

WORKING TITLE

Transnational Entrepreneurship in Support Programs in Norway: A set-theoretic approach to understanding migrant entrepreneurship support

MAIN AUTHOR

Dimitris Polychronopoulos

KEYWORDS

fsQCA, mixed embeddedness, entrepreneurship support, transnational entrepreneurship, migrant enterprise, co-creation, configurations

SHORT ABSTRACT

This study aims to investigate the set of conditions necessary for participants in entrepreneurship programs in Norway, given the variety of participants' backgrounds (forced migrants, migrants, natives), to have the following outcomes: 1) satisfaction with the program, 2) establishment of an enterprise, 3) achievement of revenue 4) engagement in transnational business. Via a fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis (fsQCA) approach, this research seeks to offer new perspectives on the configurations of antecedents required for participants in support programs in Norway to: 1) leverage their ethnic capital, human capital, and social capital, 2) increase the size of their networks, 3) engage in the co-creation of the content of the program, and 4) (for non-native participants) to overcome the liability of outsidership. We will find out whether the configurations are equifinally linked to overcoming the liability of outsidership and gaining insidership into mainstream networks in a host country and whether co-ethnic embeddedness in networks is a key construct for overcoming liability of outsidership and the need for participants to engage with the mainstream networks in the host country.

EXTENDED ABSTRACT

In recent years, the topic of migrant entrepreneurship has garnered increasing attention as a crucial facet of economic and social development in European societies. Scholars have researched the phenomenon of aiding migrant entrepreneurs as a means of facilitating integration in various contexts. Harima and Freudenberg (2020) probe the subject for refugee entrepreneurs in Germany. Similarly, Kachkar and Djafri (2021) explore this idea by analysing the entrepreneurial intentions of Syrian refugees in Turkey who aim to engage in entrepreneurial support programs. Additionally, Lyon, Sepulveda, and Syrett (2007) suggest entrepreneurship support as an integration path for refugees in marginalised urban regions of the United Kingdom. Furthermore, the landscape of migrant entrepreneurship is evolving,

driven in part by the growing diversity of populations within European countries (Banks, 2020).

Migrant entrepreneurs not only contribute to economic growth but also play a pivotal role in fostering social cohesion and cross-cultural interactions for the communities where they reside in their host societies (Eraydin, Tasan-Kok, & Vranken, 2010). Amongst migrant entrepreneurs, transnational entrepreneurs, who maintain business connections with their country of origin, can lead to new business opportunities between the home and host countries (Drori, Honig, & Wright, 2009) and the topic merits special focus since transnational migrant entrepreneurs have more profitable business activities than other migrant entrepreneurs (Solano, 2016b) and higher growth potential with more likelihood of having a positive impact on the economy (Cumming, Fleming, & Schwienbacher, 2009).

This research is a part of the Migrant Work Inclusion project at the University of South-Eastern Norway (USN, 2023). It proposes to draw from a research agenda based on a systematic literature review (SLR) of migrant entrepreneurship support in European countries by Polychronopoulos and Nguyen-Duc (2023), which offers insights into the characteristics, challenges, and policy mechanisms to contribute to the growing body of literature on transnational entrepreneurship (Bagwell, 2017; Drori et al., 2009; Muñoz-Castro, Santamaria-Alvarez, & Marín-Zapata, 2019; Solano, 2016a; Yamamura & Lassalle, 2022), recognizing that transnational entrepreneurs are not exclusively immigrants and not all immigrants who are transnational entrepreneurs conduct business with their home country (Chen & Tan, 2009), and that transnational entrepreneurs can benefit from a high level of cultural and linguistic understanding, and access to network and resources across two or more countries, which is often the case for a migrant entrepreneur who is in regular contact with the home country and well-integrated into the host country (Terjesen & Elam, 2009).

By focusing on participant characteristics as forced migrant, non-forced migrant, and native, as a starting point, this research builds on the participants' resources of ethnic capital, financial capital, human capital, and social capital upon entry into entrepreneurship support programs, where the participants have the opportunity to co-create the content of the program, increase their network, and if not originally from Norway, to overcome the liability of outsidership. This research measures the outcomes of business establishment, revenue, satisfaction in the program, and transnational business extent.

The individual agency of migrant entrepreneurs and opportunity structures under the theory of mixed embeddedness (Honig, 2019; Kloosterman, Van Der Leun, & Rath, 1999), this research aims to gain insights into the Norwegian context of migrant entrepreneurship support programs and how co-creation (Ansell & Torfing, 2021; Torfing, Sørensen, & Røiseland, 2016; Van Praag, 2021) in such programs can help participants with their transnational ambitions, by applying the scale on transnational migrant entrepreneurship (Bagwell, 2017) to create a value fuzzy set (Ragin, 2008), given transnational business' higher growth potential (Solano, 2016a) and higher profitability (Cumming et al., 2009) than non-transnational businesses.

In the context of Norway, the percentage of immigrants to Norway who become self-employed has increased from 17 percent in 2009 to 21 percent in 2015, according to Lillevik

and Sønsterudbråten (2018) and the government issues grants to fund migrant entrepreneurship support programs with either a local or a national mandate, with funding from the Directorate of Integration and Diversity (IMDi: *Integrerings- og mangfoldsdirektoratet*), to address the concern that immigrants establish business without being qualified to succeed and without understanding the requirements of running a business. So far it is not clear to IMDi which migrant entrepreneurship support designs, relationships and services are most appropriate (Lillevik & Sønsterudbråten, 2018). The Norwegian government funds migrant entrepreneurship support programs because it sees entrepreneurship as a way for those who move to Norway to contribute to the national economy (Innovasjon Norge, 2021; Regjeringen, 2015). An example of such a program is MIKS in Bergen, whose target audience is immigrants in the Bergen area, who are either registered as unemployed or completing an introduction program for newly arrived immigrants, and either seek to establish and develop their own company or learn about innovation and entrepreneurship (MIKS-NORGE.NO, 2023). The programs supported by the Norwegian government focus on mentorship, networking, and training and many follow the same handbook which introduces participants to the systematic entrepreneurship activity method (S-E-A-M) that guides the participants through the following steps: purpose, resources, business idea, business models, objectives, tasks, and financial forecasting (Dahle, 2020). Scholars proffer that training migrants to succeed in entrepreneurship can help generate inclusive growth to reduce poverty and inequality (Ranieri & Almeida Ramos, 2013), but further research is needed to understand how to improve Norway's migrant entrepreneurship support programs to match national goals.

The unit of analysis for this research is entrepreneurship support programs in Norway and the research design is to gather data via semi-structured interviews with 12 entrepreneurship support programs from different parts of Norway, combined with brief telephone interviews with 10 participants from each of the 12 programs. The aim is to find out about the program participants, given their length of time in Norway, where they grew up, their level of Norwegian language proficiency, level of satisfaction with the entrepreneurship support program, their motivations for moving to Norway, relevant details about the relevance of their current job (if employed) and their career and educational background, their motivations for starting a business, the extent of their business growth, the financing of their business, their customer base and supplier base (Norwegian, home-country, mixed, other). By bringing in the theory of mixed embeddedness (Kloosterman et al., 1999), which this study seeks to leverage via understanding of how human capital and social capital impact the output for aspiring and early-stage transnational migrant ventures, by using qualitative comparative analysis (fsQCA) methods to extend the mixed embeddedness (Kloosterman et al., 1999) model by Honig (2019) to contribute to the field of migrant entrepreneurship support and transnational migrant entrepreneurship.

The methods of fsQCA are conducive to using more than one theory to explore phenomena because one theory can sometimes only explain some of the phenomena of interest; when cases do not fit the main theory, an alternative theory might be able to do so (Park, Fiss, & El Sawy, 2020). Therefore, we will also be looking at incorporating the following theories into this study: push-pull (Kirkwood, 2009), network (Granovetter, 1973; Lin, 1999), liability of foreignness/outsiderness (Aluko, Ott, Siwale, & Odusanya, 2022; Gurău, Dana, & Light, 2020; Johanson & Vahlne, 1977), and organizational sponsorship

theory (Flynn, 1993), based on the research teams' discussions that these theories can help us in establishing the research design and help with our analysis of the data. Hence, the above theories will be taken into consideration with the following proposed research questions:

Kommentert [DP1]: When I introduce the research questions, I need to explain why I am using abductive reasoning and how I am linking this to the literature

RQ1) What configurations result in participant satisfaction with entrepreneurship support programs in Norway?

RQ2) What configurations result in participants establishing a business during their enrolment in entrepreneurship support programs in Norway? / ...within timeframe (x) of program completion?

RQ3) What configurations result in participants achieving revenue during their enrolment in entrepreneurship support programs in Norway? / ...within timeframe (x) of program completion?

RQ4) What configurations result in transnational entrepreneurship for program participants?

Kommentert [DP2]: Rather than introducing the RQs in a string, relate them to the story, consider how it's done in Decker et al: We go on to utilize the dimensions identified in that framework to undertake a fuzzy set qualitative comparative analysis (fsQCA; Douglas, Shepherd, & Prentice, 2020) in order to address our second research question: which configurations of these dimensions are important for HGAE?

This study employs abductive reasoning to discern potentially crucial elements within the Contextual environment. Abductive reasoning plays a pivotal role in historical analysis, as articulated by Megill (2007) and Wadhvani & Decker (2017). This approach harmoniously aligns with the fundamental characteristics of Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA), as emphasized by Park, Fiss, and el Sawy (n.d., p. 13). In their work, Mantere and Ketokivi (2013, p. 72) underscore the significance of abduction in the context of theorization and stress the necessity of transparently choosing between alternative elements.

Our application of abductive reasoning serves the purpose of establishing connections between two distinct bodies of literature:

Subsequently, we match the emergent dimensions with the available data for

as part of our ongoing effort to further develop the theoretical framework, making use of the fsQCA method. In an effort to maintain transparency throughout the abductive process that underlies the formulation of our framework, we meticulously confirm, discard, or refine our comprehension of the selected dimensions. Dimensions that are confirmed in this process become integral components of the theoretical framework that informs the fsQCA. Conversely, those dimensions that are discarded are duly listed but left unexamined due to spatial limitations. It is important to note that all dimensions have undergone refinement through analytically structured histories, which are elaborated upon in subsequent sections..... a process outlined by Decker, Estrin, and Mickiewicz (2020).

An idea as inspired by the above source: Create a table with the horizontal categories: Literature Stream 1, Literature Stream 2, LS 3, etc, and fsQCA dimensions.

A goal of this study is to engage in empirical middle-range theory building in a retroductive manner with the back-and-forth between induction and deduction that is offered by abduction, to develop theoretical arguments in the form of testable hypotheses (Park et al., 2020) which could lead us from this article into a second one, with the findings revealed thanks to fsQCA helping us account for the complex confluence of factors to explain outcomes such as satisfaction with a support program (both private and public), business establishment, revenue, and transnational entrepreneurship, and in turn, the extent to which satisfaction leads to outcomes of business establishment, revenue, and transnational entrepreneurship and how private and public programs compare.

When dealing with complex causality such as when phenomenon stems from multiple causes, fsQCA can help to find out how causal relationships are dependent on contextual conditions and aims to establish logical connections between the combinations of causal conditions, known as conjunctural causation, and an outcome (Kraus, Ribeiro-Soriano, & Schüssler, 2017). Thus fsQCA helps to identify the causal conditions that produce the outcomes that we are interested in understanding, even when one single condition is not the cause of the outcome (Kraus et al., 2017).

This research seeks to build on the community of fsQCA research into transnational migrant entrepreneurship by Aluko et al. (2022) and on internationalization processes by entrepreneurs by Ciravegna, Kuivalainen, Kundu, and Lopez (2018), to gain insights into how fsQCA methods can help understand migrant entrepreneurship support programs and transnational migrant entrepreneurs in Norway.

Gurău et al. (2020) reviewed common concepts from the literature surrounding the liability of foreignness, and found three inter-related factors that migrant entrepreneurs engage in to help overcome the liability: 1) personal resources, 2) embeddedness in formal/informal networks, 3) entrepreneurial attitude/behavior. Their research is based on Bourdieu's theory of social practice (Bourdieu, 1977) to create four categories for entrepreneurs, each with its own case study: ethnic enclave entrepreneur, transnational intermediary, transcultural entrepreneur, knowledge-based entrepreneur.

Previous literature on participant satisfaction in entrepreneurship support programs advises participants to investigate the support program prior to enrolling to see that it suits their needs and to consider their own expectations of the program, such as access and acquisition of: business network, funding, new skills, and the ability to grow the business (Lose & K. Tengeh, 2016). Although participants may consider support programs as worthwhile, there is a likelihood of them not being effective due to a mismatch between the latent and expressed needs of the participants (Yusuf, 2010). For researchers, understanding the antecedents and levels of participant satisfaction is an important part of developing models related to the effectiveness of entrepreneurship support programs since there is an implied link between participant satisfaction and the broader success of the program, including aspects such as business growth, performance, and survival (Sarkar, Osiyevskyy, & Hayes, 2019).

The literature lists participant satisfaction amongst several ways to evaluate entrepreneurship support programs, with other methods including: course attendance, program referrals, assessments of effectiveness, analysis of program benefits, and performance after completion of the program, such as growth, profitability, and survival (McMullan, Chrisman, & Vesper, 2001). However, it is impossible to be certain of what the outcomes would be without the support program since many variables are involved (McMullan et al., 2001). While a crucial part of the research includes participant satisfaction in the programs and how the participants themselves view the impact the programs have had on their businesses, it is also important to investigate the business performance (McMullan et al., 2001), and given that we are at an early stage in the project, we can look at whether the participants establish a business before, during, or at what point after their participation in the program, as well as investigating revenue along those lines. McKenzie and Woodruff (2013) find that many studies only measure impacts within a year of participating in an entrepreneurial support program. The project will benefit from a follow up study to track these metrics and to add additional factors such as growth, job creation, profitability, and survival beyond a year, to explore longer-term impacts; however, by evaluating the programs at this stage, the project benefits from having a research team and a full-time research fellow dedicated to conducting the analysis and presenting and publishing the results so far.

Research by Meister and Mauer (2019) suggests that participants report on access to customers and local markets, acquisition of business skills, first revenues, funding, increases in network contact, intensity of activities relating to establishment and running of the firm, partnership in the host country. Of these, our research will focus on business establishment as a key milestone.

A review of the literature on entrepreneurship support by Ratinho, Amezcua, Honig, and Zeng (2020) also finds business establishment to be a quantitative metric that can help assess the outcome of a support program, along with indicators of performance. For the performance indicator, the timeline of this study will allow us to include revenue achievement.

As for the transnational component: transnational ventures are more profitable than other forms of migrant entrepreneurship (Solano, 2016) and have higher growth potential than other forms of entrepreneurship (Cumming, Flemming, & Schwienbacher, 2009). There is a need to further investigate the role of entrepreneurship support programs in fostering transnational entrepreneurship (Muñoz-Castro, Santamaría-Alvarez, & Marín-Zapata 2019). Transnational entrepreneurs benefit from a high level of cultural and linguistic understanding, access to network and resources across two or more countries, which is often the case of migrant entrepreneurs who are in regular contact with the home country and well-integrated into the host country (Terjesen & Elam, 2009). Further key literature on transnationalism includes Portes, Haller, and Guarnizo (2002) who note that the concept moves of the conversation from the home country to the host country, with ongoing connections to the home country and cross-border social networks; Landolt, Autler, and Baires (1999) with the classification to map the types of transnational migrant enterprises, and Bagwell (2017) who provides a scale of transnational entrepreneurship that can serve as a guide for calibrating its extent with fsQCA methods. Sequeira, Carr, and Rasheed (2009) leveraged the article by Landolt et al. (1999) to investigate how a transnational migrant

entrepreneur's degree of home-country embeddedness impacts the type of transnational firm established.

The data sources include the following:

1. Phone interviews with the participants
2. Interviews with the 12 entrepreneurship support program owners
3. The elements (cards) from the Entrepreneurial Management System (EMS) the 29 elements of a Systemic Entrepreneurship Activity Method (S-E-A-M) (Dahle, 2020; Dahle & Reuther, 2022)
4. The Get-Give-Make-Live (GGML) (Toscher, Dahle, & Steinert, 2020) questionnaire which appears within the EMS
5. The demographics in the EMS (gender, education, age group, sector, ambition level, company stage)

REFERENCES

- Aluko, O., Ott, U. F., Siwale, J., & Odusanya, K. (2022). Overcoming the liability of outsidership: An fsQCA analysis of African transnational entrepreneurs in the UK. *Journal of Business Research*, *145*, 106-116. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.02.076
- Ansell, C., & Torfing, J. (2021). *Public Governanace as Co-creation* (M. Ramesh, X. Wu, & M. Howlett Eds.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bagwell, S. (2017). From mixed embeddedness to transnational mixed embeddedness: An exploration of Vietnamese businesses in London. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, *24*(1), 104-120.
- Banks, J. A. (2020). Education, citizenship, and international migration. *The Sage handbook on international migration*, 70-87.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*: Cambridge university press.
- Chen, W., & Tan, J. (2009). Understanding Transnational Entrepreneurship Through a Network Lens: Theoretical and Methodological Considerations. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *September*, 1079-1091.
- Ciravegna, L., Kuivalainen, O., Kundu, S. K., & Lopez, L. E. (2018). The antecedents of early internationalization: A configurational perspective. *International Business Review*, *27*(6), 1200-1212. doi:10.1016/j.ibusrev.2018.05.002
- Cumming, D., Fleming, G., & Schwiendbacher, A. (2009). Corporate relocation in venture capital finance. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *33*(5), 1121-1155.
- Dahle, Y. (2020). *The Entrepreneurship Handbook*. Oslo, Norway: Scandinavian University Press.
- Dahle, Y., & Reuther, K. (2022). SEAM- Die systemische Methode entrepreneurialer Aktivitäten. *Praxisratgeber Entrepreneurship*, 25-48.
- Decker, S., Estrin, S., & Mickiewicz, T. (2020). The tangled historical roots of entrepreneurial growth aspirations. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, *14*(4), 616-638. doi:10.1002/sej.1348
- Drori, I., Honig, B., & Wright, M. (2009). Transnational entrepreneurship: An emergent field of study. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, *33*(5), 1001-1022. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6520.2009.00332.x
- Eraydin, A., Tasan-Kok, T., & Vranken, J. (2010). Diversity matters: Immigrant entrepreneurship and contribution of different forms of social integration in economic performance of cities. *European Planning Studies*, *18*(4), 521-543.
- Flynn, D. M. (1993). Sponsorship and the Survival of New Organizations. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 51-62.
- Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American journal of sociology*, *78*(6), 1360-1380.
- Gurău, C., Dana, L. P., & Light, I. (2020). Overcoming the Liability of Foreignness: A Typology and Model of Immigrant Entrepreneurs. *European Management Review*, *17*(3), 701-717. doi:10.1111/emre.12392
- Harima, A., & Freudenberg, J. (2020). Co-Creation of Social Entrepreneurial Opportunities with Refugees. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, *11*(1), 40-64. doi:10.1080/19420676.2018.1561498

- Honig, B. (2019). Exploring the intersection of transnational, ethnic, and migration entrepreneurship. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46(10), 1974-1990. doi:10.1080/1369183x.2018.1559993
- InnovasjonNorge. (2021). *Oppdragsgiverrapport fra Innovasjon Norge 2020*. Retrieved from <https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/70163e970fde43eb9463c79f4def0a0e/innovasjon-norge-oppdraagsgiverreport-2020.pdf>
- Johanson, J., & Vahlne, J.-E. (1977). The Internationalization Process of the Firm—A Model of Knowledge Development and Increasing Foreign Market Commitments. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 8(1), 23-32. doi:10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490676
- Kachkar, O., & Djafri, F. (2021). Exploring the intentional behaviour of refugees in participating in micro-enterprise support programmes (MESP): is theory of planned behaviour (TPB) still relevant? *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*. Retrieved from <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85108180747&doi=10.1108%2fJEEE-05-2020-0150&partnerID=40&md5=e4a3e7f5a5e9e985ae103d279e97d8ef>
- Kirkwood, J. (2009). Motivational factors in a push-pull theory of entrepreneurship. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*.
- 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.
- Kraus, S., Ribeiro-Soriano, D., & Schüssler, M. (2017). Fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis (fsQCA) in entrepreneurship and innovation research – the rise of a method. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 14(1), 15-33. doi:10.1007/s11365-017-0461-8
- Landolt, P., Autler, L., & Baires, S. (1999). From Hermano Lejano to Hermano Mayor: the dialectics of Salvadoran transnationalism. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2), 290-315. doi:10.1080/014198799329495
- Lillevik, R., & Sønsterudbråten, S. (2018). *På egne bein - Evaluering av et tiltak for innvandrere som vil starte egen bedrift*. Retrieved from <https://www.fafo.no/images/pub/2018/20652.pdf>
- Lin, N. (1999). Building a Network Theory of Social Capital. *Connections*, 22, 28-51.
- Lose, T., & K. Tengeh, R. (2016). An evaluation of the effectiveness of business incubation programs: a user satisfaction approach. *Investment Management and Financial Innovations*, 13(2), 370-378. doi:10.21511/imfi.13(2-2).2016.12
- Lyon, F., Sepulveda, L., & Syrett, S. (2007). Enterprising refugees: Contributions and challenges in deprived urban areas. *Local Economy*, 22(4), 362-375. doi:10.1080/02690940701736769
- McKenzie, D., & Woodruff, C. (2013). What Are We Learning from Business Training and Entrepreneurship Evaluations around the Developing World? *The World Bank Research Observer*, 29(1), 48-82. doi:10.1093/wbro/lkt007
- McMullan, E., Chrisman, J. J., & Vesper, K. (2001). Some problems in using subjective measures of effectiveness to evaluate entrepreneurial assistance programs. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 26(1), 37-54.
- Meister, A. D., & Mauer, R. (2019). Understanding refugee entrepreneurship incubation - an embeddedness perspective. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 25(5), 1065-1092. doi:10.1108/ijeb-02-2018-0108

- MIKS-NORGE.NO. (2023). KIME GRÜNDERPROGRAM. Retrieved from <https://www.miks-norge.no/1-grunderprogram/>
- Muñoz-Castro, D., Santamaria-Alvarez, S. M., & Marín-Zapata, S. (2019). Transnational entrepreneurship: a systematic review of the literature. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management*, 23, 559-583.
- Park, Y., Fiss, P. C., & El Sawy, O. A. (2020). Theorizing the Multiplicity of Digital Phenomena: The Ecology of Configurations, Causal Recipes, and Guidelines for Applying QCA. *MIS Quarterly*, 44(4), 1493-1520. doi:10.25300/misq/2020/13879
- Polychronopoulos, D., & Nguyen-Duc, A. (2023). *Migrant Entrepreneurship In Europe: A Systematic Literature Review*. Under Review at F1000 Research.
- Portes, A., Haller, W. J., & Guarnizo, L. E. (2002). Transnational entrepreneurs: An alternative form of immigrant economic adaptation. *American Sociological Review*, 278-298.
- Ragin, C. C. (2008). Measurement versus calibration: A set-theoretic approach.
- Ranieri, R., & Almeida Ramos, R. (2013). *Inclusive Growth: Building up a concept*. Retrieved from Brasilia:
- Ratinho, T., Amezcua, A., Honig, B., & Zeng, Z. (2020). Supporting entrepreneurs: A systematic review of literature and an agenda for research. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 154. doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2020.119956
- Regjeringen. (2015). *Regjeringens gründerplan: Gode ideer - fremtidens arbeidsplasser*. Retrieved from Oslo: Nærings- og fiskeridepartementet:
- Sarkar, S., Osiyevskyy, O., & Hayes, L. (2019). Talking Your Way into Entrepreneurial Support: An Analysis of Satisfaction Drivers in Entrepreneur Mutual Aid Groups. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 57(2), 275-297. doi:10.1111/jsbm.12384
- Sequeira, J. M., Carr, J. C., & Rasheed, A. A. (2009). Transnational entrepreneurship: Determinants of firm type and owner attributions of success. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 33(5), 1023-1044. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6520.2009.00333.x
- Solano, G. (2016a). *Immigrant self-employment and transnational practices: the case of Moroccan entrepreneurs in Amsterdam and Milan*. (PhD). Università degli Studi di Milano Bicocca & University of Amsterdam,
- Solano, G. (2016b). *Immigrant self-employment and transnational practices: the case of Moroccan entrepreneurs in Amsterdam and Milan*.
- Terjesen, S., & Elam, A. (2009). Transnational entrepreneurs 'venture internationalization strategies: A practice theory approach. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(5), 1093-1120.
- Torfig, J., Sørensen, E., & Røiseland, A. (2016). Transforming the Public Sector Into an Arena for Co-Creation: Barriers, Drivers, Benefits, and Ways Forward. *Administration & Society*, 51(5), 795-825. doi:10.1177/0095399716680057
- Toscher, B., Dahle, Y., & Steinert, M. (2020). Get Give Make Live. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 16(2), 179-202. doi:10.1108/sej-03-2019-0016
- USN. (2023). Migrant Work Inclusion. Retrieved from <https://www.usn.no/english/research/our-research-centres-and-groups/economy-management-and-politics/migrant-work-inclusion-co-creating-joint-opportunities-through-employment-and-entrepreneurship-mw-inc/>
- Van Praag, L. (2021). *Co-creation in migration studies: The use of co-creative methods to study migrant integration across European Societies*: Leuven University Press.

- Yamamura, S., & Lassalle, P. (2022). Extending mixed embeddedness to a multi-dimensional concept of transnational entrepreneurship. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 10(1).
doi:10.1186/s40878-022-00288-y
- Yusuf, J. E. (2010). Meeting entrepreneurs' support needs: are assistance programs effective? *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 17(2), 294-307.
doi:10.1108/14626001011041283