

**Entrepreneurial pursuits in the Caribbean diaspora
networks and their mixed effects**
Schøtt, Thomas

Published in:
Entrepreneurship & Regional Development

DOI:
10.1080/08985626.2018.1515825

Publication date:
2018

Document version:
Accepted manuscript

Citation for published version (APA):
Schøtt, T. (2018). Entrepreneurial pursuits in the Caribbean diaspora: networks and their mixed effects. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 30(9-10), 1069-1090.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2018.1515825>

Go to publication entry in University of Southern Denmark's Research Portal

Terms of use

This work is brought to you by the University of Southern Denmark.
Unless otherwise specified it has been shared according to the terms for self-archiving.
If no other license is stated, these terms apply:

- You may download this work for personal use only.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying this open access version

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details and we will investigate your claim.
Please direct all enquiries to puresupport@bib.sdu.dk

Entrepreneurial pursuits in the Caribbean diaspora: Networks and their mixed effects

Thomas Schøtt
University of Southern Denmark
Department of Entrepreneurship and Relationship Management
6000 Kolding
Denmark
and
Sino-Danish Center for Education and Research
Beijing
China
Tel +45 26703591
tsc@sam.sdu.dk
ORCID 0000-0002-8604-6709

Acknowledgement. Data were collected by Global Entrepreneurship Monitor. Responsibility for analysis rests with the author. Research was supported by the project DiasporaLink, www.diasporalink.org, funded by the European Union Framework Programme for Research and Innovation, Horizon 2020 Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions (MSCA) Research and Innovation Staff Exchange (RISE), H2020-MSCA-RISE-2014, Project number 645471. Work benefitted from a sojourn as Visiting Research Fellow at the Center for Migration and Development at Princeton University and from discussions in the GEM research workshop at the University of the West Indies, Barbados, in November 2015, and in the 2nd Business and Management Conference at the University of the West Indies, Jamaica, in November 2016. The article also benefitted from dialogues with reviewers and guest editors.

Disclosure statement The author declares not to have any conflict of interest.

Entrepreneurial pursuits in the Caribbean diaspora:

Networks and their mixed effects

Abstract

Domestic Caribbean entrepreneurs are embedded in their home-society. Diasporic entrepreneurs have a dual embeddedness in home-society and in host-society, with networks spanning both societies, which may give them comparative advantages in innovation, exporting and growth. Enterprising is traditionally a livelihood in the Caribbean, which is carried into the diaspora and sustained by dense ties between host- and home-societies. The empirical contribution is a three-way comparison between the Caribbean diaspora, the domestic Caribbeans, and diasporans from other world regions. It uses a representative sample of adults living in, or originating from, the Caribbean. Diasporans are found to often become entrepreneurs by a pull of opportunity, whereas domestics are more likely to experience a push of necessity. Diasporans, more than domestics, are networking in the transnational sphere and in the sphere of business operations. This networking promotes outcomes such as innovation, exporting and growth-expectations, in contrast to negative effects from networking in the private sphere. Policies may enhance benefits of diasporic entrepreneurship for Caribbean society.

Keywords: Caribbean, diaspora, embeddedness, transnational, networks.

1 Introduction: Caribbean entrepreneurship carried into the diaspora

Sir W. Arthur Lewis lamented, in the 1950s, that risk-aversion prevailed in the Caribbean, and argued that the Caribbean should promote an entrepreneurial mindset and industrialization. This has developed to some extent (Lashley 2012; Nicholson and Lashley 2016). Many people start a business, some pushed by the necessity to make a living and seeing no better possibility than starting, and some pulled by opportunities in the market (Boxill 2003). Either way, starting and running a business is traditionally a livelihood in the Caribbean (Higman and Montheith 2010; Nicholson and Lashley 2016, Ch. 2). The tradition of enterprising is carried in families and transmitted down generations (Danns 1994; Varela 2017; Wyrwich 2015). People frequently have positive attitudes toward entrepreneurship, are entrepreneurially self-efficacious, risk-willing, and opportunity-alert, and personally know entrepreneurs who may serve as role-models (Bartesaghi et al. 2016). Entrepreneurial enterprising is legitimate and valued in the culture and somewhat supported in the polity, although not as much as elsewhere around the World (Lashley 2012). Entrepreneurial success brings a livelihood, and is celebrated and rewarded with esteem and social status. This intensity of entrepreneurial activity in the Caribbean is similar to the prevalence in the rest of Central and South America, lower than the prominence in Africa, and much higher than the salience in North America and Europe, to where Caribbeans often migrate (Chamberlain 1998; Global Entrepreneurship Research Association 2016, 2017; Portes and Grosfoguel 1994; Reis 2006; Thomas-Hope 1998a).

The Caribbean tradition of enterprising is carried abroad by emigration (Ryan 1994). Specifically, when being an entrepreneur is a typical occupation in the home-country, migrants are likely to consider this occupational choice in their new host-country (Brzozowski et al. 2014). Thereby the Caribbean tradition of starting a business continues to be cultivated in the diaspora, and entrepreneurship in the diaspora becomes an extension of entrepreneurship in the Caribbean.

Entrepreneurship in the diaspora is an extension of entrepreneurship in the Caribbean also by the network of relations between entrepreneurs in the two locations. Diasporic entrepreneurs and locals in the Caribbean have dense business ties comprising exchanges of goods and services, labor and knowledge. The business relations are not like spot exchanges in a market place, but are more committed ties with long-term reciprocity and trust, sustained by old friendships and family relations and by ease of communication and trust between compatriots (Nanda and Khanna 2010; Portes et al. 2002). These dense networks are valuable, they contain social capital, both by giving access to resources, and by placing some entrepreneurs in a position to combine things from others who are not interrelated (Burt 1992). This is the position of a diasporic entrepreneur, as will be argued below.

Entrepreneurship in the diaspora is not a replica of entrepreneurship in Caribbean home-society, but is also molded by the ecology in the diaspora (Aliaga-Isla and Rialp 2013; Elo and Riddle 2016; Kontos 2003). Entrepreneurship in the two locations are phenomena to be compared. These considerations frame our research questions:

Are diasporans different from domestics in becoming entrepreneurs by experiencing pull of opportunity and push of necessity? Do diasporan entrepreneurs' dual embeddedness in both home-society and host-society, with networks spanning both societies, give them comparative advantages in innovation, exporting and growth? How does entrepreneurship in the Caribbean diaspora differ from entrepreneurship in diasporas from other regions, Europe and Sub-Saharan Africa?

Locals in Caribbean countries are compared to diasporans, both the first generation emigrants from Caribbean countries and their off-spring, second generation diasporans, who are living in other Caribbean countries (Lesser et al. 2006) and outside the Caribbean (Beckers and Blumberg 2013; Palmer 1990). We analyze a representative survey of entrepreneurs and others in the Caribbean and the diaspora (Global Entrepreneurship Research Association 2017).

The study makes specific conceptual, theoretical and empirical contributions. The conceptual contribution is to think about entrepreneurship in the diaspora as an extension of entrepreneurship in the Caribbean, both in that the tradition in the Caribbean is carried into the diaspora and in that dense ties connect diasporic entrepreneurship and domestic entrepreneurship. The theoretical contribution is to account for systemic coupling and transnational ties as emerging from the diasporans' dual embeddedness in both home-society and host-society, with consequences for entrepreneurial work. Empirically, the contribution is an account comparing Caribbean diasporic entrepreneurship to domestic entrepreneurship and to entrepreneurship in diasporas from others regions (Foner 1998; Ojo et al. 2013; Schøtt 2016, 2017a; Walther 2012).

The following sections first review prior research to develop hypotheses, then lay out research design, report analyses, and conclude by considering findings, limitations, policies, and further research.

2 Theoretical background and hypotheses

This section conceptualizes the existential condition in the diaspora as a dual embeddedness, which is then used for developing hypotheses.

2.1 Dual embeddedness of first and second generation in the diaspora

People are embedded in their society, in that society channels, empowers and constrains their lives. Embeddedness in Caribbean society means that the local tradition of enterprising is carried in the lifestyle of people and promotes thinking about becoming entrepreneur.

People migrating from a Caribbean country to another country carry this tradition with them (Ryan et al. 2015). Enterprising continues to be salient in their lifestyle, as in their home-country, and becoming an entrepreneur may be considered an appropriate occupational choice, as in their home-society. Migrants, and to some extent also their off-spring as second generation diasporans, thereby

continue to be embedded in their home-society with its tradition for enterprising (Hamilton and Dana 2008; Lassmann and Busch 2015).

Diasporans are confronted with the conditions in their host-society, where their pursuits are channeled by opportunities, empowered by resources, and constrained by rules, norms and discrimination (Barrett et al. 2003; Baycan-Levent and Nijkamp 2009; Jones et al. 2014). Thereby diasporans become embedded in their host-society.

The diasporans thus have a dual embeddedness, and their embeddedness in both home-society and host-society molds their outlook, thinking and behavior (Ojo et al. 2013; Schoorl et al. 2000; Schøtt 2016, 2017b). The dual embeddedness is the existential condition that creates ‘mixed embeddedness’, as a diasporan’s embeddedness in host-society mixed with embeddedness in a community of diasporans in the host-country (Kloosterman 2003, 2010). The composition in the dual embeddedness shifts across generations, in that embeddedness in home-society is stronger in first generation than in second generation, while embeddedness in host-society is stronger in second than in first generation (Masurel and Nijkamp 2004; Portes et al. 2009; Wyrwich 2015).

Dual embeddedness is manifest in, and reinforced by, diasporans’ networking (Brzozowski et al. 2014; Nanda and Khanna 2010; Portes and Yiu 2013). Diasporans are often networking with some in host-society and with some in home-society (Meyer and Wattiaux 2006). Their networking involves family and tourism (Nurse 2016), and their networking often involves business ties for accessing resources as social capital for reaping benefits (Meyer 2011; Gedajlovic et al. 2013). Entrepreneurs in the diaspora often have business ties not only with peers in host-country but also with peers in home-country, and thus serve as mediators (Minto-Coy 2016b). The diasporic entrepreneurs’ relations with compatriots is a source of information from home-society and relations with local peers is a source of information from host-society, useful for making investments, for trade, and for international business more broadly (Elo 2015). The information from home-society and the

information from host-society often differ, so the diasporic entrepreneur can combine two different kinds of information, from two sources that are typically unrelated. There is a structural hole in the network around the diasporan, who is uniquely able to combine the different pieces of information (Burt 1992). The dual embeddedness thus entails relations to home-society and to host-society which is a form of social capital that can bring the diasporic entrepreneur an advantage compared to other entrepreneurs in the competition for exploring and exploiting opportunities and for achievements such as innovation, exporting and growth. This theorizing about dual embeddedness with wide-spanning transnational networks is the basis for developing hypotheses concerning entry into entrepreneurship, networking, and outcomes.

2.2 Entry into entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship & Regional Development has been the primary outlet for studies of migrants' involvement in entrepreneurship (reviewed by Aliaga-Isla and Rialp 2013). The typical study, in *ERD* and elsewhere, has focused either on emigrants from a specific home-country, occasionally comparing to the home-country (Ashourizadeh et al. 2016a; Jensen et al. 2014, 2016a, 2016b; Nanda and Khanna 2010), or on immigrants in a specific host-country, occasionally comparing to the host-country (Baycan-Levent and Nijkamp 2009; Beckers and Blumberg 2013; Jones et al. 2014; Kariv et al. 2009; Kloosterman 2003, 2010; Kontos 2003; Levie 2007; Levie and Hart 2011; Levie and Smallbone 2006; Ohlsson et al. 2012; Sepulveda et al. 2011), and occasionally comparing among immigrants from various origins (Brzozowski et al. 2014; van Tubergen 2005; Vinogradov and Kolvereid 2007, 2010; Lassmann and Busch 2015). These two major perspectives are here combined by simultaneously considering home and host locations.

Migrants from the Caribbean mostly settle in North America and Europe. Their upbringing in the entrepreneurial Caribbean society predisposes them to become entrepreneurs, typically, but their

move to a less entrepreneurial society expectedly curbs their inclination to become entrepreneurs. This consequence of their dual embeddedness is a hypothesis:

H1. Compared to domestic Caribbeans, diasporans are less likely to enter into entrepreneurship.

The diaspora from Sub-Saharan Africa have likewise moved from a highly entrepreneurial society mainly to a less entrepreneurial society, so their entry would expectedly also be reduced. The European diaspora is more mixed, so we do not predict their entry.

2.3 Occupation and satisfaction

People may stay in their home country or emigrate to get a better life, and people may pursue occupations to get a satisfying life. But where is life more satisfying, in the Caribbean or in the diaspora? And which occupational pursuit brings more life-satisfaction, becoming an entrepreneur or another occupation such as employee?

Whether entrepreneurs or employees have higher life-satisfaction is unclear in the scholarship on well-being (Binder and Coad 2013). Whether diasporic or domestic Caribbeans have higher life-satisfaction also remains unknown. But the combination of occupation being employee and location being the diaspora may be especially consequential, in that their life-satisfaction is often reduced by disadvantages and discrimination in the workplace. Discrimination in workplaces in host-societies may thus relatively boost life-satisfaction of entrepreneurs in the diaspora compared to employees in the diaspora. These expected differences in satisfaction are hypotheses,

H2 Life-satisfaction differs between diasporic and domestic Caribbeans, and differs between entrepreneurs and employees, and being diasporic entrepreneur boosts satisfaction.

Life-satisfaction differs among societies, so life-satisfaction in the Caribbean diaspora will expectedly differ from satisfaction in other diasporas.

2.4 Experiences of pull by opportunity and push by necessity

People in the Caribbean frequently become entrepreneurs because of the necessity to make a living, and the lack of possibilities for paid employment. Possibilities for paid employment are much greater in North America and Europe, so people there will become entrepreneurs because they see business opportunities and not because of necessity, and if they do not see opportunities they will probably enter paid employment (Brünjes and Diez 2013; Cheraghi 2017; Global Entrepreneurship Research Association 2017; Lofstrom 2002). This condition also influences diasporans as they become embedded in host-societies, mostly in Europe and North America, so we hypothesize,

H3. Compared to domestic Caribbeans, diasporans are more pulled by opportunity and less pushed by necessity.

The reasoning applies to emigrants moving outside the Caribbean; but perhaps not to those migrating to other countries inside the Caribbean. Such tendency should also be expected for the diaspora from Sub-Saharan Africa, but not for the diaspora from Europe.

2.5 Networking in the transnational, operational, and private spheres

Entrepreneurs are networking with people in several spheres such as the private sphere of family and friends, in the sphere of business operations, and in the transnational sphere (Jensen and Schøtt 2015, 2017). Networks may be extensive around the domestic Caribbeans, but diasporans may encounter hurdles when networking in the sphere of operations, especially in the market and professions (Stephens 2013). Diasporans are advantaged in one sphere, though, the transnational sphere (Kanas et al. 2009; Light et al. 2003; McCabe et al. 2005; Portes et al. 2002). So we hypothesize,

H4. Compared to domestic Caribbeans, diasporic entrepreneurs are networking more transnationally, but less in the private sphere and in the sphere of business operations.

We should expect similar networks around diasporans from Sub-Saharan Africa and from Europe.

2.6 Networks influencing outcomes: innovation, exporting and growth-expectations

Entrepreneurs are networking in the private sphere for emotional and material support (Klyver et al. 2014; Welter 2011), and networking in the public spheres mainly for information and other resources (Flap et al. 2000). Networking, specifically transnational networking, affects performance, also in the Caribbean (Brzozowski et al. 2014; Honig 1998; Kariv et al. 2009; Muzychenko 2008). Entrepreneurs' networking in the private sphere seems detrimental to their performance, notably survival (Coad et al. 2013), innovation (Schøtt and Sedaghat 2014), and exporting (Ashourizadeh and Schøtt 2016). Conversely, their networking in the sphere of business operations, especially in the market and professions, is beneficial for innovation (Schøtt and Sedaghat 2014; Schøtt and Jensen 2016), and networking in the transnational environment is highly beneficial for exporting (Ashourizadeh and Schøtt 2016; Li et al. 2016). This reasoning applies to both diasporic and domestic entrepreneurs (Jensen et al. 2016b), entailing the hypothesis,

H5. Entrepreneurs' network in the private sphere impedes outcomes, whereas networks in the transnational sphere and in the operations sphere benefit outcomes, notably innovation, exporting, and expectations for growth.

The beneficial and detrimental effects would expectedly be similar for the diasporans from Sub-Saharan Africa and from Europe. These hypotheses are all tested in the following.

3 Research design and data

The 'population' comprises the persons who are domestic Caribbeans, in that they and both parents were born in a Caribbean country and they are living there, and the persons who are diasporans, in that they or a parent were born in a Caribbean country, but they are living in another country. The diaspora thus comprises first generation emigrants and second generation diasporans around the whole world, i.e. diasporans living in countries within and outside the Caribbean. The Caribbean here encompasses the Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Panama, Puerto Rico, El Salvador, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela, and the many smaller islands.

3.1 Sampling

This population of diasporic and domestic Caribbeans has been surveyed in the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor. GEM is the world's largest survey of people's involvement in entrepreneurship, freely available (Global Entrepreneurship Research Association 2016, 2017).

GEM conducts the survey in each participating country with pilot tests and comprehensive quality controls on survey plans, sampling designs, questionnaire construction, translation and back-translation, participation rates, adherence to skip patterns in the questionnaire, missing data, and harmonization of data pooled from around the world (Bosma 2013; Bosma et al. 2012). The survey in 2012, and also in 2013 and 2014 in some countries, asked the adults for their own and each parent's country of birth (Vorderwülbecke 2013). These questions were posed in eight Caribbean countries, namely Barbados, Colombia, Costa Rica, Jamaica, Panama, Puerto Rico, El Salvador, and Trinidad and Tobago. The questions of origin were also posed in 67 other countries around world, diverse in economy and culture and spread across all regions, and thus sampling from by far most of the people living in the rest of the world. Within each country, the survey sampled, with considerable randomness, adults age 18 to 64 years. The high degree of representativeness in sampling implies that findings can be generalized to the domestic Caribbeans and the diasporans around the world.

The survey sampled 23,742 adults living in or originating from the Caribbean. The sample comprises 21,539 domestics in the eight surveyed Caribbean countries and 2,203 diasporans, comprising four categories: 751 first generation emigrants outside the Caribbean; 226 second generation diasporans outside the Caribbean; 681 first generation emigrants living within the Caribbean; and 545 second generation diasporans living in the Caribbean. Other regions were similarly covered in the global survey, so diasporic and domestic Caribbeans are compared to diasporans and locals from the two most different regions, Sub-Saharan Africa and Europe (with samples sizes 32,197 and 160,965 adults, respectively).

The sample of adults is used for analyzing people's entry into entrepreneurship. The survey identifies entrepreneurs as a subsample of the adults, as those who own and manage a starting or operating business (Bosma et al. 2012). The subsample of entrepreneurs is used for analyzing entrepreneurs' experiences of pull of opportunity and push of necessity, and entrepreneurs' networking and outcomes.

That the data are cross-sectional entails two limitations. First, causality is not examined, but is assumed or ignored, by only discussing association. Second, attrition during entry into entrepreneurship is high, most people with intention stop intending, and many start-ups close quickly, and a cross-sectional survey cannot pinpoint subsequent drop-out versus survival, so the conditions affecting one stage may well differ from the conditions influencing businesses at another stage (Coad et al. 2013). Therefore this study indicates entry both as intending and as starting.

3.2 Measurements

The diasporans are compared to the domestics who serve as a reference. The four categories of diasporans are compared to the domestics by using a dummy for each category, coded 1 for that category and 0 otherwise.

Entry of people into the entrepreneurial occupation is measured by their intention to become entrepreneur and by their starting (Bosma et al. 2012; Global Entrepreneurship Research Association 2017). Two operationalizations of entry are used because of the frequent attrition and limited transition and survival from the phase of intending to the phase of starting. A single operationalization thus has limited validity and reliability, so using two operationalizations enhances robustness. Entrepreneurial intention is measured dichotomously by asking: *Are you, alone or with others, expecting to start a new business, including any type of self-employment, within the next three years?* Starting is measured dichotomously by an affirmative answer to either of two questions: *Are you, alone or with others, currently trying to start a new business, including any self-employment or selling any goods or services to others?* *Are you, alone or with others, currently trying to start a new business or a new venture for your employer as part of your normal work?* A few follow-up questions confirm upstart and ownership (op. cit.). Both intention and starting are measured as a dummy, coded 0 and 1.

The pull of opportunity versus the push of necessity is measured dichotomously by asking: *Are you involved in this start-up to take advantage of a business opportunity or because you have no better choices for work?* (op. cit.), coded 0 and 1.

Life-satisfaction was measured by asking each respondent to rate dis/agreement with each of five statements (Diener et al. 2013; Pavot and Diener 2008), *In most ways, my life is close to my ideal. The conditions of my life are excellent. I am satisfied with my life. So far I have obtained the important things I want in life. If I could live my life again, I would not change anything.* Agreement was rated on a scale from 1 to 5, and the mean of the five ratings provides an index of satisfaction with life, going from 1 to 5. This measure is also used on other analyses of entrepreneurs (Jensen et al 2017a; Liu and Schøtt 2017).

Entrepreneurs are compared to employees in their life-satisfaction. Being entrepreneur contrasted being employee is a dummy, 1 for entrepreneur and 0 for employee.

Networking is measured by asking: *Various people may give you advice on your new business. Have you received advice from any of the following? Somebody in another country? Somebody who has come from abroad? A firm that you collaborate with? A firm that you compete with? A supplier? A customer? A lawyer? An accountant? A bank? A possible investor? A public advising services for business? A researcher or inventor? A current boss? Current work colleagues? Somebody who is starting a business? Somebody with much business experience? Your spouse or life-companion? Your parents? Other family or relatives? Friends?* These twenty potential advisors are drawn from three spheres: the transnational sphere, the sphere of business operations, and the private sphere, as largely discerned in a cluster analysis of the twenty variables (Jensen and Schøtt 2017). Networking in each sphere is measured as follows. Networking in the transnational sphere is measured on a scale from 0 to 2, as the number of advisors reported of these two: somebody broad and somebody from abroad (Cheraghi and Schøtt 2015). Networking in the private sphere is measured on a scale from 0 to 4, as the number of advisors reported of these four: spouse, parents, other family, and friends. Networking in the sphere of operations is measured on a scale from 0 to 14, as the number of advisors reported of these 14: collaborator, competitor, supplier, customer, lawyer, accountant, bank, investor, counselor, researcher, boss, work-colleagues, starter, and mentor.

The measures of an entrepreneur's networks in various spheres have been used to research how networking is shaped by culture (Cheraghi and Schøtt 2015), by personal attributes such as gender (e.g. Schøtt 2017b), and also by diasporic status (Cheraghi and Yaghmaei 2017; Jensen et al. 2017b), and how networks affects outcomes such as innovation (Schøtt and Sedaghat 2014), exporting (Ashourizadeh et al. 2016) and expectations for growth (Cheraghi et al. 2014), showing negative effects of the network in the private sphere, positive effects of networks in the public sphere, and occasionally indicating no effect of some networks on an outcome.

Innovation is measured by an index based on the responses to three questions: *Will all, some, or none of your potential customers consider this product or service new and unfamiliar? Right now, are*

there many, few, or no other businesses offering the same products or services to your potential customers? Have the technologies or procedures required for this product or service been available for less than a year, or between one to five years, or longer than five years? For each question, the responses are coded 1, 2 and 3 for increasing innovation, and then averaged for an index of innovation, going from 1 to 3. This measure of innovation is much used (Jensen et al 2017a; Schøtt and Sedaghat 2014).

Exporting is measured by asking the starting and established entrepreneurs: *What proportion of your customers will normally live outside your country?* The response is coded as the percentage of customers abroad, between 0% and 100%, and is then transformed logarithmically to reduce skew. This measure has been used in numerous studies (e.g. Ashourizadeh et al. 2016; Ashourizadeh and Schøtt 2016).

Expectation for growth is indicated when asking the entrepreneurs two questions: *Not counting the owners, how many people are currently working for this business? Not counting owners, how many people, including both present and future employees, will be working for this business five years from now?* Current size and size expected in five years are both transformed logarithmically to reduce skew (adding 1 before logging). The difference between the two logged counts is a measure of the expectation for change or growth, $\log(1+\text{expected size}) - \log(1+\text{current size})$. This measure of expectation for job-growth has been used in much research, also in the Caribbean and also on diasporans (Ashourizadeh 2017; Boodraj and Boodraj 2016; Cheraghi et al. 2014).

Control variables are: Gender, coded 0 for females and 1 for males. Education is coded in years. Household income was measured on a three-point scale, as lowest third, middle third, and highest third in the country, coded 1, 2 and 3 for increasing income. Household size is number of persons living together, transformed logarithmically to reduce skew. Business age is number of years since beginning to compensate owners, transformed logarithmically. Business ownership is number of

owner-managers, logged. Business size is number of persons working for the business, logged (Bosma 2013).

Most measurements derive from a common method, as responses elicited in an interview with a respondent. Such measurements may have a common method bias, in that some respondents may tend to be exaggerating their responses, while some other respondents may tend to underreport. Let us consider the hypothesis that networking benefits performance (H5). Conceivably, some will exaggerate both performance and networking while others will underreport both performance and networking, and these systematic measurement errors may affect the correlation between networking and performance and thereby undermine the test. Whether the test result is likely to be distorted by a common method bias shall be considered further when we see the test result, in section 4.4. Whether a common method bias may undermine testing of our other hypotheses can be considered here. The first hypothesis concerns effect of residing in the diaspora upon entry in form of intending or starting, but residence is not measured as a response in an interview, so the test of the first hypothesis is not undermined by a common method bias. The second hypothesis concerns how life-satisfaction depends on location and occupation, and specifically on being entrepreneur in the diaspora, but it seems unlikely that, e.g., entrepreneurs in the diaspora would exaggerate or underreport their satisfaction more or less than domestic entrepreneurs, so also the test of the second hypothesis is unlikely to be undermined by a common method bias. The third hypothesis concerns whether diasporans or locals are more opportunity-driven, but this hypothesis is like the first hypothesis, so also here there is no risk that a common method bias would undermine the test. The fourth hypothesis concerns whether diasporans and locals differ in networking, which is similar to the first hypothesis, so also here we should not expect a common method bias.

4 Results

Comparing diasporans and domestics, we first analyze entry into the entrepreneurial occupation, specifically the pull of opportunity and push of necessity, and then life-satisfaction, networking and effects on outcomes.

4.1 Diasporans and domestics entering entrepreneurship

The first question is whether diasporans enter into the entrepreneurial occupation more or less like domestic Caribbeans. Hypothesis 1 is that, because entrepreneurship is highly prevalent in the Caribbean, then the diasporans, compared to the domestics, will less frequently be intending to start and be starting.

The percentages of adults intending to start are listed in Table 1 along with the percentages of adults who are actually starting a business. Compared to the domestic Caribbeans, the diasporans are less frequently intending and starting. The diasporans differ in their intention and upstart, as seen in the breakdown of the diasporans by generation (first and second generation) and place (outside and inside the Caribbean). Notably, the diasporans residing outside the Caribbean have much lower intention and upstart.

The Caribbeans can be compared to the Africans and the Europeans, Table 1. Diasporans from Sub-Saharan Africa enter less frequently than domestic Africans. Conversely, diasporans from Europe enter more frequently than domestic Europeans.

Table 1 about here

Table 2 about here

Effects on entry are better discerned by regressions that control for other conditions, Table 2. The first model shows effects on entry in the form of intention to start a business. Being a first generation diasporan outside the Caribbean, compared to being domestic Caribbean, reduces intention to become entrepreneur. Being a second generation diasporan outside the Caribbean also reduces

intention. Being a first generation diasporan within the Caribbean also reduces intention. Being a second generation diasporan within the Caribbean does not make intention discernibly different from the intention of domestic Caribbeans. Overall, intentions of diasporans from the Caribbean are lower than the intentions of domestic Caribbeans. This supports Hypothesis 1, that entry is lower for diasporans than for domestic Caribbeans. The second model in Table 2 shows effects upon starting. The effects of the four categories of diasporas are very similar to the effects upon intention, so the results are robust. This lends further support for Hypothesis 1.

The effects upon starting from being in the diasporas from Europe and Sub-Saharan Africa, Table 2, are positive for Europeans, as was expected, and are negative for people going outside Sub-Saharan Africa, as was also expected.

4.2 Life-satisfaction of diasporic and domestic entrepreneurs and employees

Satisfaction with life expectedly differs between diasporic and domestic Caribbeans, and also differs between entrepreneurs and others, specifically employees, Hypothesis 2. How diasporic and domestic Caribbeans who are entrepreneurs and employees differ in life-satisfaction is seen in Table 3. People in the diaspora tend to be less satisfied than domestic Caribbeans. But Table 3 does not enable us to conclude whether, among the Caribbeans, entrepreneurs or employees tend to be more satisfied.

Among Europeans, entrepreneurs are less satisfied than employees, and diasporans are similar to domestic Europeans. Among Sub-Saharan Africans, entrepreneurs are less satisfied than employees, and diasporans are more satisfied than domestic Africans.

Table 3 about here

Table 4 about here

Effects upon life-satisfaction are better discerned in regressions, Table 4. The first model shows that satisfaction is lower in the diaspora than among domestic Caribbeans, and that satisfaction is lower among entrepreneurs than among employees. Hypothesis 2, that satisfaction is boosted for diasporic entrepreneurs, is tested by the interaction in the second model in Table 4. The interaction effect is positive, showing that being in the diaspora as an entrepreneur rather than an employee is boosting satisfaction, supporting Hypothesis 2. The boost is small but noteworthy (the standardized coefficient for the interaction is .04).

Among Sub-Saharan Africans, the third model shows that diasporans are more satisfied than domestic Africans, and entrepreneurs are less satisfied than employees. No combination of occupation and place entails a discernable boost to satisfaction, as indicated by the insignificant interaction effect in the fourth model. The effects are similar, but smaller, among Europeans. The three diasporas differ, notably in that being an entrepreneur in the Caribbean diaspora brings a boost in satisfaction.

4.3 Diasporans' and domestics' experiences of opportunity-pull and necessity-push

People often become entrepreneurs by a pull of opportunity or a push of necessity. Hypothesis 3 posited that diasporans, compared to domestic Caribbeans, are less pushed by necessity and more pulled by opportunity. The percentage of the entrepreneurs who experienced a pull by opportunity, rather than a push by necessity, is listed in Table 5. The diasporans, compared to the domestic Caribbeans, appear to be more opportunity-driven, overall, but the breakdown of diasporans reveal considerable differences among the four categories of diasporans.

Table 5 about here

Table 6 about here

The effects upon opportunity-pull versus necessity-push are better ascertained by regression, Table 6. The first model shows that the first generation diasporans living within the Caribbean are less pulled by opportunity than domestic Caribbeans. However, the other diasporas differ. For the Europeans, the opportunity-pull is more prevalent in the diaspora, overall, than among domestic Europeans. For the Sub-Saharan Africans, the opportunity-pull is less prevalent in the diaspora within Sub-Saharan Africa than among the domestic Africans, but the opportunity-pull is more prevalent in the diaspora outside Sub-Saharan Africa than among the domestic Africans. Thus the three diasporas differ considerably in their opportunity-pull versus necessity-push.

4.4 Diasporic and domestic entrepreneurs' networking

Entrepreneurs are networking with advisors drawn from various spheres. Hypothesis 4 posits that diasporans, compared to domestic Caribbeans, are networking more in the transnational sphere, but less in the private sphere and in the sphere of business operations. The networks in the three spheres are listed in Table 7. Diasporans, compared to domestic Caribbeans, appear to network more in the transnational sphere, but less in the sphere of business operations, overall. The breakdown of diasporans, however, shows considerable differences among the categories of diasporans from the Caribbean. For the Sub-Saharan Africans, networking in the transnational sphere, and also networking in the operations sphere, is more extensive in the diaspora than for domestic Africans. For the Europeans, however, networking in the diaspora is similar to networking of the domestic Europeans.

Table 7 about here

Table 8 about here

Effects upon networks are discerned by regressions, Table 8. The first model shows that the transnational network is especially extensive for the first generation diasporans living outside the

Caribbean. The second model shows that the network in the sphere of business operations is especially sparse for the second generation diasporans living within the Caribbean. Among the Sub-Saharan Africans, the transnational network, and also the operations network, is more extensive for most kinds of diasporans than for domestic Africans. For the Europeans, transnational networking and operations networking are especially sparse for the second generation diasporans living outside Europe, but are especially extensive for the second generation diasporans living in Europe. For all three regions, networking in the private sphere does not differ significantly between diasporan or domestic entrepreneurs or among kinds of diasporas. That transnational networking is especially extensive in the diaspora lends some support for Hypothesis 4. However, there is no overall support for the hypothesis that networks in the private sphere and in the sphere of operation are less extensive in the diaspora than for the domestic entrepreneurs in a region. Probably, the more elaborate institutions in the typical host-societies (North America and Western Europe) are inducing larger networks in the sphere of business operations.

4.5 Networks shaping outcomes: innovation, exporting and expectation for growth

What are the consequences of networking? Hypothesis 5 posited that networking in the private sphere is detrimental for outcomes, whereas networks in the public spheres benefit outcomes such as innovation, exporting, and expectations for growth. Outcomes are listed in Table 9.

Diasporans compared to domestic Caribbeans appear to have higher exporting, but lower innovativeness and growth-expectation. For the Europeans, and likewise for the Sub-Saharan Africans, however, diasporans appear to have higher performance than domestic entrepreneurs in the region, overall.

Table 9 about here

Table 10 about here

Effects on outcomes are better estimated in regressions, Table 10. The second generation outside the Caribbean has lower innovation but higher exporting than the domestic Caribbeans. The outcomes are benefiting from transnational and operational networks, whereas the network in the private sphere impedes innovation and exporting. For the Sub-Saharan diasporans, the transnational and operational networks also benefit outcomes, while being in the first generation diaspora outside Sub-Saharan Africa lowers exporting and growth-expectation. For the Europeans, outcomes benefit from transnational and operational networks, and also from being in the diaspora, overall.

5 Conclusions

The research questions were: Are diasporans different from domestics in becoming entrepreneurs by experiencing pull of opportunity and push of necessity? Do diasporan entrepreneurs' dual embeddedness in both home-society and host-society, with networks spanning both societies, give them comparative advantages in innovation, exporting and growth? How does entrepreneurship in the Caribbean diaspora differ from entrepreneurship in diasporas from other regions, Europe and Sub-Saharan Africa? The answers in the above analyses are here summarized, then contributions are pinpointed, policies considered, limitations evaluated, and further research suggested.

5.1 Summary of answers

In the Caribbean enterprising is a tradition that emigrants carry into the diaspora, where the tradition continues to encourage them to become entrepreneurs, although their inclination may be curbed by the lesser salience of entrepreneurship in their major host-societies in North America and Europe. By carrying the tradition into the diaspora and maintaining dense ties between home- and host-societies, entrepreneurship in the diaspora is an extension of entrepreneurship in the Caribbean, albeit modified by the ecology in the diaspora. Diasporans, compared to locals in the Caribbean, become entrepreneurs more by a pull of opportunity and less by a push of necessity. Diasporans are

networking more than domestic entrepreneurs in the transnational sphere and in the sphere of operations. These networks benefit outcomes such as innovation, exporting and growth-expectations, in contrast to the negative effects from networking in the private sphere. The Caribbeans' experiences are shared in some ways by diasporas from the two extremely different regions, Sub-Saharan Africa and Europe, but the diasporas also differ in complex ways, because of different origins and different destinations.

5.2 Contributions

The study makes specific conceptual, theoretical and empirical contributions. Conceptually, the contribution is to think not only about the regional system of entrepreneurship in the Caribbean as an open system. Rather, entrepreneurship in the diaspora can be thought of as an extension of entrepreneurship in the Caribbean, both in that the tradition in the Caribbean is carried into the diaspora, and in that entrepreneurship in the two locations are coupled by dense transnational business ties.

Theoretically, the contribution is to account for systemic coupling and transnational links as emerging from the dual embeddedness of diasporans, namely embeddedness in home-society combined with embeddedness in host-society. The diasporan's network often spans a structural hole (Burt 1992), the absence of a direct relation between the diasporan's contacts in the Caribbean and the contacts in the ecology of the diaspora. This hole brings social capital, a monopolistic ability to combine the diverse ideas and resources from the two sources, which can be used to enhance innovation, exporting and growth of the business.

Empirically, the contribution is the comparative understanding of entrepreneurship in the Caribbean and in the diaspora, and the comparison of Caribbean diaspora entrepreneurship with entrepreneurship in diasporas from extremely different regions, Europe and Sub-Saharan Africa.

5.3 Policies for the diaspora

Is society in the Caribbean benefiting from entrepreneurship in the diaspora? Are the diasporic entrepreneurs a drain or a gain? Can benefits be enhanced by policies? The issues have, of course, been raised frequently (Chand 2010; Kuznetsov 2006; Meyer et al. 1997; Newland and Tanaka 2010; Nurse 2004; Pastor 1985; Wint 2003). Thinking has focused on tangible flows such as remittances, trade and investments, on the return of diasporans, and increasingly on involving the diaspora in development in the Caribbean (Mino-Coy 2011). The above analyses are relevant for such considerations.

The analyses showed that many entrepreneurs in the Caribbean have extensive transnational networks (section 4.3), especially with diasporans (documented in other studies). These networks are benefitting their innovation, exporting and growth (section 4.4). Moreover, entrepreneurs in the Caribbean may use their networks with diasporans as mediators or middle-men for expanding their networks with businesses in the ecology around diasporans (Minto-Coy 2016b; Ramkissoon-Babwah 2013). In these several ways entrepreneurship in the Caribbean benefits from entrepreneurship in the diaspora.

Diasporic entrepreneurs may benefit society in the Caribbean if they return home and continue entrepreneurial endeavors (Potter et al. 2005; Thomas-Hope 1998b). High-performing diasporans are well educated and well connected in both host-society and home-society, and thereby have much human capital and social capital. Such returnees tend to bring their human and social capital with them home. Moreover, their high performance makes them role-models and their entrepreneurial practices may diffuse among young prospective entrepreneurs. Such potential returnees are a target for policies that are pursued around the Caribbean. Policies will probably be most beneficial if they celebrate diasporic entrepreneurs and support relations with them, selecting those entrepreneurs who seem most promising for a return, and if they celebrate returning entrepreneurs and support them to

pursue entrepreneurship in the Caribbean. Policies are selectively targeting high-performers, because they, rather than ordinary entrepreneurs, are likely to become gains if they return. However, entrepreneurs who are performing well in the diaspora, tend to be satisfied with their lives in the diaspora (as shown in section 4.2), and are unlikely to consider returning as attractive.

However, Caribbean society can benefit from diasporic entrepreneurs also when they stay in the diaspora. High-performing diasporic entrepreneurs tend to have extensive transnational networks (section 4.4), especially with their home-society (as well-documented in other studies). Their ties back home to the Caribbean can feasibly be broadened and deepened to include collaboration, joint ventures, and sojourns in the Caribbean. Such benefits are feasible and they can be promoted by policies (Minto-Coy 2017a, b, c).

Diasporic entrepreneurs may also be used by young Carribeans for overseas networking, training and informal apprenticeship, so that they become stimulated and skilled as prospective entrepreneurs. Such engagement of diasporic entrepreneurs in development in the Caribbean will fulfill their human needs for relatedness, especially by enacting their attachment to their homeland (Minto-Coy 2016a).

5.4 Limitations

Methodological limitations were largely considered in section 3 on research design. The ties between entrepreneurs in the diaspora and locals in the Caribbean have not been directly measured for this study (but such ties are well known from other studies; e.g. Portes et al. 2002), and only advice has been measured (because advice-seeking applies to entrepreneurs in all phases, from intending to start up through established business).

The utility of GEM is its representative coverage of the adult population in the World, which here enabled getting a representative sample of the Caribbean diasporans spread around the World and a representative sample of people, including local entrepreneurs in the Caribbean, and also

representative samples of diasporans from other regions. However, one limitation is that the survey is cross-sectional, and thus not following individuals across the years, as discussed in section 3.1 on sampling. Another limitation is that the population for random sampling is the adults, and can ask about atypical events such as migration, but cannot feasibly ask about rare events such as returning. Yet another limitation is that questions have to be answerable in a short telephone-interview, and thus mostly have a simple scale and only one item per variable, and does not probe deeply. These limitations are tradeoffs in conducting the world's largest study of people's involvement in entrepreneurship.

A more substantive limitation is that, although the study compares between diasporic and domestic entrepreneurship in their Caribbean home-societies, it does not compare between diasporans and locals in the host-countries (Ojo 2017).

5.5 Further research

Entrepreneurial endeavors in the Caribbean may acquire new practices and new institutional arrangements from the diaspora. Entrepreneurs in the diaspora learn entrepreneurial practices prevailing in the host-society and through their ties to their home-society transmit the practices to local entrepreneurs. New practices are also carried to the Caribbean by returning entrepreneurs. Returnees are also carriers of institutions, when they have operated in the framework of institutional arrangements in the host-society, and upon return advocate these arrangements for adoption and institutionalization in their Caribbean home-society (Riddle 2008; Riddle and Brinkerhoff 2011; Riddle et al. 2010). Such practical and institutional learning in the Caribbean is a subject for further research.

Comparisons can be informative. Entrepreneurship in the Caribbean diaspora can informatively be compared, not only to domestic entrepreneurship in the Caribbean as in this study, but also to local entrepreneurship in the host-countries. Entrepreneurship in Ireland, Israel and in China appears to

have been benefiting much from their diasporas, also through governmental support programs targeting returnees (Minto 2009). Those cases may be especially informative for comparisons with entrepreneurship in the Caribbean and its diaspora.

Comparison of entrepreneurship to other social institutions in the Caribbean can also be informative. Comparison to science may be especially informative. Transnational networking among scientists is intense between the Caribbean and the Caribbean diaspora, and diasporic and returning scientists carry research practices and academic arrangements to the Caribbean, as was exemplified by Sir W. Arthur Lewis.

References

- Aliaga-Isla, R., and A. Rialp. 2013. "Systematic Review of Immigrant Entrepreneurship Literature: Previous Findings and Ways Forward." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 25 (): 819-844. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2013.845694>
- Ashourizadeh, S. 2017. "Iranian Entrepreneurs at Home and in Diaspora: Entrepreneurial Competencies, Exporting, Innovation and Growth-Expectations." In: *Iranian Entrepreneurship: Deciphering the Entrepreneurial Eco-system in Iran and in the Iranian Diaspora*. Edited by S. Rezaei, L.-P. Dana and V. Ramadani. Springer Publishers, pp. 249-262.
- Ashourizadeh, S., S. Rezaei, T. Schøtt, and K.W. Jensen. 2016a. "People's Human and Social Capital Benefiting Careers in Entrepreneurship: Adults in China and in the Chinese Diaspora." *International Journal of Business and Globalisation* 16 (3): 378-400.
- Ashourizadeh, S., and T. Schøtt. 2016. "Exporting Embedded in Entrepreneurs' Transnational Networks." *International Journal of Business and Globalisation* 16 (3): 314-334.
- Ashourizadeh, S., T. Schøtt, E. Pişkinsüt Şengüler, and Y. Wang. 2016. "Exporting by Migrants and Indigenous Entrepreneurs: Contingent on Gender and Education." *International Journal of Business and Globalisation* 16 (3): 264-283.
- Barrett, G., T. Jones, D. McEvoy, and D. McGoldrick. 2002. "The Economic Embeddedness of Immigrant Enterprise in Britain." *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research* 8 (1/2) 11-31.
- Bartesaghi, A., S.M.S.S. Greco, M.V.L. Morello, R.V. Villegas, L. Veiga, P. Kew, and M. Herrington. 2016. *GEM Special Report. Latin America and Caribbean Regional Report 2015/16*. www.gemconsortium.org Accessed 2 May 2017.

- Baycan-Levent, T., and P. Nijkamp. 2009. "Characteristics of Migrant Entrepreneurship in Europe." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 21 (4): 375-397. doi:10.1080/08985620903020060.
- Beckers, P., and B.F. Blumberg. 2013. "Immigrant Entrepreneurship on the Move: A Longitudinal Analysis of First- and Second-Generation Immigrant Entrepreneurship in the Netherlands." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 25 (7-8): 654-691.
- Binder, M., and A. Coad. 2013. "Life Satisfaction and Self-Employment: A Matching Approach." *Small Business Economics* 40 (4): 1009-10033.
- Boodraj, G., and M. Boodraj. 2017. "Job Growth Expectations among Young Entrepreneurs in Caribbean Small-Island States." *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* 30 (3): 460-475.
- Bosma, N. 2013. "The Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) and its Impact on Entrepreneurship Research." *Foundations and Trends in Entrepreneurship* 9 (2): 143-248.
- Bosma, N., A. Coduras, Y. Litovsky, and J. Seaman. 2012. A Report on the Design, Data, and Quality Control of the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor. www.gemconsortium.org Accessed 19 July 2017.
- Boxill, I. 2003. "Unearthing Black Entrepreneurship in the Caribbean: Exploring the Culture and SMA Sectors." *Equal Opportunities International* 22 (1): 32-45.
- Brünjes, J., and J.R. Diez. 2013. "'Recession Push' and 'Prosperity Pull' Entrepreneurship in a Rural Developing Context." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 25 (3-4): 251-271.
- Brzozowski, J., M. Cucculelli, and A. Surdej. 2014. "Transnational Ties and Performance of Immigrant Entrepreneurs: The Role of Home-Country Conditions." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 26 (7-8): 546-573. DOI: 10.1080/08985626.2014.959068
- Burt, R.S. 1992. *Structural Holes: The Social Structure of Competition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Chamberlain, M. (ed.). 1998. *Caribbean Migration: Globalised Identities*. London: Routledge.
- Chand, M. 2010. "Diasporas as Drivers of National Competitiveness." *Advances in International Management* 23: 583-602.
- Cheraghi, M. 2017. "Young Entrepreneurs Pushed by Necessity and Pulled by Opportunity: Institutional Embeddedness in Economy and Culture." *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* 30 (3): 395-409.
- Cheraghi, M., and T. Schøtt. 2015. "Conceived Globals: Entrepreneurs' Transnational Networking, across Phases and Embedded in Culture." *International Journal of Business and Globalisation* 16 (3): 209-227.
- Cheraghi, M., Z. Setti, and T. Schøtt. 2014. "Growth-Expectations among Women Entrepreneurs: Embedded in Networks and Culture in Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia and in Belgium and France'.

International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business 23(1/2): 191-212. DOI: 10.1504/IJESB.2014.065308

Cheraghi, M., and E. Yaghmaei. 2017. "Networks around Iranian Entrepreneurs at Home and in Diaspora: Effects on Performance." In: *Iranian Entrepreneurship: Deciphering the Entrepreneurial Eco-system in Iran and in the Iranian Diaspora*. Edited by S. Rezaei, L.-P. Dana and V. Ramadani. Springer Publishers, pp. 263-275.

Coad, A., J. Frankish, R.G. Roberts, and D.J. Storey. 2013. "Growth Paths and Survival Chances: An Application of Gambler's Ruin Theory." *Journal of Business Venturing* 28 (): 615-632.

Danns, G.K. 1994. "The Role of the Entrepreneur in the Development of the Caribbean." Pp. 39-51 in: Ryan, S., and T. Stewart. (eds.). 1994. *Entrepreneurship in the Caribbean: Culture, Structure and Conjecture*. St. Augustine: University of West Indies, Institute of Social and Economic Research.

Diener, E., R. Inglehart, and L. Tay. 2013. "Theory and Validity of Life Satisfaction Scales." *Social Indicators Research* 112 (3): 497-527.

Elo, M. 2015. "Diaspora Networks in International Business: A Review on an Emerging Stream of Research." In Larimo, J., N. Nummela, and T. Mainela. (eds.), *Handbook on International Alliance and Network Research*, Cheltenham, UK: Elgar, pp. 13-41.

Elo, M. and L. Riddle. (eds.). 2016. *Diaspora Business*, Oxford: Interdisciplinary Press.

Flap, H., A. Kumcu, and B. Bulder. 2000. "The Social Capital of Ethnic Entrepreneurs and their Business Success." In: *Immigrant Business: The Economic, Political, and Social Environment*. Pp. 142- 161. Rath, J. (Ed.). MacMillan.

Foner, N. 1998. "Towards a Comparative Perspective on Caribbean Migration." In: M. Chamberlain (ed.), *Caribbean Migration: Globalised Identities*. London: Routledge.

Gedajlovic, E., B. Honig, C.B. Moore, G.T. Payne, and M. Wright. 2013. "Social Capital and Entrepreneurship: A Schema and Research Agenda." *Entrepreneurship, Theory & Practice* (): 455-478. DOI: 10.1111/etap.12042

Global Entrepreneurship Research Association. 2016. www.gemconsortium.org Accessed 2016 December 2.

Global Entrepreneurship Research Association. 2017. *GEM Global Report 2016/17* www.gemconsortium.org Accessed 2017 May 2.

Hamilton, R., and L.-P. Dana. 2008. "Changing Cultures: An International Study of Migrant Entrepreneurs." *Journal of Enterprising Culture* 16 (1): 89-105.

Higman, B.W. and K.E.A. Montheith. 2010. *West Indian Business History: Enterprise and Entrepreneurship*. Kingston: University of the West Indies Press.

Honig, B. 1998. "What Determines Success? Examining the Human, Financial, and Social Capital of Jamaican Microentrepreneurs." *Journal of Business Venturing* 13 (5): 371-394.

- Jensen, K.W., S. Rezaei, and T. Schøtt. 2016a. "Talent among Chinese Entrepreneurs at Home and Abroad." In Wang, H., and Y. Liu, (Eds.): *Entrepreneur and Talent Management from a Global Perspective: Global Returnees*, Cheltenham: Elgar, pp. 62-91.
- Jensen, K.W., S. Rezaei, T. Schøtt, S. Ashourizadeh, and J. Li. 2016b. "Chinese Entrepreneurs' Human and Social Capital Benefiting Innovation: In China and in the Chinese Diaspora." *International Journal of Business and Globalisation* 16 (3): 350-377.
- Jensen, K.W., S. Rezaei, and F.F. Wherry. 2014. "Cognitive Effects on Entrepreneurial Intentions: A Comparison of Chinese Émigrés and their Descendants with Non-Émigré Chinese." *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* 23 (1/2): 252–277.
- Jensen, K.W., and T. Schøtt. 2015. "Start-up Firms' Networks for Innovation and Export: Facilitated and Constrained by Entrepreneurs' Networking in Private and Public Spheres." *Journal of Social Network Analysis and Mining* 5 (1), Article 48, pp. 1-17. DOI 10.1007/s13278-015-0287-8.
- Jensen, K.W., and T. Schøtt. 2017. "Components of the Network around an Actor." *Encyclopedia of Social Network Analysis and Mining, Vol 1, 2nd ed*, ed by Alhajj, R., and J. Rokne. New York: Springer Science and Business Media. http://link.springer.com/referenceworkentry/10.1007/978-1-4614-7163-9_366-1. 13 pp.
- Jensen, K.W., Y. Liu, and T. Schøtt. 2017a. "Entrepreneurs' Innovation Bringing Satisfaction with Job, Work-Family Balance and Life: In China and around the World." Under review with *International Journal of Innovation Studies*.
- Jensen, K.W., T. Schøtt, J. Vang, and S. Ashourizadeh. 2017b. "Networks around Immigrant and Native Entrepreneurs: Embeddedness in Private and Public Spheres and in Modes of Incorporation." (forthcoming).
- Jones, T., M. Ram, P. Edwards, A. Kiselinchev, and L. Muchenje. 2014. "Mixed Embeddedness and New Immigrant Enterprise in UK." *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 26 (5–6): 500–520. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2014.950697>
- Kanas, A., F. van Tubergen, and T. van der Lippe. 2009. "Immigrant Self-Employment: Testing Hypotheses about the Role of Origin- and Host-Country Human Capital and Bonding and Bridging Social Capital." *Work and Occupations* 36 (3): 181–208. doi:10.1177/0730888409340128.
- Kariv, D., T.V. Menzies, G.A. Brenner, and L.J. Filion. 2009. "Transnational Networking and Business Performance: Ethnic Entrepreneurs in Canada." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 21 (3): 239-264.
- Kloosterman, R. 2003. "Creating Opportunities: Policies Aimed at Increasing Openings for Immigrant Entrepreneurs in the Netherlands." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 15 (2): 167-181. doi:10.1080/0898562032000075159.
- Kloosterman, R. 2010. "Matching Opportunities with Resources: A Framework for Analysing (Migrant) Entrepreneurship from a Mixed Embeddedness Perspective." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 22 (1): 25-45. doi: 10.1080/08985620903220488.

- Klyver, K., M. Søgård Nielsen, M.T. Schenkel, and T. Schøtt. 2014. “How Instrumental and Emotional Support from Family Differs between Vocational Decisions to Become Self-Employed or Employed.” *Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship* 25 (2): 53-74.
- Kontos, M. 2003. “Self-Employment Policies and Migrants’ Entrepreneurship in Germany.” *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 15 (2): 119–135. doi:10.1080/0898562032000075131.
- Kuznetsov, Y. 2006. *Diaspora Networks and the International Migration of Skills: How Countries Can Draw on Their Talent Abroad*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Lashley, J. 2012. “SMEs and Entrepreneurship Policies in the Caribbean.” In: *Government, SMEs and Entrepreneurship Development: Policy, Practice and Challenges*, ed. Blackburn, R.A. and M.T. Schaper. Farnham: Gower.
- Lassmann, A. and C. Busch. 2015. “Revisiting Native and Immigrant Entrepreneurial Activity.” *Small Business Economics* 45 (): 841–873. DOI 10.1007/s11187-015-9665-x
- Lesser, T., B. Fernández-Alfaro, L. Cowie, and N. Bruni (eds.). 2006. *Intra-Caribbean Migration and the Conflict Nexus*. Ottawa: Human Rights Internet.
- Levie, J. 2007. “Immigration, In-migration, Ethnicity and Entrepreneurship in the United Kingdom’, *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 28, No. 2-3, pp. 143-169.
- Levie, J. and M. Hart. 2011. “The Contribution of Migrants and Ethnic Minorities to Entrepreneurship in the UK.” In Minniti, M. (ed.): *The Dynamics of Entrepreneurial Activity*, pp. 101-124, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Levie, J., and D. Smallbone. 2006. “Entrepreneurship, Ethnicity and Migration: Current Trends and Future Directions.” In Minniti, M. (Ed.), *Perspectives on Entrepreneurship*, pp. 157-180, Praeger Publ., Westport, CT.
- Li, J., Z. Chen, and T. Schøtt. 2016. “Innovation Benefitting Exporting: Benefit Enhanced by Transnational Networking’, *International Journal of Business and Globalisation* 16(3): 245-263.
- Light, I., P. Bhachu, and S. Karageorgis. 2003. “Migration Networks and Immigrant Entrepreneurship’, in Light, I. and Bhachu, P. (Eds.): *Immigration and Entrepreneurship*, pp. 25–49, Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, NJ.
- Liu, Y., and T. Schøtt. 2017. ‘Life-Satisfaction of Entrepreneurs in the Diaspora: Embedded in Transnational Networks and in International Business.’ In *Diaspora Networks in International Business*, ed. by M. Elo and I.D. Minto-Coy. Springer Publishers. (in press).
- Lofstrom, M. 2002. ‘Labor Market Assimilation and the Self-Employment Decision of Immigrant Entrepreneurs.’ *Journal of Population Economics* 15 (1): 83–114. doi:10.1007/PL00003841.
- Masurel, E. and 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. doi:10.1068/c0356.

- McCabe, I.B., G. Harlaftis, and I.P. Minoglou. (eds.). 2005. *Diaspora Entrepreneurial Networks: Four Centuries of History*. Bloomsbury: Academic.
- Meyer, J.-B. 2011. "A Sociology of Knowledge Networks." In *The Migration-Development Nexus: A Transnational Perspective*, ed. by Faist, T., M. Fauser, and P. Kivisto. Palgrave, pp. 159-181.
- Meyer, J.-B., J. Charum, J. Gaillard, J. Granes, J. Leon, A. Montenegro, A. Morales, C. Murcia, L.-S. Parrado, and B. Schlemmer. 1997. "Turning Brain Drain into Brain Gain: The Colombian Experience of the Diaspora Option." *Science, Technology and Society* 2 (2): 285-315.
- Meyer, J.-B., and J-P. Wattiaux. 2006. "Diaspora Knowledge Networks: Vanishing Doubts and Increasing Evidence." *International Journal of Multicultural Societies* 8 (1): 15-17.
- Minto, I.D. 2009. "Diasporas and Development: An Assessment of the Irish Experience for the Caribbean." *Caribbean Paper No. 7*, Waterloo, Canada: Centre for International Governance Innovation. www.cigionline.org/series/caribbean-papers Accessed 3 May 2017.
- Minto-Coy, I.D. 2011. "'Beyond Remittancing': An Investigation of the Role of the ICTs in Facilitating and Extending the Diaspora's Contribution to the Caribbean." *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal* 17 (2): 129-141.
- Minto-Coy, I.D. 2016a. "Diaspora Engagement for Development in the Caribbean." Pp 121-139 in: *Diasporas, Development and Governance in the Global South*. Edited by Chikanda, A., J. Crush, and M. Walton-Roberts. New York: Springer.
- Minto-Coy, I.D. 2016b. "The Role of Diasporas in the Growth and Internationalization of Businesses in Countries of Origin." In *Diaspora Business*, M. Elo and L. Riddle (eds.), Oxford: Inter-Disciplinary Press.
- Minto-Coy, I.D. 2017a. "From the Periphery to the Centre: Start-up and Growth Strategies for Minority Diaspora Entrepreneurs." *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, Vol.
- Minto-Coy, I.D. 2017b. "Marshalling Transnational Partners for Caribbean Development: The Role of the Diaspora." Ch. 8 in *Caribbean Realities and Endogenous Sustainability*, ed by Karagiannis, N. and D.A. Mohammed. Kingston: University of the West Indies Press. (in press).
- Minto-Coy, I.D. 2017c. "The Role of the Diaspora in the Emergence of Economic and Territorial Intelligence in Haiti." *International Journal of Business and Emerging Markets* 9 (1): 48-67.
- Muzychenko, O. 2008. "Cross-Cultural Entrepreneurial Competence in Identifying International Business Opportunities." *European Management Journal* 26 (6): 366-377.
- Nanda, R., and T. Khanna. 2010. "Diasporas and Domestic Entrepreneurs: Evidence from the India Software Industry." *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy* 19 (4): 991-1012.
- Newland, K., and H. Tanaka. 2010. *Mobilising Diaspora Entrepreneurship for Development*, Migration Policy Institute, Washington, DC.

- Nicholson, L.A., and J.G. Lashley. 2016. *Understanding the Caribbean Enterprise: Insights from MSMEs and Family Owned Businesses*. London: Palgrave.
- Nurse, K. 2004. *Diaspora, Migration and Development in the Caribbean*. Policy Paper. The Canadian Foundation for the Americas.
- Nurse, K. 2016. "The Diasporic Economy, Trade and the Tourism Industry in the Caribbean." Pp 141-151 in *Diasporas, Development and Governance in the Global South*. Edited by Chikanda, A., Crush, J and Walton-Roberts, M. New York: Springer.
- Ohlsson, H., P. Broome, and P. Bevelander. 2012. "Self-Employment of Immigrants and Natives in Sweden: A Multilevel Analysis", *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 24 (5–6): 405–423. doi:10.1080/08985626.2011.598570.
- Ojo, S. 2017. *Diasporas and Transnational Entrepreneurship in Global Contexts*. IGI Global, Hershey, PA, USA.
- Ojo, S., S. Nwankwo, and A. Gbadamosi. 2013. "African Diaspora Entrepreneurs: Navigating Entrepreneurial Spaces in 'Home' and 'Host' Countries." *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation* 14 (4): 211-221.
- Palmer, R.W. 1990. "Caribbean Development and the Migration Imperative." In *In Search of a Better Life: Perspectives on Migration from the Caribbean*, edited by R. Palmer. New York: Praeger.
- Pastor, R.A. (ed.). 1985. *Migration and Development in the Caribbean: The Unexplored Connection*. Boulder: Westview.
- Pavot, W., and E. Diener. 2008. "The Satisfaction With Life Scale and the Emerging Construct of Life Satisfaction." *Journal of Positive Psychology* 3 (): 137–152.
- Portes, A., P. Fernández-Kelly, and W. Haller. 2009. "The Adaptation of the Immigrant Second Generation in America: A Theoretical Overview and Recent Evidence." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35 (7): 1077-1104.
- Portes, A., and R. Grosfoguel. 1994. "Caribbean Diasporas: Migration and Ethnic Communities." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 533: 48–69.
- Portes, A., W.J. Haller, and L.E. Guarnizo. 2002. "Transnational Entrepreneurs: An Alternative Form of Immigrant Economic Adaptation." *American Sociological Review* 67 (2): 278–298.
- Portes, A., and J. Yiu. 2013. "Entrepreneurship, Transnationalism, and Development." *Migration Studies* 1 (1): 75-95.
- Potter, R.B., D. Conway, and J. Phillips (eds.). 2005. *The Experience of Return Migration: Caribbean Perspectives*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Ramkissoon-Babwah, N. 2013. "The Role of the Caribbean Entrepreneur in Economic Development – Strategy and Process." *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development* 4 (11): 32-35.

- Reis, M. 2006. "The Modern to Late-Modern Period in the Caribbean Diaspora." In *Caribbean Transnationalism: Migration, Pluralisation, and Social Cohesion*, edited by Gowricharn, R.. Oxford: Lexington.
- Riddle, L. 2008. "Diasporas: Exploring their Development Potential." *ESR Review* 10 (2): 28.
- Riddle, L., and J. Brinkerhoff. 2011. "Diaspora Entrepreneurs as Institutional Change Agents: The Case of Thamel.com." *International Business Review* 20 (6): 670-680.
- Riddle, L., G.A. Hrivnak, G.A., and T.M Nielsen. 2010. "Transnational Diaspora Entrepreneurship in Emerging Markets: Bridging Institutional Divides." *Journal of International Management* 16 (4): 398-411.
- Ryan, S. 1994. "Blacks as Entrepreneurs in the Caribbean and the Caribbean Diaspora." Pp. 403-476 in: Ryan, S., and T. Stewart (eds.). 1994. *Entrepreneurship in the Caribbean: Culture, Structure and Conjecture*. St. Augustine: University of West Indies, Institute of Social and Economic Research.
- Ryan, L., U. Erel, and A. d'Angelo. (eds.). 2015. *Migrant Capital: Networks, Identities and Strategies*. Houndmills: Palgrave.
- Schoorl, J., L. Heering, I. Esveldt, G. Groenewold, R. van den Erf, A. Bosch, H. de Valk, and B. de Bruin. (2000). *Push and Pull Factors of International Migration: A Comparative Report*. Luxembourg: Eurostat, European Communities.
- Schøtt, T. 2016. "Entrepreneurs' Satisfaction with Job and Life in the Sub-Sahara African Diaspora: Dual Embeddedness in Home-Society and Host-Society." *FUTA Journal of Management and Technology* 1 (1): 75-83.
- Schøtt, T. 2017a. "Immigrant and Indigenous Youth in Europe: Entrepreneurial Intention Building on Human, Financial and Social Capital." *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* 30 (3): 374-394.
- Schøtt, T. 2017b. "Networks around Women and Men Entrepreneurs in the Iranian Diaspora: Dual Embeddedness in Iran and in Host-Society." In: *Iranian Entrepreneurship: Deciphering the Entrepreneurial Eco-system in Iran and in the Iranian Diaspora*. Edited by S. Rezaei, L.-P. Dana and V. Ramadani. Springer Publishers, pp 231-247. DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-50639-5_13
- Schøtt, T., and K.W. Jensen. 2016. "Firms' Innovation Benefiting from Networking and Institutional Support: A Global Analysis of National and Firm Effects." *Research Policy* 45 () : 1233-1246. DOI 10.1016/j.respol.2016.03.006
- Schøtt, T., and M. Sedaghat. 2014. "Innovation Embedded in Entrepreneurs' Networks and National Educational Systems: A Global Study." *Small Business Economics* 43 (2): 463-476. DOI: 10.1007/s11187-014-9546-8
- Sepulveda, L., S. Syrett, and F. Lyon. 2011. "Population Super-Diversity and New Migrant Enterprise: The Case of London." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 23 (7/8): 469-497.

- Stephens, S. 2013. ‘Building an Entrepreneurial Network: The Experiences of Immigrant Entrepreneurs.’ *Journal of Enterprising Communities* 7 (4): 233-244.
- Thomas-Hope, E. 1998a. “Globalization and the Development of Caribbean Migration.” In *Caribbean Migration: Globalised Identities*, edited by Mary Chamberlain. London: Routledge.
- Thomas-Hope, E. 1998b. ‘Return Migration to Jamaica and its Development Potential.’ *International Migration* 37 (1): 183-204.
- van Tubergen, F. 2005. ‘Self-Employment of Immigrants: A Cross-National Study of 17 Western Societies.’ *Social Forces* 84 (2): 709-732.
- Varela Villegas, R. 2017. “Youth Entrepreneurship Dynamics in the Caribbean Region: 2011-2013.” *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* 30 (3): 287-307.
- Vinogradov, E., and L. Kolvereid. 2007. “Cultural Background, Human Capital and Self-Employment Rates among Immigrants in Norway.” *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 19 (4): 359–376. doi: 10.1080/08985620701223213.
- Vinogradov, E., and L. Kolvereid. 2010. “Home Country National Intelligence and Self-Employment Rates among Immigrants in Norway.” *Intelligence* 38 (1): 151–159. doi:10.1016/j.intell.2009.09.004.
- Vorderwülbecke, A. 2013. “Entrepreneurship and Migration.” In: Xavier, S.R., D. Kelley, J. Kew, M. Herrington, and A. Vorderwülbecke. *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2012 Global Report*. Babson Park, MA: Babson College. www.gemconsortium.org Accessed 2017 May 3.
- Walther, O. 2012. “Traders, Agricultural Entrepreneurs, and the Development of Cross-Border Regions in West Africa.” *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 24 (3-4): 123-141.
- Welter, F. 2011. “Contextualising Entrepreneurship – Conceptual Challenges and Ways Forward”, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 165-184.
- Wint, A.G. 2003. *Competitiveness in Small Developing Economies: Insights from the Caribbean*. Kingston: University of West Indies Press.
- Wyrwich, M. 2015. ‘Entrepreneurship and the Intergenerational Transmission of Values.’ *Small Business Economics* 45 (1): 191–213. doi:10.1007/s11187-015-9649-x.

TABLES

Table 1.
People intending and starting, by location.

	Caribbean region		Sub-Saharan Africa		Europe	
	Intending	Starting	Intending	Starting	Intending	Starting
Local people	41%	19%	48%	26%	12%	7%
Diasporans	29%	13%	44%	21%	19%	9%
<i>Breakdown of diasporans</i>						
First generation outside region	22%	9%	36%	11%	15%	11%
Second generation outside region	21%	11%	25%	12%	19%	12%
First generation inside region	34%	14%	53%	30%	20%	9%
Second generation inside region	36%	18%	55%	29%	17%	8%

Table 2.
People's intentions and upstarts, affected by location.

	Caribbean region		Sub-Saharan Africa	Europe
	Intending	Starting	Starting	Starting
First generation outside region	-.60 ****	-.46 ****	-.90 ****	.53 ****
Second generation outside region	-.85 ****	-.56 **	-.83 ****	.68 ****
First generation inside region	-.25 **	-.30 **	.22 **	.30 ****
Second generation inside region	-.12	-.03	.20 **	.19 ****
Gender male	.28 ****	.29 ****	.09 ****	.63 ****
Age	-.02 ****	-.01 ****	-.01 ****	-.02 ****
Education	.00	.01 **	.01 ****	.08 ****
Income	.21 ****	.23 ****	.21 ****	.18 ****
Household size	.38 ****	.06	.14 ****	.03
Constant	-.46 ****	-1.75 ****	-1.66 ****	-3.48 ****
N adults	18,828	19,307	26,412	120,398

Logistic regressions with coefficients.

For location, the reference is the local people, to whom the diasporans are compared.

* $p < .10$ ** $p < .05$ *** $p < .01$ **** $p < .001$

Table 3.

Life-satisfaction, by location and occupation.

		Caribbean region		Sub-Saharan Africa		Europe	
		Local	Diaspora	Local	Diaspora	Local	Diaspora
Occupation	Entrepreneur	4.03	3.77	2.86	3.07	3.47	3.48
	Employee	4.14	3.65	3.17	3.39	3.57	3.57

Table 4.

Life-satisfaction affected by location and occupation.

	Caribbean region		Sub-Saharan Africa		Europe	
	Main effects	Interaction	Main effects	Interaction	Main effects	Interaction
Diaspora	-.37 ****	-.44 §	.17 ****	.11 §	.04 ***	.04 §
Entrepreneur	-.07 **	-.09 §	-.19 ****	-.20 §	-.07 ****	-.07 §
Entrepreneur*Diaspora		.15 *		.09		.004
Gender male	.04	.04	.04	.04	-.05 ****	-.05 ****
Age	.00	.00	.01 ****	.01 ****	-.003 ****	-.003 ****
Education	.02 ****	.02 ****	.04 ****	.04 ****	.01 ****	.01 ****
Income	.07 ****	.07 ****	.24 ****	.24 ****	.23 ****	.23 ****
Intercept	3.67 ****	3.68 ****	1.82 ****	1.83 ****	3.06 ****	3.06 ****
N respondents	2,351	2,351	6,422	6,422	36,150	36,150

Linear regression with metric coefficients.

§ Significance of main effect not tested (tested in the preceding model).

* p < .10 ** p < .05 *** p < .01 **** p < .001

Table 5.

Entrepreneurs' pull by opportunity (versus push by necessity), by location.

	Caribbean region	Sub-Saharan Africa	Europe
Local entrepreneurs	66 %	56 %	59 %
Diasporan entrepreneurs	69 %	62 %	60 %
<i>Breakdown of the diasporans:</i>			
First generation diasporans outside the region	70 %	72 %	75 %
Second generation diasporans outside the region	71 %	69 %	64 %
First generation diasporans inside the region	61 %	60 %	56 %
Second generation diasporans inside the region	77 %	52 %	64 %

Table 6.

Entrepreneurs' pull by opportunity (versus push by necessity), affected by location.

	Caribbean region	Sub-Saharan Africa	Europe
First generation diasporans outside the region	-.04	.26 *	.50 **
Second generation diasporans outside the region	.52	.06	.15
First generation diasporans inside the region	-.44 **	-.06	-.08
Second generation diasporans inside the region	.37	-.36 ***	.22 **
Gender male	.32 ****	.18 ****	.19 ****
Age	-.01 ****	.00	-.01 ****
Education	.07 ****	.08 ****	.05 ****
Income	.29 ****	.17 ****	.35 ****
Household size	-.04	-.04	-.29 ****
Constant	-.45 **	1.04 ****	-.57 ****
N entrepreneurs	4,763	9,609	15,123

Logistic regression with estimated coefficients.

For location, the reference is the locals, to whom the emigrants are compared.

* $p < .10$ ** $p < .05$ *** $p < .01$ **** $p < .001$

Table 7.
Entrepreneurs' networks.

	Caribbean region			Sub-Saharan Africa			Europe		
	Trans-national network	Operational network	Private sphere network	Trans-national network	Operational network	Private sphere network	Trans-national network	Operational network	Private sphere network
Local entrepreneurs	.23	2.15	1.83	.18	1.83	2.34	.45	3.28	1.71
Diasporic entrepreneurs	.33	1.81	1.83	.49	2.94	2.39	.47	3.15	1.61
<i>Breakdown of diaspora</i>									
First gen. outside region	.63	2.63	2.00	.95	5.00	2.33	.48	2.79	1.65
Second gen. outside reg	.14	1.71	2.14	.29	4.17	2.43	.19	2.09	1.52
First gen. inside region	.28	1.73	1.67	.54	2.76	2.36	.53	3.25	1.60
Second gen. inside reg	.34	1.62	2.06	.40	2.84	2.42	.48	3.53	1.67

Table 8.
Entrepreneurs' networks, affected by location.

	Caribbean region			Sub-Saharan Africa			Europe		
	Trans-national network	Operational network	Private sphere network	Trans-national network	Operational network	Private sphere network	Trans-national network	Operational network	Private sphere network
First gen. outside region	.48 **	.47	.33	.72 ****	3.53****	.11	.10	-.89	.33
Second gen. outside reg.	-.26	-1.60	-.64	.14	2.42 **	.02	-.20 **	-1.20 **	-.04
First gen. inside region	.16 *	.42	-.02	.44 ****	1.18 ****	.01	.18 ****	.43	.00
Second gen. inside reg.	.04	-1.24 **	.41*	.25 ****	1.19 ****	.17	.14 **	.70 *	.12
Gender male	.00	.44 ****	.03	.04 ***	.34 ****	-.02	.05 *	.16	-.20 ****
Age	-.002 *	-.03 ****	-.01 ****	.00	-.005	-.003 **	-.004 ***	-.01 ***	-.02 ****
Education	.02 ***	.10 ****	.01	.01 ***	.08 ****	.02 ****	.00	.00	-.01
Income	.08 ***	.55 ****	.13 ***	.01	.00	-.01	.04 **	.43 ****	.01
Household size	-.03	.08	.15 **	-.04 ****	-.07	.11 ****	-.03 *	.23 *	.36 ****
Opportunity pull	.11 ****	.71 ****	.01	.08 ****	.50 ****	.15 ****	.07 ***	.32 ***	-.12 **
Constant	-.09	.30	1.87 ***	.04	1.10 ****	2.21 ****	.47 ****	2.76 ****	2.41 ****
N entrepreneurs	2,200	2,172	2,188	5,877	5,726	5,880	3,022	2,957	3,012

Linear regressions with metric coefficients.

For location, the reference is the locals, to whom the diasporans are compared.

* p < .10 ** p < .05 *** p < .01 **** p < .001

Table 9.

Entrepreneurs' innovation, exporting and growth-expectation, by location.

	Caribbean region			Sub-Saharan Africa			Europe		
	Innovation	Exporting	Growth expectation	Innovation	Exporting	Growth expectation	Innovation	Exporting	Growth expectation
Local entrepreneurs	1.54	9%	1.13	1.55	10%	.88	1.42	12%	.53
Diasporan entrepreneurs	1.48	13%	.99	1.58	17%	1.11	1.49	19%	.75
<i>Breakdown of the diasporans</i>									
First generation outside region	1.52	14%	.92	1.58	23%	.85	1.60	23%	.98
Second generation outside region	1.48	17%	1.15	1.62	10%	1.11	1.48	10%	.69
First generation inside region	1.53	14%	1.05	1.58	17%	1.22	1.50	21%	.73
Second generation inside region	1.39	10%	.95	1.57	14%	1.14	1.47	18%	.76

Table 10.

Entrepreneurs' innovation, exporting and growth-expectation, affected by location and networks.

	Caribbean region			Sub-Saharan Africa			Europe		
	Innovation	Exporting	Growth expectation	Innovation	Exporting	Growth expectation	Innovation	Exporting	Growth expectation
First gen. outside region	.24	.11	-.07	.16 *	-.69 **	-.79 ****	.15	.13	.25
Second g.outside region	-.43 *	1.98 ****	-.13	.24	-.12	-.41	.00	.33 *	.04
First gen. inside region	-.09	.12	-.24	-.03	.11	.05	.07 **	.05	.10
Second g. inside region	-.20 **	.21	.02	.00	-.17	.06	.01	.40 ****	-.10
Transnational network	.06 ****	.30 ****	.04	.03 **	.29 ****	.13 ****	.04 ***	.34 ****	.07 ****
Operational network	.02 ****	.07 ****	.06 ****	.00	.04 ****	.04 ****	.01 *	.03 ****	.03 ****
Private sphere network	-.02 **	-.05 **	.02	-.01 **	.00	.02 *	.00	-.02	.00
Gender male	-.04 **	.00	.09 **	.02	.05	.16 ****	.04 *	.07 **	.21 ****
Age	.00	.00	.00	-.002 **	.00	.003 **	.00	.00	-.01
Education	.01 ***	.01	.03 ****	-.01 ****	.01 ***	.03 ****	.00	-.01	-.01
Income	-.03 **	.06	.12 ****	-.01	.09 ****	.00	.01	.01	.07 ****
Household size	-.01	-.18 ****	.09 *	-.02	-.06 *	-.01	-.04 **	.02	.06
Opportunity pull	.11 ****	.16 **	.24 ****	.05 ****	.12 ***	.18 ****	.06 ****	.12 *	.12 ****
Business age	-.07 ****	-.12 ***	-.38 ****	-.07 ****	-.09 ****	-.15 ****	-.09 ****	-.10 ****	-.40 ****
Business owners	.04 *	.06	.27 ****	.03 **	.13 ***	.24 ****	.02	.11 **	.29 ****
Business size	.02	.12 ***	-.44 ****	.01	.18 ****	-.45 ****	.02	.20 ****	-.38 ****
Intercept	1.65 ***	-.25	1.00 ****	1.78 ****	-.46 ****	.50 ****	1.60 ****	-.21	1.29 ****
N entrepreneurs	2,091	2,034	1,905	5,457	5,001	4,701	2,683	2,569	2,148

Linear regressions with metric coefficients.

For location, the reference is the locals, to whom the diasporans are compared.

* p < .10 ** p < .05 *** p < .01 **** p < .001