

Under-represented entrepreneurs: A literature review

October 2018

Under-represented entrepreneurs: A literature review

Maria Wishart

Enterprise Research Centre and Warwick Business School

Maria.Wishart@wbs.ac.uk

The Enterprise Research Centre is an independent research centre which focusses on SME growth and productivity. ERC is a partnership between Warwick Business School, Aston Business School, Queen's University School of Management, Leeds University Business School and University College Cork. The Centre is funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC); Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS); Innovate UK, the British Business Bank and the Intellectual Property Office. The support of the funders is acknowledged. The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the funders.

The project 'Building Better Business Resilience' is supported by JPMorgan Chase Foundation. The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the funders.



UNIVERSITÀ
DEGLI STUDI
DI PADOVA

ABSTRACT

Some groups of individuals, including migrants, ethnic minorities, women, people with disabilities, and those with low educational attainment are under-represented in entrepreneurship. Research shows that individuals from these groups that do succeed in starting their own businesses often experience greater barriers to entry, and lower turnover and survival rates than their mainstream counterparts. This review considers research that examines why this might be. Academic and non-academic research papers are included, both of which indicate that the barriers to entrepreneurship that under-represented groups experience can be attributed to their characteristics or circumstances. Some barriers tend to be common to all groups, for example, discrimination, access to finance, access to relevant entrepreneurship advice, and lack of business skills and experience. In addition to this, research indicates the likely impact of group-specific barriers. Migrants, for example, often face language barriers, and their lack of familiarity with host country institutions and culture can make setting up a business challenging. Recent research indicates that dominant stereotypes around migrant entrepreneurs, which present them as embedded in ethnic enclaves and restricted to low-skill and profit sectors, do not reflect the diversity of this group. Similarly, ethnic minorities are a diverse group which often include second and third generation migrants, and for whom the impact of the interplay between ethnic and mainstream networks is poorly understood. Women entrepreneurs can experience institutional barriers and social expectations that position them negatively versus male entrepreneurs. Disabled entrepreneurs often articulate the so-called benefits trap, in which the fear of losing benefits discourages them from becoming self-employed, and often lack social networks and role models to encourage them. Low educational attainment is often cited as one of a number of barriers faced by other groups of under-represented entrepreneurs, however relatively little published research considers the obstacles experienced by the less-educated per se, which is a gap in the literature. Research has largely ignored the double or even triple-disadvantage that some individuals face, due to combinations of factors that they experience, and this perhaps also merits further focus. Also worthy of further focus is the idea, as advanced by some researchers, that the characteristics and experiences of individuals in some under-represented groups can help to foster skills and resilience in them which may be beneficial to their entrepreneurial ventures. Some attention has been paid to interventions which may help to mitigate the barriers that under-represented groups face, as well as to reduce the failure rate of their businesses. Those identified include specialist training for advisers, and business skills training for under-represented entrepreneurs but again, more focus is needed in this area. Overall, this review

highlights the complexity of this area, and the variety of barriers that these individuals experience. It is clear that a 'one size fits all' solution is inappropriate and that instead, policies and interventions need to be informed by a more detailed understanding of these under-represented groups, which could give rise to more flexible and nuanced approaches.

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| ABSTRACT..... | 3 |
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 6 |
| 2. STRUCTURE OF THIS REVIEW..... | 7 |
| 3. MIGRANT ENTREPRENEURS | 7 |
| 4. ETHNIC MINORITY ENTREPRENEURS | 11 |
| 5. WOMEN ENTREPRENEURS..... | 14 |
| 6. DISABLED ENTREPRENEURS..... | 17 |
| 7. ENTREPRENEURS WITH LOW EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT | 20 |
| 8. CONCLUSIONS | 22 |
| REFERENCES..... | 24 |

1. INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurs are defined as individuals ‘who seek to generate value through the creation or expansion of economic activity, by identifying and exploiting new products, processes or markets’ (OECD, 2017, p18). The case for entrepreneurship as an enabler for individuals who experience disadvantage, to help them to transcend their circumstances, or as a tool to tackle discrimination and to increase social inclusion has been made repeatedly (e.g., Alvord et al, 2004; De Clercq and Honig, 2011; Fairlie, 2005). This review assesses academic and grey literature to date which focuses on issues related to under-represented groups and entrepreneurship, with the aim of establishing the current state of this stream of research. It seeks to answer the following questions:

- What are the main themes emerging from research to date into under-represented entrepreneurs?
- What unique challenges and opportunities do entrepreneurs from under-represented groups experience?
- How do the experiences of entrepreneurs from different under-represented groups vary?
- What contribution do under-represented entrepreneurs make to job creation and economic growth?

Groups that are under-represented in entrepreneurship include migrants, ethnic minorities, women, people who identify as having disabilities, and those with low educational attainment (Blackburn and Smallbone, 2015). These groups are all addressed in this review. Research shows that these groups can experience significant barriers to setting up and sustaining their own businesses, and this is attributed to a number of factors including lack of skills and experience, discrimination, difficulty accessing finance and poor human and social capital (Halabisky, 2015; Fairlie, 2005). Human capital is defined here as an individual’s personal skills knowledge and experience, and social capital as the resources that an individual is able to access through their personal networks (Halabisky, 2015). Although some barriers are common to different groups, others are specific to certain groups (OECD, 2017). Exploring the reasons underlying the barriers, whether common or specific, ought to help with the development of policies and intervention to address them, thus improving social inclusion, and delivering positive outcomes for the entrepreneurs themselves as well as for society as a whole.

EU employment rates for individuals from the under-represented groups identified above tend to be lower than average, and unemployment rates tend to be higher. The unemployment rate for disabled people aged 20 to 64 in the EU is 17% compared to 10% for those without a disability (European Disability Forum, 2017) and migrants to the EU have an 8.4% higher unemployment rate than EU-born workers (Eurostat, 2017). Difficulty securing employment, perhaps because of the barriers they face, has been advanced as one reason underpinning the choice of some of these specific groups of individuals to engage more in entrepreneurial activities than their mainstream counterparts. However, research has shown that these individuals experience more challenges than their mainstream counterparts in starting up and sustaining their own businesses. Additionally, their businesses tend to be more precarious, with lower turnovers and survival rates and an increased likelihood of dependent self-employment, where they have only one customer, and so-called 'false' self-employment, where they are self-employed but effectively work as employees (OECD, 2017).

2. STRUCTURE OF THIS REVIEW

This review focuses on research contemplating the five under-represented groups identified above - migrant entrepreneurs, ethnic minority entrepreneurs, women entrepreneurs, disabled entrepreneurs, and entrepreneurs with low educational attainment. The main themes in academic and non-academic literature to date with a focus on these groups are identified and discussed, before the review concludes with a number of suggested foci for future research, to address gaps in the knowledge in this area.

3. MIGRANT ENTREPRENEURS

According to the OECD (2011), migrant entrepreneurs are defined as 'foreign-born business owners who seek to generate value through the creation or expansion of economic activity, by identifying new products, processes or markets' (p141). Migrant entrepreneurs are diverse and the variety in scope, size and nature of the businesses that they run reflects this diversity. Data on the economic contribution made by migrant entrepreneurs is scarce (Lofstrom, 2014), but according to the OECD (2010) in 2005, 20% of businesses in London, employing 56,000 people and generating GBP 90 billion in revenue (11% of all business revenue in London) were migrant-owned. Between 1998 and 2008, migrant entrepreneur-owned firms employed 2.4% of the workforce of OECD countries (OECD, 2011). As well as making a material economic contribution, migrant entrepreneurs arguably accelerate globalisation with the introduction of new products and services (see below), and empirical research indicates that

the presence of migrants in a locality increases entrepreneurial activity (Mickiewicz et al, 2017). Despite these contributions, there is relatively little focus in academic literature on migrant entrepreneurship (Ram et al, 2017). Addressing this gap requires researchers to engage with a broad range of academic and non-academic stakeholders in order to gain an understanding of the area, and in doing so to contribute to wider debates related to social inequalities. Research to date has considered the barriers that migrant entrepreneurs face, the role of social networks in migrant entrepreneurship, and to a lesser degree predictors for success of migrant entrepreneurial businesses.

Migrant entrepreneurs face additional obstacles to self-employment over and above those experienced by the native population of their chosen countries, including language barriers, a lack of understanding of the culture of their new country and a lack of knowledge of the prevailing political institutions and regulations. This lack of language skills and understanding of their environment can mean that they are unaware of, or unable to access, support available to them as new entrepreneurs (OECD, 2017). The OECD suggests that the key to addressing these barriers is in the development of effective outreach programmes. Unsurprisingly, the barriers they encounter, and the ways in which they deal with them, have formed the main focus of research to date into migrant entrepreneurship.

The barriers they face have been characterised as ‘push’ factors in the creation of migrant entrepreneurs as well as obstacles. Azmat (2013, p200), for example, asserts that ‘economic necessity, social exclusion, lack of education and skills, high levels of unemployment, and language barriers’ constitute the main drivers to migrants becoming entrepreneurs. Thus, their prior experience can often be a driver to self-employment, because they struggle to find suitable employment elsewhere. Azmat argues that in trying to establish their own businesses, some migrants face double or even triple disadvantage, based upon their status as migrants but additionally, for example, as women and as originating from developing countries. She points to radically different social, institutional and cultural orientations in their host countries compared to their countries of origin, which means that they can find the context of their host country difficult to negotiate. This can mean that they struggle to gain access to finance, and to navigate unfamiliar regulations. Language barriers and lack of local knowledge can exacerbate this, and mean that they are unlikely to access available support networks and sources of assistance (Azmat, 2013). Access to finance has often been noted as a significant barrier to ethnic minority, and thus to migrant, entrepreneurs. Some studies indicate that this is down to discrimination, and unequal treatment, (e.g., Ram and Jones, 2008), while others

point to language barriers and limited knowledge of financing and how to access it as more likely reasons (e.g., Drori and Lerner, 2002). Religious barriers, in the form of a prohibition on paying interest, for example, can also play a part in putting migrant entrepreneurs at a financial disadvantage. Some cultural factors (e.g., work ethic, thrift) have been observed to contribute to entrepreneurial success in migrants, while others such as cultural expectations and religious beliefs can act as obstacles (Ensign & Robinson, 2011). Discrimination against ethnic minorities in paid employment, underpinned by negative stereotyping, has also often been identified as a 'push' factor, driving migrants towards self-employment (Ram and Jones, 2008). In some cases, ethnic groups have arguably constructed an identity for themselves as natural entrepreneurs, possibly as a way of promoting entrepreneurialism in response to the inequalities that they face (Ram and Jones, 2008). Education and skills in the entrepreneurs themselves have been found to be consistent predictors of success in migrant entrepreneurial enterprises (Lofstrom, 2014).

Dominant narratives have typically cast migrant entrepreneurs as advantaged by their embeddedness in their ethnic networks (e.g., Lofstrom, 2014). This stereotypical view contends that migrants derive benefits from these ethnic networks, including captive markets of enclaves of fellow migrants and access to financial and other resources, and that this allows them to transcend the discrimination that they face and to become economically successful (Ram et al, 2017). The benefits have been characterised as coming from the sheer proximity of their customers as well as from ethnic loyalty (Ram and Jones, 2008). Insights related to the importance of family and co-ethnic networks have been mixed - some studies have found that strong family and co-ethnic ties are positively correlated with business success for migrant entrepreneurs (e.g., Zimmer and Aldridge, 1987) however migrants with higher numbers of natives from their host countries in their networks have also been found to be more resilient to economic downturn than those with predominantly migrants (Chiesi, 2014). Strong networks with family and with their ethnic community have also been found to be a negative influence on the development of an entrepreneurial business, as those striving to establish their businesses find themselves over-embedded in these networks to the extent that they are constrained by them, and struggle to move beyond them in pursuit of business growth. This negative impact can manifest itself in obligations to employ, trade with and support network members, to the detriment of the business (Ensign and Robinson, 2011). Ethnic enclaves and the co-ethnic networks that they often produce have also been found to engender intense competition among migrant-led businesses, thus reducing opportunities and profitability (Fairlie and Loftstrom, 2013).

This de-contextualised approach has underpinned much research in this area, which has tended to adopt a social capital focus, with a strong emphasis on the social networks of the migrant entrepreneurs. Kloosterman and Rath (1999) argue for the influence of external business contexts including ‘the socio economic and politico-institutional environment of the country of settlement’ (p253) to be considered. This ‘mixed embeddedness’ approach takes account of market environment as well as social capital of the migrant entrepreneurs. It argues that the market is not a level playing field for migrants who experience disadvantage related to their resources as well as discrimination, which restricts their openings to specific, often low skill and value segments.

Migrant entrepreneurs are often depicted as over-represented in low-skill and low-profit sectors of the economy with relatively low barriers to entry, such as wholesale, retail and restaurants (Kloosterman and Rath, 1999; Lofstrom, 2014; Ram et al, 2017). Research to date focusing on the UK has also shown that in times of recession, migrant entrepreneurs are likely to be hardest hit because of their over-representation in low-skilled occupations where job losses are likely to be highest (Somerville and Sumption, 2009). However this perception is starting to be challenged. According to the OECD (2011), for example, migrant entrepreneurs are represented in as wide a variety of sectors as natives, and a majority now work outside traditional ethnic sectors. Ensign and Robinson (2011) argue that migrant entrepreneurs may often start in traditional sectors, but that they are often driven to do so because of discriminatory practices that mean they struggle to get a job, and because of the disinclination of mainstream businesses to cater for the needs of ethnic minorities. They also note a tendency for migrant-owned businesses to extend into the mainstream, by bringing the products and services originally designed for ethnic markets to the mainstream market. Such disruptive innovation has, they argue, irreversibly altered host markets, as these products and services have become a part of mainstream life in the host country.

To summarise, research to date with a migrant focus has offered insight into some of the motivations for this group to pursue entrepreneurship and into the barriers that they face, some of which they share with other under-represented groups and some of which are unique to them. Deep-seated stereotypes about this group cast them as embedded in and dependent upon their cultural enclaves, however recent studies have challenged this perception. Similarly, research is starting to question the dominant view of migrant entrepreneurs as concentrated in low skill low profit sectors.

4. ETHNIC MINORITY ENTREPRENEURS

There is some overlap in the literature relating to ethnic minority entrepreneurs and migrant entrepreneurs. In common with migrant entrepreneur research, early research (in the 1980s) tended to advance the view of ethnic minority entrepreneurs as stereotypically embedded within, and deriving advantage from, their communities, and characterised by a willingness to work long hours and to embrace entrepreneurship as a way of overcoming disadvantage. Ram and Jones (2009) argue that this conceptualisation of ethnic minority enterprise overstates the extent to which these stereotypes define ethnic minority entrepreneurs, arguing that such characteristics are also present in mainstream entrepreneur-led businesses. They also argue that it ignores the broader context within which these EMBs operate, and that prevailing social, political and economic circumstances impact considerably on them. This assertion underpins their contention that a mixed embeddedness approach is necessary to fully understand the circumstances that ethnic minority entrepreneurs experience. Researchers are also increasingly recognising that ethnic groups, never homogenous, have become super-diverse through evolving patterns of migration (Ram et al, 2012). Despite this, they continue to experience disadvantage, particularly with respect to the availability of financial resources to help ensure that their businesses succeed (Jones et al, 2012).

The outcomes of ethnic minority businesses are often asserted to be a function of the interaction between the social, human and financial capital of the entrepreneurs (Ilhan-Nas et al, 2012). As Kitching et al (2009) note, while diaspora-based networks are important, 'they do not negate the importance of class resources such as property, education and skills in the process of business formation and development among ethnic-minority groups' (p700). Deakins et al (2007) examine the role of social capital, with a focus on strong family and community ties, in the success of ethnic minority businesses (EMBs). They assert that evidence so far indicates that while social capital may be a positive force, it can also be a limiting factor for these entrepreneurs. The key to this seems to be a difference between first and subsequent generation ethnic entrepreneurs, insofar as second generation ethnic entrepreneurs are more likely to see local community networks as restrictive to their ambitions. They also note that there can be considerable variation in the 'culture and strength of local ethnic communities' (p321) meaning that available networks of successful business and finance professionals can vary significantly depending upon the specific community. The effect of social capital can thus be diverse. Clark and Drinkwater (2010) draw on census data to evidence their assertion that ethnic minority entrepreneurship is more likely to be driven by the

geographical location of these individuals in relatively deprived areas than by the presence of an ethnic enclave per se. Fairchild (2010) identifies an inter-generational relationship with the empirical observation that exposure to successful entrepreneurs from their parents' generation and within their ethnic enclave increases the likelihood of young ethnic people starting their own businesses.

Beckers and Blumberg (2013) find that despite being more integrated and often more highly educated, second generation ethnic minority entrepreneurs tend to experience less successful business outcomes in terms of growth and profitability. However, they assert that this may be a function of the fact that these businesses are more likely to be mainstream-focused rather than catering for a specific ethnic market. Some research does indicate that second generation immigrants are more likely to be successful in breaking into mainstream sectors (Efendic et al, 2015), and research in the US which examines the link between self-employment and assimilation finds that self-employment is positively linked to mainstream assimilation across a range of ethnic minority groups (Valdez, 2012). This is disputed by, among others, Ergolu (2018) who finds that despite being more proficient in terms of host country language and often having higher educational attainment than their forebears, second generation migrants remain attached to and involved in the niche segment businesses of their parents. Such findings challenge the so-called assimilation thesis which posits that as minority groups become more assimilated, ethnic niches will lose their appeal and mainstream markets more attractive. Antheas and Cederberg (2009) caution against the view that ethnic bonds constitute social capital at all, arguing that while ethnic entrepreneurs can sometimes feel that such links help them to deal with marginality, unless they demonstrably help compensate for structural disadvantage they should not be regarded as social capital.

Jones et al (2012) argue that ethnic businesses in the UK are transitioning through the substitution of human and financial capital for labour intensiveness, resulting in breakout from sectors traditionally occupied by such firms. However, progress in this direction is slow, and variable across different ethnic groups. In an empirical study into ethnic minority business start-ups in Finland, Katila and Wahldeck (2011) find that social capital is most effective when derived from both co-ethnic and broader Finnish ties. Combining these is, they argue, more likely to deliver sustained business success. Nathan and Lee (2013) offer empirical evidence that ethnic diversity in management teams of London-based firms increases the likelihood of innovation, suggesting that there may be positive economic as well as social outcomes from ethnic-minority led enterprise. Conversely, resisting the adoption of host country business

practices, and relying instead on business practices prevalent in their home countries is associated with the failure of ethnic-minority and migrant businesses (Mendy and Hack-Polay, 2015). Adapting their professional identities to reflect the influences and requirements of the mainstream sectors of their markets, by for example belonging to professional bodies or gaining professional qualifications, is positively linked to the success of ethnic minority businesses, because it evidences competence and helps to gain the trust of new groups of customers, beyond the ethnic enclave (Altinay et al, 2014).

A number of common factors experienced by aspirant ethnic minority entrepreneurs are identified in the literature as impacting upon their survival and resilience to shocks. Lack of financial capital including gaining access to start-up funding and insurance (Ram and Jones, 2009) is often cited as a barrier to these individuals establishing and maintaining businesses, although underlying reasons for this are disputed, and include racism (Ishaq et al, 2010) low level of educational attainment (Bewaji et al, 2015) absence of assets for use as collateral and poor integration into society, leading to unawareness of available sources of finance (Bruder et al, 2011; Senik and Verdier, 2011). Neville et al (2018) observe that in the USA, ethnic minorities have a greater tendency to experience discouragement when applying for external finance for their businesses, a fact that they attribute to unequal treatment versus their white counterparts. Low adoption of ICT within EMBs is noted as an issue, and variation has been observed between generations, with second and subsequent generation migrants more likely to be receptive to ICT investments. Business characteristics including size and consequent lack of financial capacity to invest, absence of internal ICT expertise and lack of strategic intent have been advanced as reasons for EMB failure to embrace ICT (Beckinsale et al, 2011). Ram and Jones (2009) also note that ethnic minority businesses have a greater tendency to be sole traders and to have low turnover than non-ethnic minority businesses. This can make them more vulnerable to external shocks. Ethnic minority-focused agencies and initiatives are not necessarily the answer to such challenges – research shows that EMBs are less likely than non-EMBs to access business advice from such sources. This is attributed to a number of factors including lack of awareness of the agencies, lack of trust and a perceived lack of relevance as well as to cultural and language differences.

Thompson et al (2010) note the impact of university education on the entrepreneurial motivations and attitudes of ethnic minority entrepreneurs. However, they also find variance between ethnic groups - the increased likelihood of opportunity-driven (rather than necessity-driven) entrepreneurship observed in Pakistani graduates is not replicated in other ethnic

groups, for example, which indicates that interventions need to acknowledge this divergence. Their research also shows variance in rates of self-employment across different ethnic groups which they argue is not well understood, and which may be attributable to differing culture, location or rates of assimilation of these groups. Entrepreneurial orientation, which is evidenced by proactive, risk-taking and innovative behaviour on the part of those leading the business, has been found to vary depending on ethnic group, and to be a driver for employment growth, although not for sales growth, in EMBs. It is possible that poor human resources management combined with a propensity to recruit family and ethnic enclave members, who may not necessarily be a good skills match for the business, may explain why employment rises but turnover does not (Wang and Altinay, 2010). This is an effect noted by Katila and Wahlbeck (2011) who observe that social capital can have a negative effect on business performance when reciprocal obligations lead to the recruitment of family or ethnic group members who are not best suited to the roles.

In summary, as noted above, there is considerable overlap between the body of research that focuses upon ethnic minority entrepreneurship and that with a focus upon migrant entrepreneurship. The debates around embeddedness in ethnic enclaves are common to both, and research indicates that these groups experience disadvantaging factors (e.g., access to finance, discrimination) in a similar way. Research with an ethnic minority focus has additionally examined the entrepreneurial activities of second and subsequent generations of migrants, often with the aim of assessing the extent to which these entrepreneurs have assimilated and have begun to operate in mainstream sectors. The interplay of ethnic and mainstream networks, and the effects of higher education levels, are a significant focus in this body of research. Findings have been diverse, and much more remains to be done if the impacts of social and human capital for ethnic minority entrepreneurs are to be understood. Much research emphasises the diversity of this group, and the need for specific and targeted interventions to address the sources of disadvantage that they experience.

5. WOMEN ENTREPRENEURS

Despite a burgeoning field of research in the area, much of which has considered policy initiatives to address this, women remain under-represented in entrepreneurship (Shinnar et al, 2018). Women are considerably less likely to be self-employed than men in the EU. Statistics show that 9.9% of women versus 17.5% of men in the EU have their own businesses (OECD, 2017). Early research (during the 1980s and 90s) into female entrepreneurship often sought to contrast the characteristics of men and women entrepreneurs. Women were often

characterised as more likely to be ‘pushed’ into starting a business from home, by economic necessity and the need to fit in with domestic and family responsibilities, whereas men were more likely to be ‘pulled’ by the lure of a new venture. As part of this characterisation, women entrepreneurs were often presented as less ambitious than men, with weaker business support networks and lower levels of prior business experience (Poggesi et al, 2015). This approach has been criticised as overly-individualistic, and likely to advocate solution at the individual rather than societal or institutional level (Hughes et al, 2012; Ahl and Nelson, 2015). Further, it has arguably led to the marginalisation of women entrepreneurs (Humbert and Brindley, 2014) in terms of research agendas. More recently, research in this area has evolved to consider in more detail the complexities of women entrepreneurs’ motivations, their experiences in attracting finance and their approaches to developing networks and managerial practices to support and enhance their businesses.

Thompson et al (2009) draw on Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) data to refute the idea that entrepreneurship can always offer a viable means through which women can combine work and home responsibilities, demonstrating that women are more likely to operate businesses from home and such businesses are likely to be ‘relatively small in scale, insecure and offer poorer returns’. This, they argue, puts them at a disadvantage versus other entrepreneurs and means that their businesses are more precarious and at a higher risk of failure. The idea that their family commitments may inhibit women’s entrepreneurial aspirations is often expressed, however research indicates that the relationship between entrepreneurial aspirations and family life is much more nuanced, and that it varies depending upon a woman’s life stage (Manolova et al, 2010).

Women’s motivations for entrepreneurship are found to differ from those of men, with less focus on purely growth and financial objectives and more on developing their own profiles and skills sets. This can mean that women entrepreneurs tend to have multiple motivations which, in turn, can arguably lead to less focus on the business but which may also mean that they are more tenacious in the face of financial difficulties because they have more reasons to persist (Manolova et al, 2012). Shinnar et al (2018) observe that women are less likely than men to act on their entrepreneurial intentions, a finding they attribute to socially prescribed gender roles which mean that women are less supported than men in their entrepreneurial ambitions. Women entrepreneurs are often characterised as more risk averse than men but again, research points to a more nuanced reality, in which a woman’s life stage impacts upon her

willingness to take business risks. Typically, becoming a mother is observed to lead to lower risk-taking behaviour (Humbert and Brindley, 2014).

The common assertion that women face discrimination in accessing finance is challenged by Manolova et al (2010). These researchers suggest that women experience discrimination not in accessing finance *per se*, but rather in accessing finance on favourable terms, a subtle but material difference. More broadly in terms of bias, traditional discourses of entrepreneurship are often found to be masculine in focus (Aggestam and Wigren-Kristoferson, 2017; Braches and Elliot, 2017) and women entrepreneurs, particularly those operating in traditionally male-dominated sectors, articulate the idea that the bias that they experience is deeply embedded and unconscious, but that in order to overcome it they need to assimilate and even to become 'honorary' men in order to fit in and gain acceptance and credibility (Martin et al, 2015).

In common with other under-represented groups, lack of education and managerial skills are found to impede female entrepreneurship (Huang et al, 2012). Conversely, possessing a balanced set of skills is positively correlated with self-employment, and offering a broad exposure to a range of industry experiences and approaches in education, for example at degree-level, could therefore potentially improve entrepreneurial outcomes for women. (Tegtmeier et al, 2016).

Proposed interventions to improve female entrepreneurial outcomes often focus upon the development and nurturing of human and social capital. Mentoring, for example, is often advanced as an intervention which can improve self-confidence as well as improve business and managerial skills in women (e.g., Laukhuf, 2015). Shinnar et al (2018) suggest that incorporating female entrepreneurial exemplars in formal business educational programmes, for example in case studies, may increase the likelihood of women following through on their entrepreneurial ambitions. McGowan et al (2015) advocate the development of social capital in young female entrepreneurs, specifically with the establishment of a diverse range of formal and informal contacts, as a way of improving their entrepreneurial outcomes by helping them negotiate the challenging circumstances they are likely to encounter. As well as social capital, they note the importance of human capital for women entrepreneurs, and argue that the provision of high quality business education programmes to develop relevant skills ought to be a central focus for policymakers seeking to improve entrepreneurial outcomes. Fuentes-Fuentes et al (2015) agree that social capital is an important predictor of success in women-led enterprises, and suggest that research ought to interrogate not only the make-up of the

networks that women entrepreneurs draw on, but also the knowledge content of the networks, since the acquisition of knowledge related to markets, technical know-how and customers is strongly linked to entrepreneurial orientation and business success. Their research demonstrates that for women entrepreneurs, this sort of knowledge is likely to be accessed through their networks. Interestingly they note that women are more likely to use this knowledge to improve non-financial outcomes of their businesses such as customer satisfaction. This view is supported by Bulanova et al (2015) who find in an empirical study that women entrepreneurs resist business growth partly because they believe it will impact negatively on the quality of services offered. This resonates with the idea, often expressed, that women and men entrepreneurs' motivations and objectives can be divergent, and that this ought to be acknowledged in any interventions designed to improve female entrepreneurial outcomes.

In summary, and in common with other under-represented groups, the barriers and impediments to entrepreneurship that women experience appear to vary depending upon their life stage and levels of human and social capital. Overly simplistic comparisons with male entrepreneurs evident in early research did little to drive forward the agenda of women entrepreneurs. A more nuanced understanding of this group is emergent, and future research could deliver much to expand this knowledge.

6. DISABLED ENTREPRENEURS

In 2009, 25% of the population of the EU aged 16 or over had an impairment of some kind. Disability is correlated with lower employment rates and earnings, and disabled people who are in employment tend to work in lower-skill, lower-pay roles (Kitching, 2014). According to government statistics, in 2012 in the UK 46% of working age disabled people were in paid employment compared to 76% of non-disabled people (UK Government, 2014). This disparity is often attributed to discrimination, but also to the common presumption that employing people with disabilities has health and safety implications, and to financial incentives which do not work to motivate employers to employ disabled people (Cooney, 2008). The implications of these statistics for the well-being of disabled individuals as well as for society as a whole are significant, and often entrepreneurship is presented as a way of increasing participation rates of disabled people in the labour market. In fact, EU and US data shows that self-employment rates are higher for disabled people than for those without a disability. For example, in the UK, 18% of disabled men and 8% of disabled women are self-employed, versus 14% and 6% respectively for people without a disability (Boylan and Burchart, 2002). Data on the economic

contribution made by disabled entrepreneurs is scant, and there is a paucity of research in this area (Renko et al, 2016).

Impairments and disabilities are diverse and a first step in addressing issues related to employment barriers for disabled people is to acknowledge that impairment characteristics vary significantly in terms of type, severity, stability, duration and time of onset (Berthoud, 2011). For example, as discussed below, recent research has identified constraints and opportunities related specifically to mental health disabilities (Stephan, 2018). More than this, personal characteristics and socio-economic circumstances also vary, meaning that a 'one size fits all' approach is unlikely to be appropriate when developing policy (Kitching, 2014). Research to date on disabled entrepreneurship has considered motivations to become self-employed, which have tended to be characterised as either 'push' or 'pull' factors. Pull factors include things like the flexibility of being self-employed, and increased autonomy, while push factors may include lack of employment opportunities and discrimination (Boylan and Burchart, 2002). Cooney (2008) asserts that reasons for starting a business in disabled people can be complex, often driven by both negative 'push' factors and positive 'pull' factors. He notes that 'while there are many positive reasons for people with disabilities establishing their own business, prejudice and other negative motivations remain the key initiating factors' (p128). He also notes a disconnect between dominant perceptions of successful entrepreneurs and the perceptions that disabled people have of themselves – essentially, many do not see the identity of entrepreneur as available to them, or as compatible with their disabled status.

Researchers have also considered the barriers that disabled people face when attempting to become entrepreneurs. Some of these barriers are relevant for a number of under-represented groups, and some are specific to people with disabilities. In common with other groups, disabled entrepreneurs struggle to gain access to start-up capital, and this is often attributed to a poor credit rating due to lack of employment prospects, and the discrimination of banks towards people with disabilities (Kitching, 2014). Also in common with other under-represented groups, people with disabilities can lack the skills and confidence necessary to start their own business (OECD, 2017). They often also lack the aspiration to become an entrepreneur (OECD, 2014), perhaps because of the way that they are positioned by others and by society as a whole. An absence of appropriate business advice which may encourage entrepreneurial activity is also often noted in research (Pavey, 2006; Boylan and Burchardt, 2002), and this is likely to be attributable to a number of factors. In some cases, the aspirant entrepreneurs simply don't see themselves as disabled, and so do not seek out specialist advice. More

commonly, those giving the advice do not have the expertise and experience necessary to be able to identify and offer appropriate support to people with disabilities, and this is undoubtedly sometimes driven by unconscious bias. Support materials are not always available in a format suitable for disabled individuals (e.g., in braille, in audible format). For disabled individuals in particular, support services may be physically inaccessible.

Research has also identified specific barriers entrepreneurship for disabled people. Kitching (2014) asserts that the benefits trap, in which disabled potential entrepreneurs are discouraged from starting a business by the prospect of losing their existing benefits, is a significant barrier. Boylan and Burchardt (2002) find that many disabled people are unaware of in-work tax support available for them, and contend that fear of losing housing benefits is the main barrier related to the benefits trap. As noted above, if advice is available, disabled people often report that advisers dissuade them from entrepreneurial choices, perhaps because of unconscious stereotyping or bias (Pavey, 2006). Disabled individuals may experience additional bias – similar to the double disadvantage outlined above – if they belong to more than one under-represented group. Hence, disabled women or disabled migrant entrepreneurs often find themselves experiencing more than one source of disadvantage when it comes to starting up a business. Drakopoulou Dodd (2015), for example, notes that disability is often combined with poor educational attainment, which leads to double disadvantage. Disabled people often also lack social networks which can facilitate entrepreneurial start-ups, and role models (Uddin and Jamil, 2015). Researchers have contended that while barriers to entrepreneurship can be similar across a range of under-represented groups, ‘...for disabled people they may be more acute or more difficult to overcome’ (Boylan and Burchardt, 2002, p8).

Conversely, the experience of having and living with their disability has been characterised as a factor that can contribute to their entrepreneurial abilities. Researchers have asserted, for example, that disabled people derive skills through facing and coping with their disability which equip them well for entrepreneurship, notably problem-solving and innovation skills honed by having to overcome adversity throughout their lives (Cooney, 2008; Drakopoulou Dodd, 2015; Maritz and Laferriere, 2016). Some research into disabled entrepreneurship has found that the support of family members, both in terms of encouragement and provision of finance, and access to in-work benefits can act as enablers to disabled individuals seeking to start their own businesses. (Boylan and Burchart, 2002). Research focusing on mental health disabilities has found a positive association between some disabilities and entrepreneurship. For example

ADHD, which is classed as a psychological disorder, appears to encompass traits and features which facilitate entrepreneurship in some individuals (Stephan, 2018).

Suggestions to address the barriers faced by disabled entrepreneurs include the bringing together of disabled people and those who can offer support on entrepreneurship through networking events, in order to start a dialogue and to allow the supporters to understand the situations of disabled people better (Drakopoulou Dodd, 2015). Advisory skill training for supporters, and entrepreneurial skill training for the disabled are also advanced as policy recommendations to address the disadvantage that disabled entrepreneurs can experience (Maritz and Laferriere, 2014). OECD (2014) research has also identified the role of technology in facilitating entrepreneurship, in particular by improving disabled peoples' connections with the world. Further research focus on this under-researched area is also recommended (Pagan, 2009).

This is a diverse group, and the wide range of different impairments experienced by disabled entrepreneurs makes it challenging for research to identify insights and interventions that are appropriate for all. As with migrants, aspirant entrepreneurs from this group experience barriers that they have in common with other under-represented groups, as well as those unique to their particular circumstances. Entrepreneurship is often advanced as a way into the workplace for people with disabilities, and so a better understanding of the diversity of impairment, and of the way that people with different disabilities experience barriers, could offer much to policy and practice.

7. ENTREPRENEURS WITH LOW EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Relative to the bodies of research devoted to migrant entrepreneurs and disabled entrepreneurs, the body of literature that investigates educational attainment and its relationship with entrepreneurship is perhaps less developed. Fairlie's (2006) USA-focused research finds that those who drop out of their high school education are significantly less likely than those who complete their education to start a business. For those that do start a business, there is a negative correlation between level of education and the likelihood of the business failing, and further, in the event of failure, the less-educated are more likely to move to unemployment. In addition to this, low educational attainment is thought to contribute to the challenges experienced by a number of entrepreneurs, including migrant and disabled (Fairlie, 2006). Jiménez et al (2015) note that previous studies have found a link between education

and successful formal entrepreneurship (e.g., Delmar and Davidsson, 2000, in Jiménez et al), although they argue that educated individuals are probably also more likely to do well in paid employment. Probing the link, Jiménez et al (2015) find that both secondary and higher education is linked to successful entrepreneurship because of the higher self-confidence, lower perceived risk and enhanced human capital that it confers. Education also enhances potential entrepreneurs' capabilities to detect and evaluate business opportunities.

Acknowledging that less educated people are more likely to experience disadvantage, Becker's (1962) human capital thesis asserts that investing in skills and abilities impacts positively on the individuals as well as on their organisations, and this notion underpins a number of studies in this area. Kim et al (2006) see skills as central to entrepreneurial success, asserting that '... neither financial nor cultural capital resources are necessary conditions for entrepreneurial entry. By contrast, potential entrepreneurs gain significant advantages if they possess high levels of human capital' (p5). In a review of literature focusing on the impact of formal schooling on entrepreneurship, Van der Sluis et al (2008) find overall that education has a positive and significant effect on entrepreneurial performance, but highlight problems of definition and measurement in some studies, arguing that as a body of work, this lags behind the schooling-employees literature. They find no link between formal schooling level and likelihood to engage in entrepreneurship. Unger et al (2011) undertake a review of literature focusing on human capital, including education experience knowledge and skills, and entrepreneurial success, and also find a body of work that is fragmented insofar as different conceptualisations of human capital are employed, and a variety of success indicators and contexts are examined. Nonetheless, this review concludes that there is a small but significant relationship between human capital and success, particularly in younger businesses, but that the relationship is stronger for current task-related skills than for general educational attainment. Investigating the link between level of formal education of an entrepreneur and the quality of the strategic decisions that they take, Sonfield and Lussier (2014) conclude that 'a greater level of education leads to choosing "better" entrepreneurial innovation/risk situations and their appropriate entrepreneurial strategies' (p24). Estrin et al (2016) find that higher levels of education (e.g., university-level) may be especially relevant to the identification and development of social entrepreneurship initiatives.

While the studies outlined above evidence some focus upon the link between formal education levels and entrepreneurship, as noted by Unger et al (2011) this is a relatively emergent and fragmented body of work. Low educational attainment has more often been considered as an

additional source of disadvantage experienced by other under-represented groups. However, the research that has considered educational attainment per se, indicates that it is linked to entrepreneurial performance and can impact positively on business performance. Specific skill-focused education in particular appears to have a stronger link than general education to the performance of an entrepreneur's business. These findings suggest that more focus in this area is needed, to elucidate the connection between formal education, skills training and entrepreneurial success.

8. CONCLUSIONS

Significant bodies of research, both academic and non-academic, have delivered varying degrees of insight into the experiences of these five groups of under-represented entrepreneurs, however much of this research has focused explicitly upon describing barriers and difficulties, and significant gaps remain in understanding of the way that these barriers can be negotiated and overcome. Very little research has focused on the strengths of these groups, and on the ways in which these could potentially contribute to their entrepreneurial success.

Migrant entrepreneurs have been studied in some depth, however evidence suggests that this group is starting to evolve beyond its origins in low-skill, low-profit sectors which are embedded in ethnic communities. Examining this evolution, perhaps with some focus on the length of time that migrants have been in their host countries, which has largely been ignored in studies to date, might improve understanding of the way that this group experiences entrepreneurship in the twenty-first century. Ethnic minority entrepreneurship research has started to consider the interplay of ethnic and mainstream networks, and the effects of higher education levels for these individuals, many of whom are second and third generation immigrants, but more remains to be done if the impacts of social and human capital for these entrepreneurs are to be understood. A more nuanced understanding of the ways in which women approach entrepreneurship is emerging, but more research is needed to continue the move away from simplistic comparisons with men and to identify relevant interventions. For disabled entrepreneurs, more understanding around the diversity of impairment they experience and the way that this impacts upon their entrepreneurial ambitions would enable the development of relevant policies and interventions. As Fairlie (2005) notes, entrepreneurs with low educational attainment have received less attention in the literature so far than other groups, however lack of educational qualifications has often been included as one of a number of factors present in other under-represented groups. The research that has been undertaken

suggests that there is a link between formal education level and entrepreneurial success, however understanding of the barriers that the less educated experience is quite superficial. This is a gap in the literature.

The notion of double or even triple disadvantage emerges in a number of research reports, whereas much research to date has addressed under-represented entrepreneurs in distinct groupings. Further, Blackburn and Smallbone (2015) also note that physical location of the entrepreneur appears to be a compounding factor in relation to under-represented groups. For example, they assert that entrepreneurs in deprived locations appear to experience more problems in accessing finance, which makes it more challenging for start-ups and sustainability. In some cases this may result in double-disadvantage for some groups, such as ethnic minorities who live in poorer parts of the inner-cities. Exploring the overlapping nature of many potentially disadvantaging factors may offer a different perspective from which to consider policy and practice related to entrepreneurship in under-represented groups.

REFERENCES

- Aggestam, M., & Wigren-Kristoferson, C. (2017). How women entrepreneurs build embeddedness: a case study approach. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 9(3), 252-268.
- Ahl, H., & Nelson, T. (2015). How policy positions women entrepreneurs: A comparative analysis of state discourse in Sweden and the United States. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 30(2), 273-291.
- Altinay, L., Saunders, M. N. K., & Wang, C. L. (2014). The Influence of Culture on Trust Judgments in Customer Relationship Development by Ethnic Minority Small Businesses. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 52(1), 59-78.
- Alvord, S. H., Brown, L. D., & Letts, C. W. (2004). Social Entrepreneurship and Societal Transformation. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 40(3), 260.
- Anthias, F., & Cederberg, M. (2009). Using Ethnic Bonds in Self-Employment and the Issue of Social Capital. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35(6), 901-917.
- Azmat, F. (2013). Opportunities or obstacles? *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 5(2), 198-215.
- Becker, G. S. (1962). Investment in Human Capital: A Theoretical Analysis. *Journal of Political Economy*, 70(5), 9-49.
- Beckers, P., & Blumberg, B. F. (2013). Immigrant Entrepreneurship on the Move: A Longitudinal Analysis of First- and Second-Generation Immigrant Entrepreneurship in the Netherlands. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 25(7-8), 654-691.
- Beckinsale, M., Ram, M., & Theodorakopoulos, N. (2010). ICT adoption and ebusiness development: Understanding ICT adoption amongst ethnic minority businesses. *International Small Business Journal*, 29(3), 193-219.
- Berthoud, R. (2011). Trends in the Employment of Disabled People in Britain. Institute for Social and Economic Research. University of Essex.
- Bewaji, T., Yang, Q., & Han, Y. (2015). Funding accessibility for minority entrepreneurs: an empirical analysis. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 22(4), 716-733.
- Blackburn, D., & Smallbone, D. (2015). Sustaining self-employment for disadvantaged entrepreneurs - A background paper for the OECD Centre for Entrepreneurship, SMEs and Local Development. Retrieved from
- Boylan, A., & Burchardt, T. (2002). Barriers to self-employment for disabled people. Report prepared for the Small Business Service.

- Braches, B., & Elliott, C. (2016). Articulating the entrepreneurship career: A study of German women entrepreneurs. *International Small Business Journal*, 35(5), 535-557.
- Bruder, J., Neuberger, D., & R athke-D oppner, S. (2011). Financial constraints of ethnic entrepreneurship: evidence from Germany. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 17(3), 296-313.
- Bulanova, O., Isaksen, E. J., & Kolvereid, L. (2016). Growth aspirations among women entrepreneurs in high growth firms. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 11(2), 187-206.
- Chiesi, A. M. (2014). Interpersonal Networking and Business Resilience: How Immigrants in Small Business Face the Crisis in Italy. *European Sociological Review*, 30(4), 457.
- Clark, K., & Drinkwater, S. (2010). Patterns of Ethnic Self-Employment in Time and Space: Evidence from British Census Microdata. *Small Business Economics*, 34(3), 323-338.
- Cooney, T. (2008). Entrepreneurs with Disabilities: Profile of a Forgotten Minority. *Irish Business Journal*, 4(1), 119-129.
- De Clercq, D., & Honig, B. (2011). Entrepreneurship as an integrating mechanism for disadvantaged persons. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 23(5-6), 353-372.
- Deakins, D., Ishaq, M., Smallbone, D., Whittam, G., & Wyper, J. (2007). Ethnic Minority Businesses in Scotland and the Role of Social Capital. *International Small Business Journal*, 25(3), 307-326.
- Drakopoulou-Dodd, S. (2015). Disabled entrepreneurs: rewarding work, challenging barriers, building support. Policy brief. Hunter centre for entrepreneurship. University of Strathclyde.
- Drori, I., & Lerner, M. (2002). The Dynamics of Limited Breaking Out: The Case of the Arab Manufacturing Businesses in Israel. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 14(2), 135-154.
- Efendic, N., Andersson, F. W., & Wennberg, K. (2015). Growth in first- and second-generation immigrant firms in Sweden. *International Small Business Journal*, 34(8), 1028-1052.
- Erođlu, Ő. (2018). Trapped in small business? An investigation of three generations of migrants from Turkey to Western Europe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 44(7), 1214-1232.
- Estrin, S., Mickiewicz, T., & Stephan, U. (2016). Human capital in social and commercial entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 31(4), 449-467.
- European Disability Forum. (2017). Employment. Retrieved from <http://www.edf-feph.org/employment>
- Eurostat. (2017). Migrant integration statistics – labour market indicators. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Migrant_integration_statistics_-_labour_market_indicators

- Fairchild, G. B. (2010). Intergenerational ethnic enclave influences on the likelihood of being self-employed. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(3), 290-304.
- Fairlie, R. (2005). Entrepreneurship among disadvantaged groups: An analysis of the dynamics of self-employment by gender, race, and education. In S. Parker, Z. Acs, & D. Audretsch (Eds.), *Handbook of entrepreneurship*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Fairlie, R., & Lofstrom, M. (2013). Immigration and entrepreneurship. Discussion paper 7669. Institute for the study of Labour. Bonn.
- Fuentes-Fuentes, M. D., Bojica, A. M., & Ruiz-Arroyo, M. (2015). Entrepreneurial orientation and knowledge acquisition: effects on performance in the specific context of women-owned firms. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 11(3), 695-717.
- Halabisky, D., European, C., & Development, O. f. E. C.-o. a. (2015). Policy brief on sustaining self-employment : entrepreneurial activities in Europe (9789279433900 9279433903). Retrieved from Luxembourg: <http://bookshop.europa.eu/uri?target=EUB:NOTICE:KEBE14002:EN:HTML>
- Huang, K.-h., Mas-tur, A., & Yu, T. H.-k. (2012). Factors affecting the success of women entrepreneurs. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 8(4), 487-497.
- Hughes, K. D., Jennings, J. E., Brush, C., Carter, S., & Welter, F. (2012). Extending Women's Entrepreneurship Research in New Directions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36(3), 429-442.
- Humbert, A. L., & Brindley, C. (2015). Challenging the concept of risk in relation to women's entrepreneurship. *Gender in Management*, 30(1), 2-25.
- Ilhan-Nas, T., Sahin, K., & Cilingir, Z. (2011). International ethnic entrepreneurship: Antecedents, outcomes and environmental context. *International Business Review*, 20(6), 614-626.
- Ishaq, M., Hussain, A., & Whittam, G. (2010). Racism: A barrier to entry? Experiences of small ethnic minority retail businesses. *International Small Business Journal*, 28(4), 362-377.
- Jiménez, A., Palmero-Cámara, C., González-Santos, M. J., González-Bernal, J., & Jiménez-Eguizábal, J. A. (2015). The impact of educational levels on formal and informal entrepreneurship. *BRQ Business Research Quarterly*, 18(3), 204-212.
- Jones, T., Mascarenhas-Keyes, S., & Ram, M. (2012). The Ethnic Entrepreneurial Transition: Recent Trends in British Indian Self-Employment. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 38(1), 93-109.
- Jones, T., Ram, M., Edwards, P., Kiselichev, A., & Muchenje, L. (2012). New Migrant Enterprise: Novelty or Historical Continuity? *Urban Studies*, 49(14), 3159-3176.

- Katila, S., & Wahlbeck, Ö. (2011). The role of (transnational) social capital in the start-up processes of immigrant businesses: The case of Chinese and Turkish restaurant businesses in Finland. *International Small Business Journal*, 30(3), 294-309.
- Kim, P., Aldrich, H., & Keister, L. (2006). Access (Not) Denied: The Impact of Financial, Human, and Cultural Capital on Entrepreneurial Entry in the United States. *Small Business Economics*, 27(1), 5-22.
- Kitching, J. (2014). Entrepreneurship and self-employment by people with disabilities Background Paper for the OECD Project on Inclusive Entrepreneurship.
- Kitching, J., Smallbone, D., & Athayde, R. (2009). Ethnic Diasporas and Business Competitiveness: Minority-Owned Enterprises in London. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35(4), 689-705.
- Kloosterman, R., van der Leun, J., & Rath, J. (1999). Mixed Embeddedness: (In)formal Economic Activities and Immigrant Businesses in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 23(2), 252-266.
- Laukhuf, R. L., & Malone, T. A. (2015). Women Entrepreneurs Need Mentors. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching & Mentoring*, 13(1), 70-86.
- Lofstrom, M. (2014). Immigrants and entrepreneurship. *IZA World of Labor*.
- Manolova, T. S., Brush, C. G., Edelman, L. F., & Shaver, K. G. (2012). One Size Does Not Fit All: Entrepreneurial Expectancies and Growth Intentions of US Women and Men Nascent Entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 24(1-2), 7-27.
- Maritz, A., & Laferriere, R. (2016). Entrepreneurship and self-employment for people with disabilities. *Australian Journal of Career Development*, 25(2), 45-54.
- Martin, L., Wright, L., Beaven, Z., & Matlay, H. (2015). An unusual job for a woman? Female entrepreneurs in scientific, engineering and technology sectors. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 21(4), 539-556.
- McGowan, P., Cooper, S., Durkin, M., & O'Kane, C. (2015). The Influence of Social and Human Capital in Developing Young Women as Entrepreneurial Business Leaders. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 53(3), 645-661.
- Mendy, J., & Hack-Polay, D. (2018). Learning from failure: A study of failed enterprises of self-employed African migrants in the UK. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 25(2), 330-343.
- Mickiewicz, T., Hart, M., Nyakudya, F., & Theodorakopoulos, N. (2017). Ethnic pluralism, immigration and entrepreneurship. *Regional Studies*, 1-15.
- Nathan, M., & Lee, N. (2013). Cultural Diversity, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship: Firm-level Evidence from London. *Economic Geography*, 89(4), 367-394.

- Neville, F., Forrester, J. K., O'Toole, J., & Riding, A. (2017). 'Why Even Bother Trying?' Examining Discouragement among Racial-Minority Entrepreneurs. *Journal of Management Studies*, 55(3), 424-456.
- OECD. (2010). *Entrepreneurship and Migrants Report by the OECD Working Party on SMEs and Entrepreneurship*.
- OECD. (2011). *International Migration Outlook 2011*.
- OECD/European Union. (2017). *The Missing Entrepreneurs: OECD Publishing*.
- Pagán, R. (2009). Self-employment among people with disabilities: evidence for Europe. *Disability & Society*, 24(2), 217-229.
- Pavey, B. (2006). Human capital, social capital, entrepreneurship and disability: an examination of some current educational trends in the UK. *Disability & Society*, 21(3), 217-229.
- Poggesi, S., Mari, M., & De Vita, L. (2016). What's new in female entrepreneurship research? Answers from the literature. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 12(3), 735-764.
- Prescott, C. E., & Nicholas, P. R. (2011). Entrepreneurs because they are Immigrants or Immigrants because they are Entrepreneurs?: A Critical Examination of the Relationship between the Newcomers and the Establishment. *The Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 20(1), 33-53.
- Ram, M., & Jones, T. (2008). *Ethnic minorities in business*. A SERT publication.
- Ram, M., & Jones, T. (2009). *Ethnic-minority businesses in the UK: a review of research and policy developments* Paper presented at the 29th Annual Conference of the Institute-for-Small-Business-and-Entrepreneurship, Cardiff, WALES.
- Ram, M., Jones, T., & Villares-Varela, M. (2016). Migrant entrepreneurship: Reflections on research and practice. *International Small Business Journal*, 35(1), 3-18.
- Ram, M., Trehan, K., Rouse, J., Woldesenbet, K., & Jones, T. (2012). Ethnic Minority Business Support in the West Midlands: Challenges and Developments. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 30(3), 504-519.
- Renko, M., Bullough, A., & Saeed, S. (2016). ENTREPRENEURSHIP UNDER ADVERSE CONDITIONS: GLOBAL STUDY OF INDIVIDUAL RESILIENCE AND SELF-EFFICACY. *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings*, 2016(1), 1901-1906.
- Senik, C., & Verdier, T. (2011). Segregation, Entrepreneurship and Work Values: The Case of France. *Journal of Population Economics*, 24(4), 1207-1234.

- Shinnar, R. S., Hsu, D. K., Powell, B. C., & Zhou, H. (2017). Entrepreneurial intentions and start-ups: Are women or men more likely to enact their intentions? *International Small Business Journal*, 36(1), 60-80.
- Somerville, W., & Sumption, M. (2009). Immigration in the United Kingdom, The Recession and beyond. The Equality and Human Rights Commission.
- Sonfield, M., & Lussier, R. N. (2014). THE INFLUENCE OF THE ENTREPRENEUR'S EDUCATION LEVEL ON STRATEGIC DECISION MAKING. *Journal of Small Business Strategy*, 24(1), 19-28.
- Soriano, D. R., & Castrogiovanni, G. J. (2012). The impact of education, experience and inner circle advisors on SME performance: insights from a study of public development centers. *Small Business Economics*(3), 333.
- Stephan, U. (2018). Entrepreneurs' Mental Health and Well-Being: A Review and Research Agenda. *Academy of Management Perspectives*.
- Tegtmeier, S., Kurczewska, A., & Halberstadt, J. (2016). Are women graduates jacquelines-of-all-trades? Challenging Lazear's view on entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 47(1), 77-94.
- Thompson, P., Jones-Evans, D., & Kwong, C. (2009). Women and Home-based Entrepreneurship: Evidence from the United Kingdom. *International Small Business Journal*, 27(2), 227-239.
- Thompson, P., Jones-Evans, D., & Kwong, C. C. Y. (2010). Education and entrepreneurial activity: A comparison of White and South Asian Men. *International Small Business Journal*, 28(2), 147-162.
- Uddin Ahmar, M., & Jamil, S. A. (2015). Entrepreneurial Barriers Faced by Disabled in India. *Asian Social Science*, 11(24).
- UK Government. (2014). Official statistics Disability facts and figures
- Unger, J. M., Rauch, A., Frese, M., & Rosenbusch, N. (2011). Human capital and entrepreneurial success: A meta-analytical review. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(3), 341-358.
- Valdez, Z. (2012). Self-Employment as an Indicator of Segmented Assimilation among Six Ethnic Minority Groups *Entrepreneurship Research Journal* (Vol. 2).
- Van der Sluis, J., van Praag, M., & Vijverberg, W. (2008). Education and Entrepreneurship Selection and Performance: A Review of the Empirical Literature. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 22(5), 795-841.
- Wang, C. L., & Altinay, L. (2012). Social embeddedness, entrepreneurial orientation and firm growth in ethnic minority small businesses in the UK. *International Small Business Journal*, 30(1), 3-23.

Zimmer, C., & Aldrich, H. (1987). Resource Mobilization through Ethnic Networks: Kinship and Friendship Ties of Shopkeepers in England. *Sociological Perspectives*, 30(4), 422-445.



Centre Manager
Enterprise Research Centre
Warwick Business School
Coventry, CV4 7AL
CentreManager@enterpriseresearch.ac.uk

Centre Manager
Enterprise Research Centre
Aston Business School
Birmingham, B4 7ET
CentreManager@enterpriseresearch.ac.uk