7th International Conference on Diversity in Organisations, Communities and Nations
3-6 July 2007, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

New Orientations in Ethnic Entrepreneurship:
Motivation, Goals and Strategies of New Generation Ethnic Entrepreneurs

Tüzin BAYCAN LEVENT[a*]
Peter NIJKAMP[b]
Mediha SAHIN[b]

[a] Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Istanbul Technical University, Taskisla, 34437, Taksim, Istanbul, Turkey
[b] Department of Spatial Economics, Free University Amsterdam, De Boelelaan 1105, 1081 HV Amsterdam, The Netherlands
**Corresponding Author: tuzin.baycanlevent@itu.edu.tr*

Abstract

The literature on ethnic entrepreneurship has identified a blend of structural and cultural factors that influence the step towards ethnic entrepreneurship. An important issue is whether ethnic entrepreneurs produce for their own ethnic niches or whether they try to cover a wider market of customers. This difference between so-called internal and external orientation has been the subject of many recent empirical investigations. An internal orientation may offer a more protected market, but will never lead to market expansion ('break-out strategy'). An external orientation requires more skills, diversified communication channels and access to government policy support measures. The concentration of ethnic entrepreneurs in traditional sectors has led many studies to focus mainly on this internal orientation, while there is a limited number of studies that address non-traditional sectors and external orientations of ethnic entrepreneurs. Against this background, the present study aims to deal with new departures for ethnic entrepreneurship in terms of motivation, sectoral choice, business goals and strategies of new generation ethnic entrepreneurs. What is the motivation and orientation of new generation ethnic entrepreneurs? How far are new generation ethnic entrepreneurs from their ethnic groups or their ethnic niches in the market? Can an innovative orientation –external orientation- help to break out from the local ethnic dependency or to escape from a lock-in situation in an ethnic enclave? Can the different motivations and orientations of new generation ethnic entrepreneurs help in realizing effective break-out strategies? In order to answer these questions the study focuses on external orientations of new generation ethnic entrepreneurs, while it addresses in particular the way -and the extent to which- the choice for entrepreneurship is made by higher educated ethnic young generations.

1. Introduction

In recent years, we have witnessed two important changes in ethnic entrepreneurship, viz. the fact that many ethnic entrepreneurs set up businesses in other than traditional markets (e.g. the hotel and catering industry) and the growing number of second generation immigrants who decide to become self-employed (EIM, 2004; Ram and Smallbone, 2001; Rusinovic, 2006; van den Tillaart, 2001). Although the hospitality industry is still most popular among the first generation, it is noteworthy that in recent years -due to the increasing pressure on and high competitiveness in traditional areas- this share has declined considerably. Instead, the first generation has become more often active in other sectors like producer services which include finance, insurance, real estate and business-related professional services, such as accounting, consulting, marketing, engineering or design, most of which employ a high share of technical, professional and managerial jobs. In other words, the process of sectoral change is multi-faceted, while given the increasing pressure on traditional areas, equally new niches are developing. Generational change is also contributing to the emergence of new areas of immigrant business activity such as business and professional services, hospitality and entertainment, ICT and creative industries. The second generation is predominantly represented in these newly developing niches like the producer services sector. As a result, the sectoral distribution of the second generation entrepreneurs has become more similar to the native entrepreneurs than the first generation.

However, the existing literature on ethnic entrepreneurship still mainly focuses on first-generation ethnic entrepreneurs who are still predominantly active in the traditional low-skilled and labor-intensive activities. Clearly, in recent studies we find contributions that focus on the labour market position of the second generation, but in general studies on second-generation immigrants who are self-employed or entrepreneur remain limited. On the other hand, the concentration of ethnic entrepreneurs in traditional sectors -in other words, internal orientations of ethnic entrepreneurs- have led many studies to focus on these traditional sectors or on this internal orientation. There is a limited number of studies that address non-traditional sectors and external orientations of ethnic entrepreneurs.

Given this imbalance in ethnic entrepreneurship analyses, From this need, the present study aims to investigate new orientations in ethnic entrepreneurship in terms of motivation, sectoral choice, business goals and strategies of ethnic entrepreneurs. What is the motivation and orientation of the new generation of ethnic entrepreneurs? How far are new generation ethnic entrepreneurs from their ethnic groups or their ethnic niches in the market? Can a new orientation –external orientation- help to break out from the ethnic dependency or to escape from the situation of being an ethnic enclave? Can the different motivations and orientations of new generation ethnic entrepreneurs help in breaking-out strategies? In order to answer these questions the study focuses on external orientations of the new generation of ethnic entrepreneurs while addressing in particular the way -and the extent to which- the choice for entrepreneurship is made by higher educated young ethnic generations. Our study analyses in particular the motivation, goals and strategies of the second generation Turkish entrepreneurs in the ICT and FIRE sector in the Netherlands. The next section will investigate the generational differences and new (external) orientations in etnic entrepreneurship. Section 3 will examine immigrants and entrepreneurship in the Netherlands on the basis of different groups as well as the differences between the first and the second generation of ethnic entrepreneurs. Section 4 will analyse new orientations of the second generation Turkish entrepreneurs in the Netherlands in terms of their motivation, sectoral choice and goals and strategies of entrepreneurial activities. The last section will conclude with a general evaluation of the external orientation of the second generation ethnic entrepreneurs.

2. Generational Differences and New (External) Orientations in Ethnic Entrepreneurship

The empirical results of many case studies show that ethnic entrepreneurs usually set up their business in the sectors where informal production would give them a competitive advantage and where the network of ethnic people provides them an opportunity for an informal way of doing business and exchanging information. Normally, ethnic enterprises start with a focus on clients from their own ethnic group, with traditional products, services and communication channels. Therefore, the orientation for the majority of ethnic entrepreneurs is internal in the beginning. This internal orientation and the mutual trust within the ethnic network provides on the one hand, rotating credits, a protected market and a proper labor force (Basu, 1998; Deakins et al., 1997; Deakins, 1999; Kloosterman et al., 1998; Lee et al., 1997; Rettab, 2001), while on the other hand it creates a more than average loyalty between the ethnic firm and his clients (Dyer and Ross, 2000). Therefore, it can be said that the traditional business strategies including internal orientation, traditional sectors, ethnic employees and ethnic customers may give the impression of a 'safe haven'.

An important issue in ethnic entrepreneurship is whether ethnic entrepreneurs produce for their own ethnic niches or whether they try to cover a wider market of customers. This difference between so-called internal and external orientation has been the subject of many recent empirical investigations (see, e.g., Choenni 1997; Tillaert and Poutsma, 1998). Concentration of a large number of ethnic entrepreneurs, producing and selling similar products and services, in a limited market, combined with a high unemployment rate and low purchasing power in the neighbourhood, could have severe implications for the degree of competition and survival rates of the enterprises. If ethnic business remains limited to the ethnic market, their potential for growth is sharply circumscribed (Aldrich and Waldinger, 1990). Rath (2000) emphasised that the opportunities and strategies of entrepreneurs are closely linked to their embeddedness in the economic, political-institutional, and social environments; these external factors, such as social embeddedness, also have great influence on the start and development of ethnic business. An internal orientation may offer a more protected market, but will never lead to market expansion ('break-out strategy'). An external orientation requires more skills, diversified communication channels and access to government policy support measures (see, e.g., Bates 1997, Deakins et al. 1997, van Delft et al. 2000, Light and Bhachu 1993).

A break-out strategy in ethnic entrepreneurship can be defined as a strategy to get away from the situation in which own ethnic groups dominate such factors as capital, clients and employees (Baycan-Levent et al. 2005). In other words, a break-out strategy is a strategy to escape from internal orientation or from being an 'ethnic enclave' in some stage in order to orient to external markets. However, breaking out from this ethnic dependency may not be possible due to the special relationships between ethnic entrepreneurs and their ethnic niches. The advantages of an internal orientation may create also many disadvantages when a number of ethnic entrepreneurs seeks to expand their market domain by offering products and services for a broader group of clients, outside their own ethnic group. An exclusive focus on a limited market in the beginning can pose a serious threat to the future of many ethnic minority firms. The 'safe haven' conditions do not create promising opportunities for economic expansion of the firms concerned. Therefore, when they want a market expansion, a number of ethnic entrepreneurs succeeds in this goal and thus brings their firms in a next development stage, but a number of them does not succeed in this breaking-out strategy and is left to the commercial constraints of their own group. A number of the latter deliberately chooses to stay in this market niche. Although the own ethnic group offers the entrepreneurs certain advantages in terms of customer loyalty, it seems that this focus makes them vulnerable and withholds opportunities for expansion. So there is a paradox concerning the ethnic minority entrepreneur and his ethnic group: there is both a strength and a weakness, but in the end it seems to be a life-threatening weakness for many ethnic firms.

Although an internal orientation is the main feature of ethnic entrepreneurship, it is observed that there are different motivations for different generations of immigrants, as the profile of ethnic people is developing over time. This development is heavily related to the educational opportunities. Chiswick and Miller (1994) found that age at arrival varies negatively with post-immigration educational attainment. They emphasized that the determinant and nature of human capital accumulation after arrival is an important step towards understanding the immigrant's adjustment process. Therefore, the age at arrival is the most important determinant to define first-generation and second-generation immigrants and also entrepreneurs in terms of their background. Although several definitions are used especially for second-generation immigrants, generally persons who were born in the host country or immigrant to the host country at an age younger than six, can be classified as second-generation.

In general, the first-generation entrepreneurs entail more push factors, whereas the second generation may exhibit more pull factors. First-generation ethnic entrepreneurs are more motivated by discrimination, problems with the transferability of their diplomas and obtaining status, compared with their second-generation counterparts. The latter group derives more motivation from blocked promotion to start their own business. Not surprisingly, this group is generally found to be more ambitious and selective in choosing a job. In other words, while first-generation immigrants may be more frequently 'forced entrepreneurs', second-generation immigrants may act more frequently as 'voluntary entrepreneurs'. The results of recent case study researches (see e.g. Masurel and Nijkamp, 2004; Rusinovic, 2006) show that the younger generation is more open and looks for new opportunities outside the traditional markets. They often have more experience with non-ethnic situations and more often embedded in mainstream markets and formal networks. Therefore, an orientation to non-traditional markets may help especially the younger generation of entrepreneurs in breaking out strategies.

3. Immigrants and Entrepreneurship in the Netherlands

3.1. Immigrants in the Netherlands

In the early 1960s, the Netherlands switched from emigration to immigration country. The increase in prosperity in the Netherlands reduced emigration and induced new immigration flows at the same time. Post-war immigrants can be distinguished in three main groups: immigrants from former colonies, those who were recruited for unskilled jobs (so-called guest workers), and more recently refugees (see for immigration flows in different periods Kraal and Zorlu, 1998; Lucassen and Penninx, 1997; Zorlu and Hartog, 2001).

The flow of large numbers of 'guest workers' created an immigration surplus in the Netherlands. During the long post-war boom, the demand for workers for unskilled jobs increased while the supply of unskilled Dutch workers was decreasing. The shortage of unskilled labourers was compensated by the inflow of Mediterranean workers (Hartog and Vriend, 1990). Workers were actively recruited or came spontaneously from countries like Italy, Spain, Portugal, Turkey, Greece, Morocco, Yugoslavia and Tunisia. The recruitment policy stopped during the first oil crisis but the immigration from the recruitment countries continued as a chain-migration, at first in the form of family reunification throughout the 1970s and later on in the form of family formation in the 1980s and 1990s. Between 1982 and 1983 the immigration flow stagnated and even dropped almost to the level of emigration, no doubt as a reaction to the deep recession of the Dutch economy after the second oil crisis in 1979. The increase of immigration in the second half of the 1980s was dominated by family formation/re-union of 'guest workers'. Additionally, the flow of political refugees and asylum seekers, from politically unstable areas in the world, has also increased. While the chain-migration from Turkey and Morocco has continued during the last two decades, the number of south European immigrants did not grow much after the end of formal recruitment, and even experienced a decrease. In the end, Surinamese, Antilleans, Turks and Moroccans became the largest migrant minority groups and this group is gradually growing due to a combination of continuous immigration and a relatively high birth rate. Immigration streams are now increasingly dominated by political refugees and asylum seekers.

According to Dutch statistics, a person is considered an immigrant either if they and at least one of their parents were born outside the Netherlands or if they themselves were born in the Netherlands out of at least one foreign-born parent. Dutch statistics draw also a distinction between Western and non-Western immigrants. In 2006, more than 3 million people in the Netherlands were considered as 'immigrant' and 1.7 million immigrants are non-Western immigrants. The three largest groups of non-Western immigrants in the Netherlands are Turks, Surinamese and Morroccans (Table 1).

Table 1 Demographic development of Dutch population 1996-2006 (CBS, 2007)

	1996	**2000**	**2006**
Total population	15,493,889	15,863,950	16,334,210
Native	12,995,174	13,088,648	13,186,595
Immigrants (absolute numbers)	2,498,715	2,775,302	3,147,615
Immigrants (percentage)	16.1	17.5	19.3
Total first-generation immigrants	1,284,106	1,431,122	1,604,259
Western immigrants	522,554	544,890	584,268
Non-Western immigrants, including:	761,552	886,232	1,019,991
Moroccans	140,572	152,540	168,504
Antilleans	55,808	69,266	80,102
Surinamese	179,266	183,249	187,483
Turks	167,248	177,754	195,711
Other non-Western immigrants	218,658	303,423	388,191
Total second-generation immigrants*	1,214,609	1,344,180	1,543,356
Western immigrants	805,048	821,645	843,297
Non-Western immigrants, including:	409,561	522,535	700,059
Moroccans	84,516	109,681	154,735
Antilleans	31,016	37,931	49,581
Surinamese	101,349	119,265	144,407
Turks	104,266	131,136	168,622
Other non-Western immigrants	88,414	124,522	182,714

* Second-generation immigrants were born in the Netherlands, from at least one of their parents was born elsewhere.

According to the study of Garssen and Zorlu (2005) since 1972, the number of non-Western immigrants in the Netherlands has multiplied by ten, while the non-Western population increased with 1.5 million between 1972 and 2005, the total Dutch population increased by three million in the same period. Therefore, in the past three decades non-Western immigrants were responsible for half of the population growth in the Netherlands. Garssen and Zorlu have also emphasized that the increase of non-Western immigrants is partially caused by the growing share of the second generation immigrants. According to the latest data of CBS (2007), in the last ten years, since 1996, the sharpest rise in absolute number of the second generation immigrants was among Moroccans with 70,219 and among Turks with 64,356 second generation immigrants (Table 1).

The increasing number of the first and the second generation non-Western immigrants in Dutch society has drawn attention to the position and socio-cultural and structural integration of immigrants (see Bijl et al., 2005; Dagevos et al., 2003). A comparative evaluation between the first and the second generation within the different immigrant groups show that the dominant trend is a greater degree of socio-cultural integration among the second generation immigrants. Members of the second generation have more contacts with native Dutch persons, have a better command of the Dutch language and more modern opinions in comparison to the first generation (Dagevos et al., 2003). Table 2 shows the share of immigrants spending most free time with people who have the same ethnic background. As can be clearly seen from Table 2 the percentages among all ethnic groups in spending free time with their own ethnic group decreased sharply among the second generation. Gender and education level play also an important role in immigrants' choice in spending free time. While females and less educated immigrants are more oriented to their own ethnic group in their relationships, contrary males and higher educated immigrants are less oriented to their own ethnic group.

Table 2 Share of immigrants spending most free time with people who have the same 'ethnic' background (in percentages) (SCP/LAS, 2004/2005)

	Turks	Moroccans	Antilleans	Surinamese
Total	64	50	35	35
Male	60	49	29	35
Female	69	53	41	35
Age				
15-24 year	61	42	36	35
25-44 year	61	51	32	36
45-65 year	75	64	40	34
Education				
VBO/MAVO	60	47	39	35
MBO/HAVO/VWO	55	37	28	34
HBO/WO	53	36	26	24
Generation				
1st generation	70	56	41	38
2nd generation	53	34	11	29

* Second-generation immigrants were born in the Netherlands, from at least one of their parents was born elsewhere.

On the other hand, the level of education also differs considerably between the first and the second generation immigrants. Among the first generation immigrants the level of education is lower compared to native Dutch whereas the level of education of the second generation immigrants does not differ significantly from native Dutch (Zorlu and Traag, 2005). Depending on their better educational level the second generation immigrants in general have a better position in the labor market than the first generation. However, in 2004, after years of economic recession, the labor market participation among immigrants has decreased to 48 percent and the unemployment rate was 16 percent among immigrants, three times higher compared to native Dutch (Zorlu and Traag, 2005). This has led to the increasing numbers of the first and the second generation immigrants choose to become self-employed.

After this historical overview of the immigration and the current situation of immigrants in the Netherlands, we will discuss in the next sub-section the labour market positions of different migrant groups and ethnic/migrant entrepreneurship in the Netherlands.

3.2. Immigrant entrepreneurship in the Netherlands

Since the late 1980s the number of immigrant entrepreneurs has sharply risen in the Netherlands. While there were about 12,000 non-Western immigrant entrepreneurs in 1989, this number more than tripled and reached to 44,700 by 2002 (EIM, 2004). Between 1999 and 2004 the total number of entrepreneurs in the Netherlands increased from 925,800 to 939,799 (Table 3). Within this period, the highest increase was among non-Western immigrants, compared to native and Western entrepreneurs. The number of non-Western entrepreneurs increased from 34,100 in 1999 to 46,900 in 2004, with an increase of 3.8 percent. Among Western immigrants the number of entrepreneurs increased from 72,700 to 74,500 (0.2 percent) and among native Dutch the number of entrepreneurs decreased from 819,000 in 1999 to 818,300 in 2004. A decrease in the number of native Dutch entrepreneurs is especially observed after 2001. On the other hand, a decrease in the number of Western entrepreneurs after 2003 draws also attention. It seems while there is an increasing trend to become entrepreneur among non –Western immigrants, there is a decreasing trend to become entrepreneur among Western immigrants and native Dutch. This fact can be partially explained by the recession in the Dutch economy after 2001.

Table 3 Development of number of entrepreneurs in the Netherlands, 1999-2004 (CBS, 2007)

Year	Native entrepreneurs	Western immigrants entrepreneurs	Non-Western immigrant entrepreneurs			Total
			1st generation	2nd generation	1st and 2nd generation	
1999	819,000	72,700	30,200	3,900	34,100	925,800
2000	835,400	75,000	33,700	4,700	38,400	948,806
2001	845,100	77,200	38,100	5,500	43,600	965,900
2002	841,400	77,200	39,500	6,000	45,500	964,100
2003	842,300	77,300	40,700	6,400	47,100	966,799
2004	818,300	74,500	40,100	6,800	46,900	939,799

Among non-Western immigrant entrepreneurs the highest increase in the number of entrepreneurs was among the second generation immigrant entrepreneurs between 1999 and 2004. While the increase rate for the first generation was 3.3 percent, it was 7.4 percent for the second generation. However, among both the first and the second generation non-Western immigrants the self-employment rate lags behind both Western immigrants as well as native Dutch (Bijl et al., 2005). While among native Dutch 9.2 percent of the labor force population chooses to become an entrepreneur, among non-Western immigrants this percentage is 4.1 percent (Table 4). Nevertheless, between 1999 and 2003 the self-employment rate increased more rapidly among non-Western immigrants than among native Dutch and Western immigrants.

Table 4 Development of self-employment rate among native Dutch, Western and non-Western immigrants, 1999-2003 (Bijl et al., 2005)

	1999	2003
Native Dutch entrepreneurs	8.9	9.2
Western immigrant entrepreneurs	7.1	7.2
Non-Western immigrant entrepreneurs, including :	3.6	4.1
-First-generation immigrants	3.9	4.5
-Second-generation immigrants	2.5	2.8
Total	8.3	8.5

In absolute numbers the largest group of immigrant entrepreneurs in the Netherlands, among both the first and the second generation originate from Turkey and Surinam (Table 5). However, in the period 1999-2004 the sharpest rise was among Moroccan entrepreneurs, namely 64 percent.

Table 5 Number of entrepreneurs (x1,000)*, 1999-2004 (CBS, 2007)

Year	Turkey	Morocco	Netherlands/ Antilles	Surinam
1999	7.9	2.8	1.5	6.4
2000	9.2	3.3	1.8	7.1
2001	11.0	4.0	2.0	7.8
2002	11.5	4.3	2.1	7.9
2003	11.9	4.4	2.2	8.0
2004	11.8	4.6	2.1	7.7

*This table includes both first- and second-generation immigrant entrepreneurs

There are considerable differences in the self-employment rates among the different ethnic groups. First generation Chinese immigrants are most active as entrepreneurs in comparison to the other ethnic groups (Table 6). Also, Chinese immigrants choose to become an entrepreneur almost twice as often as native Dutch (Bijl et al., 2005). On the other hand, the relative growth of the self-employment rate is higher among Turkish than among Chinese immigrants (Table 6).

Table 6 Self-employment rates among non-Western immigrants, 1999-2003 (Bijl et al. 2005)

	1999	2003
Turks	3.9	5.1
First generation	4.4	5.7
Second generation	2.0	3.0
Moroccans	1.7	2.3
First generation	1.8	2.5
Second generation	0.9	1.4
Surinamese	3.0	3.4
First generation	3.1	3.6
Second generation	2.6	2.7
Antilleans	2.1	2.3
First generation	1.8	2.0
Second generation	3.3	3.7
Chinese	16.9	15.7
First generation	18.9	17.2
Second generation	6.9	7.2

With regard to the sectors in which immigrant entrepreneurs set up their businesses, it appears that in the past decade immigrants more often set up businesses other than traditional sectors (EIM, 2004; CBS, 2007). Although the hotel and catering industry is still most popular among the first generation, the percentage has declined considerably. Instead, the first generation chooses more often to become active in other sectors like business in the business or producer services which include finance, insurance, real estate and business related professional services, such as accounting, consulting, marketing, engineering, or design, most of which employ a high quotient of technical, professional and managerial jobs. The second generation is predominantly represented in the producer services sector. In 2002, one-quarter of the second generation start a business in this sector. As a result, the sectoral distribution of the second generation has become more similar to the native Dutch entrepreneurs than the first generation.

Table 7 Sectoral distribution among first and second-generation non-Western immigrant entrepreneurs, 1999-2002 (in percentages) (EIM, 2004)

	First generation		**Second generation**	
	1999	**2002**	**1999**	**2002**
Sector				
Agriculture / fishing	2	2	3	2
Minerals / industry/ energy	5	4	3	4
Building industry	3	5	6	7
Trade and reparation business	26	25	22	21
Hotel and catering industry	35	31	14	12
Transportation, storage and communication	3	5	6	7
Financial institutions	1	1	3	2
Producer services / business to business	12	15	22	25
Public administration / education	3	3	3	2
Healthcare and public welfare	3	3	6	5
Other services	7	8	14	14
Total	100	100	100	100

According to the study of Dagevos and Gesthuizen (2005), Surinamese and Antillean entrepreneurs are more often active in the producer services than other ethnic groups (Table 8). Among Turkish entrepreneurs there is a more than average increase of entrepreneurs in the producer services as well.

Table 8 Sectoral distribution among non-Western immigrant entrepreneurs, 2004 (in percentages) (Dagevos and Gesthuizen, 2005)

	Turks	**Moroccans**	**Surinamese**	**Antilleans**
Agriculture / fishing	4	2	0	1
Industry	5	2	3	3
Building industry	7	6	6	12
Trade and reparation business	6	6	3	2
Wholesale	9	7	11	10
Retail trade	19	26	15	11
Hotel and catering industry	20	17	9	6
Transportation, storage and communication	6	8	6	3
Financial institutions	1	0	2	1
Real estate	1	1	3	1
Producer services / business to business	16	14	24	30
Other services	6	11	18	19

The research study on first and second generation immigrant entrepreneurs in Dutch cities conducted by Rusinovic in 2006 shows also some interesting results about the differences between the first and the second generation immigrant entrepreneurs. According to the results of this research which consists of 252 immigrant entrepreneurs in the Netherlands, among the first generation the largest group (31 percent) is active in an ethnic market, whereas among the second generation this percentage has declined to 15 percent. The first generation is more often embedded in ethnic markets and depends more than the second generation on informal as well as transnational networks in running their businesses. In comparison to the first generation the second generation is more often embedded in mainstream markets (38 percent) and almost three-quarters of the second generation are at least partially embedded in formal networks. However, Rusinovic has mentined that this does not mean that the importance of embeddedness in informal networks has disappeared with successive generations. For the second generation entrepreneurs embeddedness in formal and informal social networks are not mutually exclusive options, but the formal and informal networks overlap or complement each other. The results of Rusinovic's research show also that the embeddedness in transnational networks remains of importance for the second generation, however, the transnational involvement among the second generation has declined compared to the first generation. According to Rusinovic, among the second generation transnational involvement has become more a strategic choice –'strategic transnationalism'- whereas among the first generation it is more often a necessity.

An overall evaluation of immigrant entrepreneurship in the Netherlands highlights the changing trends in recent years. The new trends have emerged as a new orientation to non-traditional sectors or sectoral change in immigrant entrepreneurship towards especially to producer services and as an increasing number of second generation immigrant entrepreneurs.

3.3. Turkish entrepreneurship in the Netherlands

The first wave of Turkish immigration to the Netherlands took place in the 1960s and 1970s. The shortage of unskilled labourers led the Dutch government to sign a treaty with the Turkish government for the immigration of what are known as 'guest labourers'. According to Dieleman (1993) many immigrants came to the Netherlands in the 1960s and 1970s to work in the old industries. Dutch companies recruited these people for heavy, unskilled work (Houtzager and Rodrigues, 2002). As elsewhere, they filled the demand for workers at the bottom of the job market. The Netherlands went through a long period of economic growth during these years, and the number of Turkish immigrants grew strongly. The first oil crisis was the end of the official recruitment of Turkish guest workers, and the number of entrants decreased. The occurrence of the second oil crisis caused an economic crisis and a decrease in the demand for workers. A long-term unemployment became a serious problem. After this period, migration from Turkey almost solely existed of family reunification (bringing wife and children to the Netherlands), family formation (bringing in a marriage partner from their country of origing) and asylum migration. Both the Turkish guest workers and the Dutch government thought their stay would be temporary at first. After a brief working they planned to return to their home country with the savings in the Netherlands. Nevertheless, most of the Turkish guest workers decided to stay and brought their wives and children to the Netherlands. Many people came to the country because of this family reunification and the Turks became permanents habitants of the Netherlands. As the economic crisis hit the Dutch economy in 1970s, especially the old industries, many immigrants faced with exclusion from new job opportunities in the restructured urban economy (e.g., in the service sector), a number of them tried to make a niche as small business entrepreneurs.

Nowadays, the Turks are the major immigrant group in the country. In 2004, about 350 000 first and second generation Turks lived in the Netherlands, which is about 2.2% of the Dutch population (Euwals et al. 2007). Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands are on average younger than the natives, and they have more often children, and usually they have a lower level of education. The participation in the labour market lags significantly behind that of the native Dutch population in the Netherlands. The employment rate for Turkish men is 23% points lower than for native men (Euwals et al. 2007). The relatively low level of education of Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands may be a reason for a less favourable labour market position of Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands.

Choenni (1997) noted that more than 10% of the Turkish working population in Amsterdam consists of entrepreneurs, and they constitute about 20% of all ethnic entrepreneurs in Amsterdam. The hospitality sector (restaurants, cafés, bars) is an important domain for Turkish entrepreneurs. Recent research indicates that, in relation to the total population, Turkish entrepreneurs account for the highest percentage of start-ups among all groups (including the native Dutch) in the Netherlands: 11.5% of the Turkish working population started their own firm in 2000, versus 6.5% of all other groups (www.kvk.nl). Jansen et al. (2003) mentioned that, despite certain disadvantages compared with the native Dutch population, immigrants from Turkey show the same rate of entrepreneurship. Although the Turkish immigrants show similar characteristics to other immigrants (from Morocco, Suriname and the Antilles), their rate of entrepreneurship is much higher. According to Masurel and Nijkamp (2003), Turkish entrepreneurs account for the highest percentage of start-ups among all groups, in relation to the total population (including the Dutch native population).

Today, Turks are the largest entrepreneurial group in the country. The relative growth of the entrepreneurship rate is higher among Turkish immigrants, in relation to other non-western groups. Between 1999 and 2004 the total number of Turkish entrepreneurs in the Netherlands increased from 7,900 to 11,700 (see Table 8). Among Turkish immigrant entrepreneurs there is an increasing group of second-generation immigrants. In 1999, out of the 7,900 Turkish entrepreneurs, 800 were of second-generation whereas in 2004 out of the 11,700 Turkish entrepreneurs, 1,800 consist of second-generation immigrant entrepreneurs. While the increase rate for the first generation was 1.4 percent, it was 2.3 percent for the second generation.

Table 9 Development of Turkish entrepreneurship in the Netherlands (CBS, 2007)

	1999	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**
First generation	7,100	8,200	9,600	10,000	10,200	9,900
Second generation	800	1,000	1,300	1,500	1,700	1,800
Total	7,900	9,200	10,900	11,500	11,900	11,700

Most Turkish entrepreneurs are working in the hospitality sector (bars, cafes, restaurants), but nowadays, we can see a shift to different sectors (see Table 8). According to Dagevos and Gesthuizen (2005), there is a more than average increase of entrepreneurs in the producer services (finance, insurance, real-estate, and business related professional services). Therefore, the next section will investigate the motivation, driving forces and goals and strategies of Turkish entrepreneurs in these new sectors.

4. New Orientations of Turkish Entrepreneurs in the Netherlands

4.1. Prefatory Remarks

Our study aims to investigate the new orientations in ethnic entrepreneurship in terms of motivation, sector choice, goals and strategies of new generation ethnic entrepreneurs. What is the motivation and orientation of new generation ethnic entrepreneurs? How far are new generation ethnic entrepreneurs from their ethnic groups or their ethnic niches in the market? Can a new orientation –external orientation- help to break out from the ethnic dependency or to escape from the situation of being an ethnic enclave? Can the different motivation and orientation of new generation ethnic entrepreneurs help in breaking out strategies? In order to answer these questions our study focuses on external orientations of new generation ethnic entrepreneurs while addressing in particular the way and the extent to which the choice for entrepreneurship is made by higher educated ethnic young generation.

Our study analyses the motivation, goals and strategies of the second generation Turkish entrepreneurs in the ICT and FIRE sector in the Netherlands. The sample of our study consists of totally 23 Turkish entrepreneurs that of 16 are active in ICT sector and 7 are active in FIRE sector. Our sample considers three groups of companies/entrepreneurs in the ICT sector: automation companies, software computer programming companies and internet service provider companies and in the FIRE sector: finance, insurance, real estate, consulting and accountancy companies that require a higher educational level and skills and that is very far from any ethnic niche in terms of products, services and communication channels. The empirical data of our research are based on in-depth personal interviews held in the first half of 2007. Much information about the entrepreneurs was provided first from the Turkish businesses website "Webisrehberi" for the contact addresses and then during the survey in an informal way using both the ethnic and business networks and relations among entrepreneurs.

In the present section we will evaluate the empirical results of our case study research in three parts. In Sub-section 4.2. we will examine the profile of the second generation Turkish entrepreneurs in terms of personal characteristics, motivation, driving force and entrepreneurial family tradition. And next, in Sub-section 4.3. we will examine the profile of Turkish enterprises in ICT and FIRE sector in terms of enterprise features, performance, profiles of employees and clients and goals and strategies. After this evaluation of the empirical results of our case study research, we will discuss and evaluate the new orientation of the second generation Turkish entrepreneurs in Sub-section 4.4.

4.2. Profile of Turkish entrepreneurs in ICT and FIRE sector

The Dutch Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) defines the second generation immigrants as persons who were born in the Netherlands from at least one parent who was born abroad (CBS, 2007). However, some researches argue that age at arrival may also play a role with post-immigration educational attainment (Chiswick and Miller, 1994; Masurel and Nijkamp, 2004; Veenman, 1996). According to these researches the important question is not where one is born but formation and education are at least equally important. From this approach Veenman (1996) defines the second generation as all children from foreign migrants who are born in the Netherlands or immigrant to the Netherlands at an age of younger than six. Masurel and Nijkamp (2004) add an alternative definition while taking the age of twelve years or the border between primary and secondary education. In this study, we will follow the alternative definition developed by Masurel and Nijkamp and we will put more emphasis on the educational attainment in defining the second generation Turkish entrepreneurs.

Personal characteristics

An examination of the personal characteristics of Turkish entrepreneurs in ICT and FIRE sector (Table 10) shows that the majority of the entrepreneurs (74%) falls between the age 30 and 49, and that most of them are married (65%) with children (78%). When the arrival year is taken into consideration we see that more than half of the entrepreneurs (52%) came between 1971 and 1980 (when they were younger than twelve years) whereas 22% were born in the Netherlands. Therefore, the majority (74%) of the entrepreneurs falls in the category of the second generation with their educational attainment (83%) in the Netherlands. While the majority (61%) graduated from higher vocational schools and universities, the rest (39%) graduated from middle vocational or secondary schools. Depending on their arrival year and educational attainment in the Netherlands all of them can speak Dutch fluently or good and most of them (83%) can speak English fluently or good as well. An overall evaluation of personal characteristics of the second generation Turkish entrepreneurs draws attention to their higher educational level and language ability.

Motivation, driving force and entrepreneurial tradition

When we look at the position, the previous experience and the previous sector of Turkish entrepreneurs before the start (Table 11), we see that the majority (78%) of the entrepreneurs was employed, 13% was student and 9% was already active as an entrepreneur in their previous position. While in general unemployment is observed as a driving force to become entrepreneur for many immigrants, in our case unemployment was not found as a driving force. On the contrary, it seems previous experience of entrepreneurs through employment and entrepreneurship (82%), moreover the obtaining way of this experience as an employee and entrepreneur in the same sector (69%) create a pulling effect to become entrepreneur. The sector choice of entrepreneurs supports also this pulling effect. Almost 40% of the entrepreneurs have oriented to this sector because of the big demand or the gap in the sector whereas the other 40% of the entrepreneurs have choosen this sector because of their work experience and 20% because of their education. The current situation of the sector was evaluated by the majority of the entrepreneurs (52%) as a growing sector, while emphasizing the existence of a lot of changes (17%) as well as a high competition (17%) in the sector. This growing and promising sector structure can be another pull effect for entrepreneurs. The existence of Turkish entrepreneurs in the same sector does not show a clear evidence of the attractiveness of this sector for entrepreneurs. 48% of the entrepreneurs have mentioned that the share of Turks in the sector is decreasing while 30% have claimed contrary that the share of Turks is increasing.

When we look at the reasons to become an entrepreneur, the first reason appears as to be independent and to be own boss (78%). Flexibility with a share of 13% ranks as the second reason. It seems to have an extra income (9%) is not an important reason to become entrepreneur. While more than half of the entrepreneurs (52%) have an entrepreneur family member that can be evaluated as another motivation or driving force to become entrepreneur, the other factors such as capital sources and information sources show that entrepreneurs are not dependent to their family or friends. 91% of the entrepreneurs have used their own capital or have obtained from financial institutions and 78% have used their own experience or have obtained information from formal institutions and fellow entrepreneurs. Only 13% of the entrepreneurs have obtained information from family and relatives. All these figures clearly show that the second generation Turkish entrepreneurs are quite independent from their ethnic niche.

Table 10 Personal characteristics of (second-generation) Turkish entrepreneurs

	Number of entrepreneurs	**Share in total (%)**
Age		
20 - 29	4	17
30 - 39	10	44
40 - 49	7	30
50>	2	9
Marital status		
Single	5	22
Married	15	65
Divorced	3	13
Family status		
With children	18	78
Without children	5	22
Education level		
Secondary school level	2	9
Middle vocational training	7	30
Higher vocational training	6	26
University	8	35
Education place		
The Netherlands	19	83
Turkey	3	13
Other	1	4
Language ability (Dutch)		
Fluently	19	83
Good	4	17
Moderate	0	0
None	0	0
Language ability (English)		
Fluently	10	44
Good	9	39
Moderate	3	13
None	1	4
Arrival year in the Netherlands		
born	5	22
1961-1970	1	4
1971-1980	12	52
1981-1990	2	9
1991-2000	3	13
Total	**23**	**100**

Table 11 Motivation and driving forces of (second-generation) Turkish entrepreneurs

	Number of entrepreneurs	Share in total (%)
Position before starting		
Employed	18	78
Unemployed	0	0
Entrepreneur	2	9
Student	3	13
Previous experience		
Through employment	15	65
Through entrepreneurship	4	17
Through school or study	4	17
Previous sector		
Employee in the same sector	15	65
Employee in different sector	1	4
Entrepreneur in the same sector	1	4
Entrepreneur in different sector	4	17
Student	2	9
Sector choice		
GAP/Big demand	9	39
Work experience	9	39
Education	5	22
Situation of the sector		
Growing/increasing	12	52
Smaller/decreasing	3	13
Changes a lot	4	17
High competition	4	17
Turks in the sector		
Growing/increasing	7	30
Smaller/decreasing	11	48
No idea	5	22
The reasons to be entrepreneur		
To be independent/to be own boss	18	78
Extra income	2	9
Flexibility	3	13
Entrepreneur in the family		
Yes	12	52
No	11	48
Capital sources		
Own capital	17	74
Family or friends	2	9
Financial institutions	4	17
Information sources		
Own experience	14	61
Relatives and family	3	13
Formal institutions and fellow entrepreneurs	4	17
Combination of 1, 2 and 3	2	9
Total	**23**	**100**

4.3. Profile of Turkish enterprises in ICT and FIRE sector

The features of Turkish enterprises in ICT and FIRE sector

Turkish enterprises in our case study are in two sectors: ICT sector which consists of three groups of companies/entrepreneurs viz. automation companies, software computer programming companies and internet service provider companies and FIRE sector which consists of finance, insurance, real estate, consulting and accountancy companies (Table 12). However, the majority of the enterprises (70%) in our sample is in the ICT sector. When we examine the features of the enterprises we observe that the second generation Turkish entrepreneurship has started after 1996 and there is an enormous increase in start-up enterprises especially after 2000. More than half of the enterprises (57%) in our sample have started after 2000. Most of the enterprises are small (65%) whereas the majority (61%) has less than five workers. On the other hand, sole proprietorship is the main feature of the most enterprises (74%).

Table 12 Business characteristics of (second-generation) Turkish entrepreneurs

	Number of enterprises	**Share in total (%)**
Activities of the enterprise		
ICT sector	16	70
FIRE sector	7	30
Foundation year of enterprise		
1986-1990	1	4
1991-1995	0	0
1996-2000	9	39
2001+	13	57
Proprietorship		
Sole proprietorship	17	74
Partnership	6	26
Number of employees		
No employee	1	4
1-5 employees	14	61
6-15 employees	8	35
Total	**23**	**100**

Performance of Turkish Enterprises in ICT and FIRE sector

When the development of sales and the profit of last year are examined for Turkish enterprises in ICT and FIRE sector in terms of their performance, 91% of the enterprises had an increase in sales, while the rest 9% had about the same level (Table 13). The profit of last year shows the same success level, while 87% of the entrepreneurs had a positive profit, 13% had the same profit. There are no decrease in development of sales and no negative profit at all. These figures show a very high economic performance.

Table 13 Performance of (second-generation) Turkish entrepreneurs

	Number of enterprises	Share in total (%)
Development of sales		
Increase	21	91
Decrease	0	0
Same	2	9
Profit last year		
Positive	20	87
Negative	0	0
Same	3	13
Total	**23**	**100**

Profile of employees and clients of Turkish enterprises in ICT and FIRE sector

When we examine the number and the composition of employees, we see that 23 Turkish enterprises in ICT and FIRE sector provide an employment opportunity for 111 persons of which 64% from their own ethnic group (Table 14). Although Turkish entrepreneurs exhibit an independent profile on the basis of motivation and driving forces as well as capital and information sources, here interestingly we observe a relatively high dependency to own ethnic group in terms of hiring employees. While 22% of the entrepreneurs have explained this fact by a need for Turkish employees because of their Turkish clients, 13% have clearly mentioned that they prefer Turkish employees for many reasons. However, more than half of the entrepreneurs (57%) have mentioned that they prefer to hire Dutch employees. These figures show that the highest dependency to own ethnic group when compared with the other factors appears in the composition of employees. However, these figures can be also evaluated as a sign of transformation from own ethnic group to other groups in hiring employees. On the other hand, when we examine the composition of the clients, we observe that almost half of the enterprises (48%) have non-Turkish clients and international clients, while 13% have mixed clients with a majority (80%) of Dutch clients, almost 40% have mixed clients with a majority (80%) of Turkish clients. Even the majority of the enterprises (60%) serve non-Turkish clients, the share of Turkish clients is quite high and here we observe once more a dependency to own ethnic group.

Goals and strategies of Turkish enterprises in ICT and FIRE sector

When we examine the target groups of the enterprises as a part of their goals and strategies, we observe once more a relatively high dependency to clients from own ethnic group. 35% of the entrepreneurs have indicated that their target group is Turks (Table 15). 35% of the entrepreneurs have mentioned that they have no target group, whereas 22% have mentioned that their target group is Dutch natives and other groups. On the other hand, the strategies of the majority (57%) have been mentioned as to grow the business and to provide more products and services. Specialization has been another strategy for 30% of the enterprises.

Table 14 Profile of employees and clients of (second-generation) Turkish entrepreneurs

	Number of employees	Share in total (%)
Composition of employees		
Total employees	111	100
Nationality of employees		
Turkish employees	71	64
Non-Turkish employees	40	36
Preferences for employees	**Number of enterprises**	**Share in total (%)**
Need for Turkish employees, because of Turkish clients	5	22
No Turkish employees at all	2	9
Preference for Turkish employees	3	13
Preference for Dutch native employees	13	57
Composition of clients (%)	**Number of enterprises**	**Share in total (%)**
Nationality of clients (individual clients + firms)		
80 % Turks – 20 % Natives	9	39
20 % Turks – 80 % Natives	3	13
Non-Turkish clients	8	35
International clients	3	13
Total	**23**	**100**

Table 15 Goals and strategies

Target group	Number of enterprises	Share in total (%)
Turks	8	35
Dutch natives and other groups	5	22
No target group	8	35
Other (mixed)	2	9
Strategies		
Growth + More products and services	13	57
Specialization	7	30
Moving to Turkey	3	13
Total	**23**	**100**

Support from family and social network

When the support obtained from family and social networks is examined, it is seen that the majority of the entrepreneurs (at average 70%) have not taken any support from their family and social networks (Table 16). The highest rates appear in obtaining financial support with a rate of 35% and operationally support with a rate of 39%. However, these figures cannot be evaluated as an ethnic dependency as in general many of the entrepreneurs who are owner of the small enterprises obtain similar supports from family members.

Table 16 Support from family and social networks

	Number of enterprises	Share in total (%)
Financial support from family		
Yes	8	35
No	15	65
Managerially support from family		
Yes	2	9
No	21	91
Operationally support from family		
Yes	9	39
No	14	61
Support from social network		
Yes	7	30
No	16	70
Total	**23**	**100**

4.4. Evaluation of the new orientation of Turkish enterpreneurs

In this section we will evaluate the empirical results of our case study research and we will try to answer the research questions that we raised.

An overall evaluation of the empirical results of our case study research shows that the second generation Turkish entrepreneurship in the Netherlands has started after 1996 and there has been an enormous increase in start-up enterprises especially after 2000. Depending on the arrival year of the Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands we may expect this increase in start-up second generation enterprises to continue in the future. We may also expect that the sector choice of the second generation Turkish entrepreneurs will be different than the first generation, probably will be more oriented to non-traditional, new developing and promising sectors such as ICT, FIRE or may be education and health sectors where immigrant employment is becoming increasingly significant (between 20% and 30% of immigrants work is in one of these two sectors in Finland, Switzerland, Sweden and the UK (OECD, 2006)) in many European countries nowadays.

What is the motivation and orientation of new generation ethnic entrepreneurs?

The results of our investigation demonstrate that the motivation and driving forces of the second generation Turkish entrepreneurs are stemming from both their personal characteristics shaped by their higher educational level and language ability and their previous working experience as an employee or entrepreneur in the same sector. The demand for and a gap in the sector as well as the growing and promising structure of the sector seem to play an important role in pulling the second generation Turkish immigrants to become entrepreneur. As a summary, we can say that the motivation and driving forces of the second generation Turkish immigrants can be explained by the pull factors. While their main motivation to become entrepreneur appears as to be independent and flexible, the other reason can be an entrepreneurial spirit which is stemming from entrepreneurial family tradition as more than half of the entrepreneurs have an entrepreneur family member.

How far are new generation ethnic entrepreneurs from their ethnic groups or their ethnic niches in the market?

The results of our study show that the second generation Turkish entrepreneurs are quite independent from their own ethnic group in terms of obtaining capital and information. They tend to use their own capital and own knowledge and experience and when necessary they tend to apply to formal and financial institutions. We can say that their approach and behaviour differently than their first generation counterparts are formal. This clearly shows that the second generation Turkish entrepreneurs are quite independent from their ethnic niche. However, when the number and the composition of employees and clients are examined this picture changes a little bit. Although the second generation Turkish entrepreneurs exhibit an independent profile on the basis of motivation and driving forces as well as capital and information sources, here a relatively high dependency to own ethnic group in terms of hiring employees and serving clients draw attention. A relatively higher rate of Turkish clients as a target group also highlights a relatively high dependency to clients from own ethnic group. This fact can be explained by a reason to benefit from both own ethnic group and the other groups in the market. Why to escape from potential and ready clients from own ethnic group? From this perspective, a relatively higher level of employees and clients cannot be seen as an ethnic dependency. Contrary, this can be evaluated as a way in expanding the market and a transformation period from an internal orientation to an external orientation.

Can a new orientation –external orientation- help to break out from the ethnic dependency or to escape from the situation of being an ethnic enclave? Can the different motivation and orientation of new generation ethnic entrepreneurs help in breaking out strategies?

The results of our investigation show that a new orientation to non-traditional sector or in other words, an external orientation with a combination of personal characteristics, skills and experience may cause a very high economic performance and success level of the second generation Turkish entrepreneurs. Therefore, this new orientation may also help in escaping from the situation of being an ethnic enclave and breaking out the ethnic dependency. This external orientation on the other hand may help in expanding the market. However, this external orientation never neglects to benefit from the own ethnic group.

5. Concluding Remarks

A growing number of the second generation migrant entrepreneurs and an orientation to non-traditional sectors have become the new trends in migrant entrepreneurship in recent years. Although traditional sectors are still most popular among the first generation migrant entrepreneurs, due to the increasing pressure and high competitiveness in traditional areas, new niches are developing and while the first generation has more often become active in these new areas like producer services which include finance, insurance, real estate and business related professional services, the second generation have contributed to the emergence of new areas of immigrant business activity such as ICT and creative industries.

Similar trends are also observed in the Netherlands. A general evaluation of immigrant entrepreneurship in the Netherlands highlights a sectoral change in immigrant entrepreneurship towards especially to producer services and an increasing number of second generation immigrant entrepreneurs in these sectors.

Our study investigated the new –external- orientations in immigrant entrepreneurship in terms of motivation, sector choice, goals and strategies of the second generation immigrant entrepreneurs while addressing the second generation Turkish entrepreneurs in ICT and FIRE sector in the Netherlands. The results of our study show that the second generation Turkish entrepreneurship in the Netherlands has started after 1996 and there has been an enormous increase in start-up enterprises especially after 2000. The results of our study show also that the motivation and driving forces of the second generation Turkish entrepreneurs are stemming from both their personal characteristics shaped by their higher educational level and language ability and their previous working experience as an employee or entrepreneur in the same sector. The demand for and a gap in the sector as well as the growing and promising structure of the sector play also an important role in pulling the second generation Turkish immigrants to become entrepreneur in these new sectors. The results of our study show on the other hand that the second generation Turkish entrepreneurs are less oriented to ethnic co-clientele, more embedded in formal networks while keeping their informal networks as a complementary option.

References

Aldrich, H.E., R. Waldinger (1990). Ethnicity and Entrepreneurship. *Annual Review of Sociology* **16:** 111-135.

Basu, A. (1998). An Exploration of Entrepreneurial Activity among Asian Small Businesses in Britain. *Small Business Economics* **10:** 313-326.

Bates, T. (1997). Financing Small Business Creation: The Case of Chinese and Korean Immigrant Entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing* **12:** 109-124.

Baycan-Levent, T., E. Masurel, P. Nijkamp (2005). Break-Out Strategies of Ethnic Entrepreneurs. In: T.N. Vaz, E.J. Morgan, P. Nijkamp (Eds) *The New European Rurality; Strategies for Small Firms.* Ashgate, Aldershot, 143-156.

Bijl, R.V., A. Zorlu, A.S. van Rijn, R.P.W. Jeenissen, M. Blom (2005). *The Integration Monitor 2005: The social integration of migrants monitored over time: trend and cohort analyses.* Ministry of Justice Research and Documentation Centre and Statistics Netherlands

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (CBS) (2007). http://www.cbs.nl 2007

Chiswick, B.R., P.W. Miller (1994). The Determinants of Post-Immigration Investments in Education. *Economics of Education Review* **13(2):** 163-177.

Choenni, A. (1997). *Veelsoortig Assortiment.* Het Spinhuis, Amsterdam 1997

Dagevos, J., M. Gijsberts, C van Praag (2003). *Rapportage minderheden 2003: onderwijs, arbeid en sociaal-culturele integratie.* Den Haag: SCP

Dagevos, J., M. Gesthuizen (2005). *Niet-westerse allochtonen met een stabiele arbeidsmarktpositie: aantallen en ontwikkelingen.* SCP: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau, Den Haag, November 2005.

Deakins, D. (1999). *Entrepreneurship and Small Firms.* Second Edition, McGrawHill, London.

Deakins, D., M. Majunder, A. Paddison (1997). Developing Success Strategies for Ethnic Minorities in Business: Evidence from Scotland. *New Community* **23:** 325-342.

Delft, H. van, C. Gorter, P. Nijkamp (2000). In Search of Ethnic Entrepreneurship in the City. *Environmental Planning C* **18:** 429-451.

Dieleman, F. (1993). Multicultural Holland: Myth or Reality? In: R. King (Ed) *Mass Migrations in Europe: The Legacy and the Future.* Belhaven Press, London, 118-135.

Dyer, L.M., C.A. Ross (2000). Ethnic Enterprises and their Clientele. *Journal of Small Business Management* **38(2):** 48-66.

EIM (2004). *Monitor Etnisch Ondernemerschap 2004.* Onderzoek voor Bedrijf & Beleid, Zoetermeer: Ministerie van Economische Zaken, November 2004.

Euwals, R., J. Dagevos, M. Gijsberts and H. Roodenburg (2007). *Immigration, Integration and the Labour Market: Turkish Immigrants in Germany and the Netherlands.* Discussion Paper Series, IZA DP No. 2677

Garssen, J., A. Zorlu (2005). Demografie. In: *Jaarrapport Integratie 2005.* Den Haag, Voorburg: SCP / WODC / CBS: 14-27

Hartog, J., N. Vriend (1990). Young Mediterraneans in the Dutch labour market: A Comparative Analysis of Allocation and Earnings. *Oxford Economic Papers* **42:** 379- 401.

Houtzager, D., P.R. Rodrigues (2002). *Migrants, Minorities and Employment in the Netherlands; Exlusion, Disrcimination and Anti-discrimination.* Raxen 3 Report to the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC).

Kloosterman, R.C., J. van der Leun, J. Rath (1998). Across the Border; Economic Opportunities, Social Capital and Informal Businesses Activities of Immigrants. *Journal of Ethnic Migration Studies* **24:** 367-376.

Kraal, K., A. Zorlu (1998). *City Template Amsterdam. Basic Information on Ethnic Minorities and TheirParticipation.* Report According to the Grid for City Templates of the MPMC Project, Amsterdam: IMES.

Lee, Y., T. Cameroen, P. Schaeffer, C.G. Schmidt (1997). Ethnic Minority Small Business: A Comparative Analysis of Restaurants in Denver. *Urban Geography* **18(7):** 591-621.

Light, I., P. Bhacku (Eds.) (1993). *Immigration and Entrepreneurship, Culture, Capital and Ethnic Networks.* Transaction Books, New Brunswick, N.J.

Lucassen, L., R. Penninx (1997*). Newcomers. Immigrants and their Descendants in the Netherlands 1550-1995*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis (published originally in Dutch in 1994: *Nieuwkomers, Nakomelingen, Nederlanders).*

Masurel, E., P. Nijkamp (2004). Differences between first-generation and second-generation ethnic start-ups: Implications for a new support policy. Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy **22(5):** 721-737.

OECD (2006). *International Migration Outlook.* SOPEMI 2006 Edition, OECD: Paris

Ram, M., D. Smallbone (2001). *Ethnic Minority Enterprise: Policy in Practice.* Final Report prepared for the Small Business Service, June 2001.

Rath, J. (2000). Introduction: immigrant business and the economic, politico-institutional and social environment. In: J. Rath (Ed) *Immigrant Business: The Economic, Political and Social Environment.* Macmillan Press, London, 1-19.

Rettab, B. (2001). *The Emergence of Ethnic Entrepreneurship – A Conceptual Framework.* EIM/Business & Policy Research. Zoetermeer

Rusinovic, K. (2006). *Dynamic Entrepreneurship: First and second-generation immigrant entrepreneurs in Dutch cities.* IMISCOE Dissertations, Amsterdam University Press

Tillaart, H. van den, E. Poutsma (1998). *Een factor van betekenis: zelfstandig ondernemerschap van allochtonen in Nederland.* ITS, Nijmegen.

Veenman, J. (1996). *Keren de kansen? De tweede-generatie allochtonen in Nederland.* Van Gorcum, Assen.

Zorlu, A., J. Hartog (2001). *Migration and Immigrants: The case of the Netherlands.* Prepared for Migration Policy and The Economy: International Experiences, Munchen: Hans Seidel Stiftung.

Zorlu, A., T. Traag (2005). Opleidingsniveau en taalvaardigheid. In: *Jaarrapport Integratie 2005.* Den Haag, Voorburg: SCP / WODC / CBS: 44-56.