-taking, and proactiveness. In the described differences with other generations, especially the two last aspects seem to differ. According to the respondents, the second- and third-generation is less willing to take the risk and break with traditional ways of doing things. Instead, they weight costs and benefits, and are more laid back. Future research could study the differences between these generations immigrant entrepreneurs in order to find out whether this assumption is correct and the influence on business development.
5. Conclusion

The present study is part of the Rotterdam Immigrant Project, a multi-method multi-year research project lead by Dr Jeremiah P. Spence, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Global and International Communication at Erasmus University Rotterdam. The primary objective of the project is to develop a deep understanding of immigrants living in the Rotterdam Metropolitan Area. Herein, the present study focussed on the immigrant entrepreneurs in Rotterdam-Zuid. As a starting point for the analysis, the strategy of Grounded Theory orientated qualitative research was undertaken. Meaning, first, we collected general data about the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam in order to find gaps. As a result, we found that the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam needs to be strengthened for businesses to develop and grow, but that the cause of this issue is not yet found and examined (Jansen, De Vos, & Lescher, 2016; Nlgroei, 2016). Other research (Eraydin et al., 2010; Fairlie & Lofstrom, 2013; Xavier et al., 2013) showed that immigrant entrepreneurs have the potential to contribute to the urban economic performance of a region and are important agents for urban economic growth and competitiveness. Studying immigrant entrepreneurs could therefore be informative to strengthen the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam. Initially, we started to study the challenges of immigrant entrepreneurs for business growth and development. However, soon we realised that this is a narrow focus of which the outcome would not be able to strengthen the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam. Instead, we shifted our focus to the entrepreneurial habits and experiences of immigrant entrepreneurs. In doing so, we could examine these habits and experiences, and analyse whether or not they have the potential to contribute to the development of businesses and entrepreneurship in the region. Hence, in the present study we have posed the following research question: To what extent could immigrant entrepreneurship contribute to the development of the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam? To answer this research question, we designed the following sub questions: 1. Within the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam-Zuid, what defines the immigrant entrepreneurial experience and habits?; and, 2. What challenges do immigrant entrepreneurs in Rotterdam-Zuid encounter regarding infrastructure, culture, and media? To answer these questions, we use the structure of this study which is built on the environmental components and the behaviours and attributes within the entrepreneurial ecosystem. The entrepreneurial ecosystem model is applied to Rotterdam-Zuid by examining the actors, environmental variables, and behaviours and attributes. By understanding the environment of the city and interviewing immigrant entrepreneurs, we build a list of unique behaviours or attributes that define the entrepreneurial experience and habits of immigrant entrepreneurs in Rotterdam-Zuid. The used method of studying agents individually according to the agent-based modeling
theory was very helpful as it enabled the researcher to explore the complex structure of the ecosystem by finding patterns and interactions between the individual agents (Cilliers, 1998; McKelvey, 2004; Siegfried, 2014). Moreover, this type of analysis was required since Rotterdam-Zuid appeared to be a complex region (McKelvey, 2004; Macal & North, 2009). Only by using an individual-level focus of agent-based modelling, we were able to observe the diversity of attributes and behaviours between existing agents and the dynamic behaviour of the entire system (North, 2014).

First, from the interviews emerged two environmental components that played an important role in the entrepreneurial habits and experience of the immigrant entrepreneurs: 1. The location; and, 2. The municipality and other support organisations. The entrepreneurs provided three reasons to choose Rotterdam-Zuid as a location for their business: Population, price, and familiarity. From this we can derive three findings: 1. All respondents perceive their area as multicultural, resulting in agglomeration effects and cross-cultural entrepreneurship. Although, initially four respondents chose Rotterdam-Zuid due to the presence of their ethnicity, in the long term a majority of the respondents also experienced the multicultural character of Rotterdam-Zuid as a benefit for their business; 2. All ten respondents chose Rotterdam-Zuid over Rotterdam-Noord, due to the low renting prices; and, 3. A minority of the respondents explicitly chose Rotterdam-Zuid because they are familiar with the environment. In sum, the difference between Rotterdam-Noord and Rotterdam-Zuid regarding the multicultural population, the experienced language barrier, the price differences, and the presence of ethnic networks have appeared to be important factors in why immigrant entrepreneurs are more likely to start a business in Rotterdam-Zuid. Furthermore, from the interviews derived that the entrepreneurs assign an important role to the municipality, and experience that this role is not fulfilled sufficiently. This lack emerged in three areas: 1. Maintenance of the areas: Attractiveness, safety, and cleanliness; 2. Entrepreneurial support: Advice and financing; and, 3. Infrastructure for communication. The analysis showed that in the entrepreneurial ecosystem there is an issue with the infrastructure for communication. Although, the infrastructure appears to be present, the immigrant entrepreneurs are unable to find the right nodes for communication. As a result, they are unable to strengthen their entrepreneurship and solve the issues they face regarding maintenance of the area and the entrepreneurial support.

Second, the behaviours and attributes. In the analysis, we have found a list of unique behaviours and attributes that define immigrant entrepreneurial habits in Rotterdam-Zuid. These habits can be classified as follows: Self-representation, (cross-) cultural entrepreneurship, networks and communities, cultural differences. From these habits we can
derive seven findings: 1. Although the central self-representation of immigrant entrepreneurs in their businesses contributes to the trust-relationships with customers, it also has the potential to cause limitations to business growth on the long term; 2. A majority of the respondents are doing business cross-cultural, providing them more opportunities for business development and growth; 3. The lower the level of integration, the more limitations for business development arise; and vice versa. For example, having ethnic employees causes restrictions for business development on the long term; 4. The type of embeddedness (into the social network or into the socio economic and politico-institutional environment) is to a great extent related to the development phase of the business (start-up or undertaking) as in the start-up phase business remain within their social network while in undertaking business entrepreneurs are more likely to step out their social network; 5. A majority of the immigrant entrepreneurs are using subcontracting to launch and develop their business, cultural as well as cross-cultural. This phenomenon contributes to the development of networks and communities, and, moreover, strengthens the entrepreneurial ecosystem of their area; 6. Immigrant entrepreneurs tend to perceive the Dutch entrepreneurs as negative due to their lack of cross-cultural activity and flexibility, and their timid character.

In sum, the immigrant entrepreneurs encounter specific challenges in their communication with the municipality, shopkeepers’ association, and project developers; resulting, in wrong expectations. If the communication between these parties can be improved, the entrepreneurial experience of the Rotterdam-Zuid area can be strengthen resulting in a stronger entrepreneurial ecosystem. On the contrary, no challenges have occurred regarding culture. Instead, cross-cultural entrepreneurship appears to be a characteristic of immigrant-entrepreneurship in Rotterdam-Zuid. It can be considered as a hidden economic potential, as it can strengthen: 1. The immigrant businesses regarding business development and growth; 2. The communities and networks of businesses and entrepreneurs; and, 3. The entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam-Zuid. Nonetheless, the entrepreneurial habits of the immigrant entrepreneurs also caused some limitations. The lack of creativity within some communities and the importance of self-representation limits the opportunities for business collaborations and business development. To conclude, to answer the main research question, the present study has shown that immigrant entrepreneurship has the potential to contribute to the development of the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam by mainly promoting cross-cultural entrepreneurship. If the level of integration of the businesses increases while maintaining their ethnic identity, and business collaborations arise between ethnicities, the ecosystem of Rotterdam can be strengthened resulting in more successful business launches and business developments.
In the analysis we have used multiple theories to back up our findings. However, some theories have appeared to be lacking or contradictory. First, the Immigrant Business Enterprise Classification Framework of Curci and Mackoy (2010) was suitable for this study to analyse the different levels of business integration in Rotterdam’s mainstream business community and to examine to what extent the businesses act within and outside their ethnic network. However, the analysis has exposed the framework to be insufficient. In order to grasp the entire entrepreneurial behaviour of the agents, we had to add more categories besides customers and products and service, namely suppliers and employees. These two factors appeared also to be growth limitations when they are not sufficiently integrated. Secondly, Xavier et al. (2013) and Chrysostome and Lin (2010) state that immigrant entrepreneurs often maintain strong ties with their homeland community in the process of starting their business, and that this could be an explanation for their success. In the present study, however, the immigrant entrepreneurs did not have contact with their homeland community in the start-up phase, nor in the later stages of their business development. Their assumption that this is a disadvantage for non-immigrant entrepreneurs, is according to this study incorrect, but to draw a more valid conclusion, a bigger sample should be analysed. Lastly, Kloosterman et al. (1999) and Baycan-Levent and Nijkamp (2009) showed that immigrant entrepreneurs seek low barriers to entry due to the lack of financial and human capital. The authors focus particularly on the choice of market and products, but the present study showed that it also applies to the area in which the business is launched as the respondents intentionally chose for Rotterdam-Zuid due to low renting prices (i.e. a low entry barrier).

Furthermore, in the present study there are some limitations to take into account. First, the study has been performed on only ten research subjects. The selection of these subjects was based on the area of settlement in Rotterdam-Zuid. To get a more reliable outcome, more entrepreneurs should be interviewed. Moreover, to make a comparison and to draw conclusions on the differences between the start-up phase and the phase of undertaking business, and between the different levels of integration, an equal distribution of the business among these categories should be made. Second, language can be considered as a research limitation of a study containing immigrant entrepreneurs from different backgrounds. The interviews are conducted in Dutch and English. These languages are not the native language of the respondents. Only four out of ten respondents spoke fluent Dutch. The other interviews in Dutch, as well as in English, have been restricted to the ability of the respondent to speak in those languages. This caused that sometimes the respondents had some difficulties to express themselves. If the interviews were conducted in the native language of the respondents, the respondents might have been able to express themselves better; leading to
more extensive stories (i.e. data). Lastly, in Rotterdam-Zuid are more nationalities present than only Polish, Indian, Surinamese, South-American, African, and Turkish. Not addressing other cultures, is a limitation of the research outcome. To get an understanding of the entire entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam-Zuid, attention should be paid to other nationalities as well. This could expose more networks of and connections between agents, and enabling the research to examine the scale of cross-cultural entrepreneurship in Rotterdam-Zuid.

During the analysis of the data, we came across interesting phenomena which also raised new questions. First, in this research, the spatial approach has been applied to the entrepreneurial ecosystem to find the characteristics of immigrant entrepreneurship in Rotterdam-Zuid. One of the reasons for this is that the success of businesses is mostly due to the region in which they are embedded and that the strategic policies differ among regions (Gibson & Mahdjoubi, 2014). However, in order to assess to what extent the characteristics define Rotterdam-Zuid, other migrant cities in the Netherlands, such as Amsterdam and The Hague, could be studied as well. In doing so, comparable studies can be done between cities and thus possible explanations can be found for differences between cities in (immigrant) entrepreneurial success (Rekers & Van Kempen, 2000). These differences can be used to strengthen the entrepreneurial ecosystem of each of the cities, and the Netherlands as a whole. Moreover, the present study has shown that the (cross-cultural) connections extend the studied area as the immigrant entrepreneurs of Rotterdam-Zuid keep ties with entrepreneurs in these cities as well. Second, the present study has shown that there are communication issues between immigrant entrepreneurs, the municipalities, and shopkeepers’ association. However, we have only studied the experience of the immigrant entrepreneurs. Further research should assess the experience of the municipality, shopkeepers’ associations, and project developers, in order to examine the nodes of communication in the infrastructure of Rotterdam-Zuid. Only by letting the other side (i.e. all agents within the entrepreneurial ecosystem) heard, we can draw conclusions and find ways to strengthen the communication infrastructure. Third, in the present study, three respondents expressed their experience with second- and third-generation immigrant entrepreneurs. As their characterisation of these generations was the opposite of their characterisation of first-generation immigrants, further research could address the differences between first-generations and second- or third-generations immigrant entrepreneurs. Their habits, experiences, and mentality could differ due to, among other, that they have been embedded in the host-country’s environment for a longer period of time.
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### Appendix A: Share of entrepreneurs per nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age category</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-29</th>
<th>30-34</th>
<th>35-39</th>
<th>40-44</th>
<th>45-49</th>
<th>50-54</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60-64</th>
<th>Total 20-64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bosnian</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgian</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surinamese</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iranian</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanian</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American*</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes North- and South-America

Table A1: Share of entrepreneurs per nationality and age category in the Netherlands in 2014 (CBS, 2016A)
Appendix B: Environmental components

List of environmental components that are essential elements in the entrepreneurial ecosystem of Rotterdam and used as a starting point of the present study:

- Regulation
  - Ease of incorporation
  - Ease of compliance with regulation
- Taxation
  - No personal income tax
  - Low corporate taxation
- Office Space
  - Formal office space
  - Informal office space
  - Incubators
  - Accelerators
  - Co-working spaces
  - Coffee shops
- Internet Capacity and Infrastructure
  - Dark fiber
  - Live fiber
  - Redundant networks
- History of Rotterdam
- Restaurants
  - Non-corporate/non-franchise restaurants
  - Food trucks
  - Foodie culture
- Coffee Shops
- Parks
  - Greenbelts
  - Greenspace
- Tolerance Index
  - Friendliness to gay, lesbian, bisexual, trans-persons
- Segregation Index
  - Unfriendliness to non-Dutch ethnicities
- Capital
- Funding from FFF
- Angel investors
- Venture capital firms
- Major banks
- Crowdfunding
- Customers

- Geography
  - Weather
  - Natural disasters

- Cultural Events
  - Bars
  - Clubs
  - Live music
  - Festivals
  - Symphony, opera, ballet

- Gentrification
  - Transitioning neighbourhoods

- Formal Institutions
  - Erasmus University
  - Chamber of Commerce (Kamer van Koophandel)
  - Innovation Quarter
  - VET Zomerbijeenkomst

- Informal Institutions
  - WTC Rotterdam
  - Club of Rotterdam
  - Business club Rotterdam
  - Ditvoorst

- Media
  - Media production
  - Media reception
  - Media infrastructure

- Infrastructure
  - Hot water system
  - Housing
Appendix C: Research area

Image B1 Percentage of non-Western immigrants per neighbourhood (CBS, 2016A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip code</th>
<th>Afrikaanderwijk</th>
<th>Bloemhof</th>
<th>Hillesluis</th>
<th>Zuidplein</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business in zip code</td>
<td>3072</td>
<td>3073</td>
<td>3074</td>
<td>3083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhabitants</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surinamese (%)</td>
<td>8221</td>
<td>13681</td>
<td>11862</td>
<td>1207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antillean (%)</td>
<td>16,1</td>
<td>12,1</td>
<td>13,8</td>
<td>8,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verdeans (%)</td>
<td>6,3</td>
<td>6,9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turks (%)</td>
<td>2,7</td>
<td>2,2</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccans (%)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19,5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others: non-Western</td>
<td>10,5</td>
<td>7,9</td>
<td>10,4</td>
<td>2,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autochthonous (%)</td>
<td>13,2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10,7</td>
<td>9,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others: EU (%)</td>
<td>18,9</td>
<td>29,5</td>
<td>20,3</td>
<td>56,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others: Western (%)</td>
<td>4,1</td>
<td>8,5</td>
<td>8,7</td>
<td>8,2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B1 Demographics research area (Buurtmonitor, 2015; Chamber of Commerce, n.d.)
Appendix D: Sample

Image D1 Locations of immigrant businesses in sample

1: Yealidal
2: Surifood
3: Seema Sharma
4: Tunkara Design
5: Kapsalon Latina
6: Rincón Latino
7: Classic Diamond
8: Publimedia
9: Biedronka
10: Rose’s

Bloemenparadijs
Appendix E: Interview guide

Semi-structured interview protocol
Date:
Location:
Interviewer(s):
Participant(s):

Thank you for meeting with me today. I am conducting a research study on immigrant entrepreneurs in Rotterdam-Zuid and their experience in doing business. For this study, your experiences and perspectives are important and I would like to ask you to share your views. I will be recording the interview so I can accurately capture our conversation. This recording will be transcribed afterwards and I am willing to send you this transcription for review.

Before we begin: If you are comfortable participating in this interview I would like to ask if you could read and (orally) sign this consent form.

Do you have any further questions?
1) Demographical information:
- Name (pseudonym if applicable)
- Age
- Gender
- Country of origin / Ethnicity
- What languages do you speak?
- Do you consider yourself first or second generation immigrant?
  - (If applicable) When did you arrive in the Netherlands?
    Probes: Year, motivation or reason, with whom, first perception.
- (If applicable) Did/do you experience any barriers in your daily life and how do you encounter these?
  Probes: Language, skills, education, culture.
- To what degree do you feel Dutch and/or European, and why?
- What’s your highest level of education? In what and where are you educated?
- How is your relationship with friends and family?
  Probes: Nationalities, home or host country.

2) Entrepreneurial background:
- What was your first experience with entrepreneurship?
- How common is entrepreneurship in your social network?
- Did you have any business experience before starting this business?
  Probes: Where, when, what, how, why, stopped, success, challenges?
- Why did you become an entrepreneur?
  Probes: Necessity or opportunity driven / structural or cultural factors.
- How is your educational background helpful as an entrepreneur?
- Are there benefits you were looking for as an entrepreneur?

3) Current business:
- When was this business founded?
- What was the reason for starting a business?
- Why this sector: experience, knowledge, social network?
- How would you characterise this business?
  Probes: Innovative, new, modern, conservative, cultural, multicultural, integrated, diverse, open/closed.
- Why did you choose this location (area/Rotterdam-Zuid)?
- How do you experience this location?
Probes: Positive and negative, feedback for municipality, vision for the area.
- What makes this location/region/Rotterdam unique for entrepreneurship?
- Should this neighbourhood change in any way?
- What does this business offer?
  Probes: product, service, ethnic.
- What’s your role in this business? Since when?
- What other people are involved in this business?
  Probes: different amount for start-up phase and now, what’s their role, what is their connection to the business/owner?
  Probes: friends, family, community, regular employees, finding new employees.
- Could you describe your supplier network?
  Probes: Community, ethnicity, social network, challenges, cultural.
- How would you describe the target customer group?
  Probes: Nationality, immigrant, age, loyalty.
- What kind of promotion/marketing do you use acquire new customers? How, what, where?

**Culture**
- Are there cultural differences with customers, employees, suppliers?
- Are there any ties with your homeland?
- Are there any cultural events you participate in with your business?
- What’s the role of your culture in this business? Is the Dutch culture represented?
- In what way do you think your business differs from Dutch (or other cultures’) comparable businesses?
- Do you experience any advantages and/or disadvantages of being immigrant entrepreneur? Probes: Social network, lack support

**4) Creating the business:**
- Could you tell us more about how this business is created?
  Probes: idea, responsible, start-up process, received support (alone, friends, family, community), finance, suppliers, customer-base, employees.
- Did you experience any barriers in the initial start-up phase?
  Probes: limitations/challenges for finance, suppliers, customers, employees, cultural barriers, language barriers
- Do you experience challenges related to media/infrastructure/culture?
- To your knowledge, is there anything or anyone that supports or facilitates
entrepreneurship in this region (for you)?
Probes: Coach, senior advisor, dynamic duo with colleague entrepreneur, group of entrepreneurs.
- Where there any entrepreneurial risks you encountered?
- Has your business changed over the years?
  Probes: Structure, customers, employees, size, support, more effective.
- Do you experience challenges right now or are there any challenges that remain?
- How would you describe your connections to other entrepreneurs in (or outside) the neighbourhood/community?
  Probes: Ethnicity, community, competitiveness, support, cooperation, collaboration
- Have you experienced that you attracted other business to this area of the same ethnicity? Or where you attracted to this place by others?
- Are you a member of any associations or trade group, how does this help you?
- Do you see any differences between Dutch en immigrant entrepreneurships?

5) Future
- What are your future plans?
- Are you being growth-oriented?
- What are potential areas or possibilities to grow?
  Probes: size, expertise, customer group, profit, position on the market, cross-cultural (Çelik, 2015)
- What contacts do you need for this?
  Probes: Inside or outside social network/community, necessary support.
- When are you satisfied with your business?
  Probes: size, success

Room for additional information which the respondent would like to add.
### Appendix F: Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Highest level of education</th>
<th>Role in business</th>
<th>Business name</th>
<th>Start year</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Type of business</th>
<th>Level of integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Rashim Yesildal</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>HBO real estate (Netherlands)</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Yesildal Verzekeringen &amp; Financieringen</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Bloemhof (Dordtselaan)</td>
<td>Service: consulting and insurance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Michael Yung</td>
<td>Chinese-Surinamese</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>WO law and economics (Netherlands) – not finished</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Surifood</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Zuidplein (Mall)</td>
<td>Retail: restaurant</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Soemit Bihari</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>WO MA Entrepreneurship and Strategy (Netherlands)</td>
<td>Marketing manager Employee (son of owner)</td>
<td>Seema Sharma</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Bloemhof (Dordtselaan)</td>
<td>Service: beauty salon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Mohammed Tunkara</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>MBO Fashion at Davinci College, Albeda College, and Zadkine (Netherlands)</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Tunkara Designs</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Hillesluis</td>
<td>Service: clothing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Teresa Piñada</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>WO Law (Chili) Beauty school (Netherlands)</td>
<td>Manager / assistant / intern hairdresser</td>
<td>Latina Kapsalon</td>
<td>2017 (taken over)</td>
<td>Hillesluis (Groene Hilledijk)</td>
<td>Service: hairdresser</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Carmen Castillo</td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>HBO retail (Netherlands)</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Latin Rincón</td>
<td>2012 (taken over)</td>
<td>Hillesluis (Hillevlief)</td>
<td>Retail: bar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Lynda Oheneba</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>MBO level 4 (Netherlands)</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Classic Diamond</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Afrikaanderwijk</td>
<td>Service: fabrics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Anil Jagroep</td>
<td>Surinamese</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>HBO office-management (Netherlands)</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Publimedia</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Hillesluis (Groene Hilledijk)</td>
<td>Service: advertising and marketing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Karam Ozo</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Secondary education (Sweden)</td>
<td>Manager / assistant</td>
<td>Biedronka</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Zuidplein</td>
<td>Retail: food market</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Sandra</td>
<td>Surinamese</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>MAVO (Netherlands)</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Rosa’s Bloemenparadijs</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Bloemhof (Dordtselaan)</td>
<td>Retail: flowers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>