

Typology of diaspora entrepreneurship: Case studies in Uzbekistan

Maria Elo^{1,2}

Published online: 14 April 2016

© Springer Science+Business Media New York 2016

Abstract The characteristics and importance of transnational diasporans as entrepreneurs for the economy and international business of emerging countries have remained underexplored. This paper addresses types of diaspora entrepreneurship (DE) theoretically and empirically in the context of Uzbekistan. Diaspora entrepreneurship is often seen as necessity-driven and less opportunity-driven. So far, emerging Central-Asian countries are considered countries of origin (COOs) of diasporans, but not yet as countries wherein diasporans want to invest and work, that is, countries of residence (CORS). Uzbekistan is also a post-Soviet economy with limited tradition on private entrepreneurship. Thus, the paper asks what makes people become entrepreneurs in emerging countries such as Uzbekistan when they have alternative opportunities in developed countries. It explores key drivers and socio-cultural reasons for the entry and establishment decision and introduces a typology of DE. This multiple case study presents implications and findings on culturally different entrepreneurs who have decided to enter Uzbek business elucidating their motivations and role in transition economies.

Abstrakt Die Charakteristika und die Bedeutung der transnationalen Diasporans als Unternehmer für die Wirtschaft und das internationale Geschäft in den Schwellenländern sind inadäquat erforscht geblieben. Dieses Papier befasst Arten von Diaspora Unternehmertum (DE) theoretisch und empirisch im Kontext von Usbekistan. Diaspora Unternehmertum wird häufig betrachtet als Notwendigkeit-getrieben und weniger durch Chancen. Bisher Zentralasiatischen Schwellenländer werden als Herkunftsländer (COOs) von Diasporans betrachtet, aber noch nicht als Aufenthaltsländern (CORS) in welchen die Diasporans investieren und leben möchten.

✉ Maria Elo
Maria.elo@utu.fi

¹ Turku School of Economics, University of Turku, 20014 Turun Yliopisto, Turku, Finland

² Institute of Migration, Eerikinkatu 34, 20100 Turku, Finland

Daher wird hier gefragt, was die Menschen zu Unternehmern in Schwellenländern wie Usbekistan treibt, wenn sie alternative Möglichkeiten in entwickelten Ländern haben. Zusätzlich, Usbekistan ist ein Post-Sowjetische Ökonomie mit begrenzten Tradition für private Unternehmertum. Die Studie erforscht Schlüsselfaktoren und soziokulturelle Gründe für die Markteintritt und Gründungsentscheidung, und präsentieren einer Typologie der DE. Diese Mehrfachfallstudie präsentiert Auswirkungen und Ergebnisse zu kulturell verschiedene Unternehmer, die sich entschieden haben usbekischen Unternehmer zu werden, die klärt ihre Beweggründe auf, und ihre Rolle in den Transformationsländern.

Keywords Diaspora entrepreneurship · Typology · Transition economy · Uzbekistan · Entry drivers · Transnational diaspora

Schlüsselwörter Diaspora Unternehmertum · Typologie · Übergangswirtschaft · Uzbekistan · Markteintritt-Treiber · transnationale Diaspora

JEL Classification F22 · F21 · J15 · D01 · H30 · O29

Introduction

International business (IB) research on emerging economies focuses mainly on the level of multinational and transnational corporations (e.g., Meyer et al. 2009), but these corporations often start their market entry in collaboration with a local representative or receive incentives to enter from local entrepreneurs (cf. Lin 2010). Often, such bridge-builders between countries are diasporans (Brinkerhoff 2009). These small actors as drivers of change and development have not attracted much research interest in the “transitional periphery” of Central Asia (cf. Brinkerhoff 2009; Kuznetsov 2008; Newland and Tanaka 2010; Debass and Ardovino 2009, see also Arslan et al. 2015). However, they are acknowledged in international business and entrepreneurship, especially due to their transnationalism and entrepreneurial characteristics (e.g., Tung 2008; Drori et al. 2009; Brinkerhoff 2009; Piekkari et al. 2010; Jones et al. 2011; Kyle 1999; Lin 2010). The role of entrepreneurs in transition economies (e.g., Bolt 1997; Khalmurzaev 2000; Welter et al. 2006) and a better understanding of their intertwined global investment behaviour are of central importance for business and economy (cf. Buckley and Ghauri 2004). Entrepreneurs are central to economic development, as they take risks, search for and develop opportunities, they strive for livelihood and increased profits, as well as for growth and expansion (cf. Bolton and Thompson 2004; Burns 2001). Bolton and Thompson (2004) regard entrepreneurs as persons with talent and temperament who make things happen. International entrepreneurship (IE) is described as “a combination of innovative, proactive and risk-seeking behaviours that crosses national borders and is intended to create value in organizations” (McDougall and Oviatt 2000, p. 903). In similar vein, transnational diaspora entrepreneurs represent a form of international entrepreneurship connecting business across borders (e.g., Drori et al. 2006; Riddle et al. 2010).

Diaspora research may assist in explaining venturing and internationalisation processes in and from emerging economies, when combined with IB and entrepreneurship

theories. Diasporans as economic actors, i.e. entrepreneurs, are influenced by numerous endogenous and exogenous determinants. Diasporans are “migrants who settle in one place, move on and regroup; they may also be dispersed, and they are in a continuous state of formation and reformation” (Cohen 2008, p. 142). Brubaker (2005) considers diasporans to be individuals who meet the criteria of dispersion, homeland orientation and boundary maintenance. Riddle et al. (2010) define transnational diaspora entrepreneurs as migrants and their descendants who establish entrepreneurial activities that span the national business environments of their countries of origin (COOs) and countries of residence (CORs). Due to globalisation and increasing immigration, diasporans as entrepreneurs have become an important category of entrepreneurs (Xavier et al. 2012). They facilitate international business connections between their COO and COR (Brinkerhoff 2009; Cohen 2008; Riddle et al. 2010) and have particular roles in homeland investment (Gillespie et al. 1999). This study approaches diaspora entrepreneurs as diasporans who may also be repatriates or circular migrants and who carry out business activities as self-employed professionals, classic individual entrepreneurs, co-entrepreneurs, business owners, investors or multi-entrepreneurs.

Diasporans are generally seen as being forced to seek alternative ways to maintain their families’ livelihood, and thus as pushed into entrepreneurship; beyond necessity, however, there are also opportunity drivers¹ (cf. Welter and Smallbone 2010). Necessity relates to less qualified diasporans who face employment problems in the host country and suffer from the absence of other alternatives (Ellis and Pecotich 2001; Heinonen 2010). On the other hand, there are also elite diasporans with developed skills and numerous alternatives for their career and livelihood (cf. Leinonen 2012; Mullings 2011). There are also individuals who are not pushed to migrate by necessity, but who choose to become diasporans to fulfil their entrepreneurial, career or social goals and dreams (Vissak and Zhang 2012).

Research on diaspora flows has examined issues with economic implications, such as remittances, brain drain and brain gain, with a focus on the macro-level flows and effects (e.g. Cohen 2005; Tung 2008), but has not yet explained individual-level decision making and diaspora strategies. The research on brain circulation takes a broader view, connecting flows and competitiveness (e.g. Tung 2008), while diaspora investments and entrepreneurship research integrates people into the research interest (cf. Gillespie et al. 1999; Kotabe et al. 2013; Riddle 2008). The importance of diaspora in the economic growth of the home country, especially in large emerging markets such as China, Brazil and India has been broadly acknowledged (e.g. Aliaga-Isla and Rialp 2012; Bolt 1997; Chung and Tung 2013; Nkongolo-Bakenda and Chrysostome 2013; Poutziouris et al. 2002; Riddle et al. 2010; Vissak and Zhang 2012). The transition economies in Central Asia have not yet attracted similar attention—despite the emerging nature of their international business or the investment potential of diaspora entrepreneurs (diaspora direct investment, DDI; cf. Abdurakhmonov 2003; Azizov 2007; Debass and Ardovino 2009; Newland and Tanaka 2010; Sattarov 2012). Only very few studies have been conducted on Central Asian entrepreneurial activity and its transitional context (Bikbaeva and Gaibnazarova 2009; Khalmurzaev 2000; Suhir and Kovach 2003; Welter et al. 2006; Welter and Smallbone 2010).

¹ See more in www.elie-project.eu

In short, Uzbekistan in Central Asia needs to generate entrepreneurship but is mostly seen as a place of departure, not a place to venture. In the context of Uzbekistan, the determinants that drive entrepreneurs to venture there are largely unknown, and the determinants for diaspora entrepreneurs’ venture decision (as they could choose to venture in the USA, the EU or other developed economies with less uncertainly and institutional voids) are even more so (cf. Nkongolo-Bakenda and Chrysostome 2013). Thus, the determinants for Uzbek DE are theoretically interesting as these entrepreneurs decide to venture in a particularly difficult context, although they have comparative foreign perspectives and other alternatives for venturing or livelihood (e.g. employment, migration, repatriation).

Research on determinants and dynamics of DE needs better contextualisation (e.g. Lasch and Dana 2011). Due to the transitional character of the Central Asian economies, this study turns the classic diaspora perspective (outflow) around and focuses on the underexplored diaspora entrepreneurship (DE) “flow” towards business (inflow) in emerging economies (cf. Nkongolo-Bakenda and Chrysostome 2013). This micro-analytical perspective concentrates on entrepreneurial level dynamics instead of institutions, transaction costs, agency and resources (Wright et al. 2005). It is assumed that different factors affect necessity-driven diasporans from poor countries seeking a better future in new host countries than those entrepreneurs and diasporans who enjoy international alternatives for their place of venturing. The non-acknowledgment of this strategic choice may create an underlying research bias. Generalisations and the lack of segmentation in diaspora analysis create additional research problems; therefore, findings on the “poor-to-rich-country entrepreneurship” logic are not applicable to other cases with a different aetiology. This study points out that there are diaspora entrepreneurs acting against the poor-to-rich flows investing in an emerging market economy, thereby suggesting a dissimilar entry strategy (cf. Meyer et al. 2009). Moreover, it employs a novel analytical typology for DE (Fig. 1) and for contextualisation of the DE type and country setting, which assists the development of propositions that guide the research process and analysis (Fischer and Reuber 2001).

Emerging market economies are countries in transition reforming their markets towards a market economy after being dictatorships, parts of the Soviet Union or other centrally regulated, command economies (Irnazarov 2009). According to Peng (2003), institutional transitions from a planned economy to market competition in Russia are pervasive enough to be labelled transition economy. In turn, weak institutional

Country/location:	Developing	Emerging	Developed
Entrepreneur:			
Developing	A) Developing market DE, low asymmetry (cf. intra-regional diaspora in South-East Asia), “poor-to-poor”	B) “Lonely starter” style DE, medium asymmetry, “poor-to-less poor”	C) High asymmetry-based classic DE, “poor-to-rich”
Emerging	D) “Early starter” style DE, medium asymmetry (cf. Chinese and Indians in Africa), “less poor-to-poor”	E) Emerging market DE, low asymmetry (cf. Chinese in Brazil), “less poor-to-less poor”	F) Medium asymmetry -based classic DE, “less poor-to-rich”
Developed	G) “Colonial style” DE, high asymmetry (cf. German in Senegal), “rich-to-poor”	H) “Pioneer style” DE, medium asymmetry, “rich-to-less poor”	I) Developed market diaspora (cf. “elite”) entrepreneurship, low asymmetry (cf. US-Americans in Finland), “rich-to-rich”

Fig. 1 Theoretical and analytical typology of DE based on COO and COR types (Source: Elo 2013)

infrastructure, uncertainty, economic and political instability and lack of suitable ties affect entry choices and strategies (Peng 2003; Peng and Luo 2000; Wright et al. 2005). They lack such pull-factors that developed countries provide. As a result, developing and emerging countries are seen as the COO of diasporans, but not yet as target countries wherein they want to invest and work. Altruistic motivations represent the only exception to this (cf. Debass and Ardovino 2009; Riddle and Brinkerhoff 2011; Nkongolo-Bakenda and Chrysostome 2013). Thus, it is important to understand the migration flows and directions, and beyond that, the underlying factors stemming not only from economic circumstances but also from individuals' dreams, opportunities and socio-cultural contexts (cf. Elo et al. 2015). These individual-level entrepreneurship determinants require an in-depth understanding that is more contextual (cf. Dunning 2006, see also Nkongolo-Bakenda and Chrysostome 2013).

The "targeting rich countries" assumption is too one-sided and probably invalid in relation to diaspora entrepreneurs, as entrepreneurs act in multiple embedded contexts (e.g. Smallbone and Welter 2008). Especially in the case of Uzbekistan, we do not really know what drives entrepreneurship as an alternative to emigration or what stimulates repatriation and migration to the this "transitional periphery"(cf. Arslan et al. 2015). The pull and push factors on the macro-economic level fail to explain alone this phenomenon on incoming DE (cf. Lasch and Dana 2011; Nkongolo-Bakenda and Chrysostome 2013). Thus, the study asks: What makes people become entrepreneurs in a transition economy like Uzbekistan, especially if they have other alternatives to prosper elsewhere? The purpose of the study is to examine if there are distinct types of DE and to explore determinants that influence the generation of such DE in the difficult context of transition economy. The study attempts to identify key determinants for this decision from a rather holistic perspective, as the influence of socio-cultural context is often neglected (Urbano et al. 2011), and the macro-level context dominates IB research (cf. Dunning 2006). The multiple-case study presents culturally diverse entrepreneurs who have decided to invest and work in Uzbekistan and their reasons for this decision. The entrepreneurs represent various migrant backgrounds and ethnicities, including both Uzbek and non-Uzbek nationals. Theoretically, the study attempts to develop and test proposition for future DE research.

The study contributes with the typology providing the contextualisation and with its nexus of extant research on emerging economies and DE. It serves to give insight into the unique emerging Uzbek private entrepreneurship and the settings behind it (cf. Abdurakhmonov 2003; Imnazarov 2009; Majidov 2007) and is among the first to deal with DE related to Uzbekistan and the role of diasporans in Uzbek economic development (cf. Elo et al. 2015; Khalmurzaev 2000). The study contributes with novel information for understanding DE on individual level, which is particularly interesting in an emerging country setting and during a reform era.

The article is divided as follows: the next "[Business, diaspora entrepreneurship and investment in Uzbekistan](#)" section reviews the current research literature on business in Uzbekistan illustrating the contextual setting of an emerging economy (the "[Business and entrepreneurship in Uzbekistan](#)" section), and it reviews research on transnational DE (the "[Transnational diaspora entrepreneurship](#)" section). The "[Development of theory with the typology of diaspora entrepreneurship and understanding DE determinants](#)" section presents the discussion on DE theory development and propositions and the novel theoretical-analytical typology employed for DE research contextualisation.

Then, the “[Method and research design](#)” and “[Analysis and research findings](#)” sections discuss the method and research design and present the analysis and research findings. Theoretical, managerial and methodological implications are discussed in the conclusive “[Conclusions and discussion](#)” section, along with suggestions for further research and policymaking.

Business, diaspora entrepreneurship and investment in Uzbekistan

Business and entrepreneurship in Uzbekistan

Entrepreneurship and the development of private business after the Soviet era is still a considerable challenge (cf. Bikbaeva and Gaibnazarova 2009; Khalmurzaev 2000; Libman 2008; Peng 2003). Beyond institutional challenges (Peng 2003; Libman 2008; Wright et al. 2005), several country-specific differences are evident. Khalmurzaev (2000, p. 295) summarises the key differences in the small and medium-sized enterprise (SME) sector as follows: Uzbek SMEs exhibit lower performance and competitiveness than developed market SMEs do; they provide jobs to fewer employees; and the significance of state property is disproportionate. Business and social infrastructures present impediments for SMEs (Khalmurzaev 2000). However, these challenges are counter-balanced in Uzbekistan by a fast-growing economy and the largest population in Central Asia. Uzbekistan offers various opportunities such as the free industrial and economic zone in the Navoi region for business, especially for significant foreign investments (Investment policy review of Uzbekistan 1999). Moreover, it has attracted foreign investment and businesses such as the CNPC, Petronas, Nestlé, British American Tobacco, Gazprom, Lukoil, VimpelCom, MTC and General Motors, and its economic policies are designed to attract large manufacturing and service companies from abroad (US State Department, 2014, <http://www.state.gov/e/eb/rls/othr/ics/2012/191261.htm>). Investments may be influenced by prior investment choices (Azizov 2007), but a real bandwagon effect (Aharoni 1966) has not occurred in the case of Uzbekistan, perhaps due to problems with trade openness and reliability (Sattarov 2012; <http://www.state.gov/e/eb/rls/othr/ics/2012/191261.htm> retrieved 27.1.2014). Notably, the role of private entrepreneurship, which emerged in the 1990s (Khalmurzaev 2000), is still developing, along with the rules of the game (Peng 2003). The authoritarian regimes that have ruled Central-Asian countries since their independence still face problems in finding suitable transition strategies for their economies, which were among the poorest and least industrialised parts of the USSR (Stark 2010). Uzbekistan has transformed in numerous ways, such as legislation, taxation, capital and credit systems, business support systems and education, but it has followed a gradual reform path (Khalmurzaev 2000; Libman 2008). In terms of international business, Uzbekistan has failed to become a hot spot despite its historical role in the Silk Road; in fact, some multi-national corporations (MNCs) have exited the market, such as Caterpillar and Texaco Overseas Holdings Inc.

The location of Uzbekistan is logistically demanding, as it is a landlocked country. This creates difficulties in foreign trade, particularly due to disadvantages in transportation infrastructure. In 2012, the main trade partners of Uzbekistan were Russia, China, Kazakhstan, the Republic of Korea, Turkey, Afghanistan and Ukraine, which

illustrates the regional emphasis on external trade relations. The economic regional integration in Central Asia is also supported by intra-regional migration (Libman 2008) and strong local socio-cultural ties (Coudouel et al. 1998; Welter and Smallbone 2010). This geo-economic emphasis is visible in Uzbek foreign trade, investments and entrepreneurship.

Concerning entry conditions and receptivity, there is a size bias: Uzbekistan strongly favours major foreign investments and discourages investments by small and medium-sized foreign investors (Majidov 2007), although some improvements are evident (Khalmurzaev 2000). To further promote the state policy of self-sufficiency, Uzbekistan's foreign investment regime particularly favours foreign investors who produce goods in Uzbekistan that may be exported or which replace goods that would otherwise be imported (Doing Business in Uzbekistan 2009, p. 14.) According to Majidov (2007), "The economic policy pursued during this [post-independence declaration] period created a unique environment for the newly emerging entrepreneurial class to operate in. In addition, the political regime centred on a strong leadership and the so called 'Ideology of Independence' created an entirely new set of incentives and punishments for those aspiring to get ahead" (p. 147). Centralisation remains strong. The official language is Uzbek, especially for documents and administration, but Russian is employed as the lingua franca for business and inter-personal networks (Libman 2008). In addition to practical difficulties and limitations for foreign entrepreneurs, the repatriation of profits is considered difficult. However, the relative stability, high gross domestic product (GDP) growth rates (in 2012 the GDP grew 8.2 %) and emerging private enterprises and SMEs also provide positive impulses for the economy, development and entrepreneurship (cf. http://www.uzinfoinvest.uz/eng/living_in_uzbekistan/economy/, retrieved 30.4.2013; Welter et al. 2006).

There are no institutional or other regulative pull factors in Uzbekistan, since the policies for entrepreneurs in small and family business are not particularly welcoming. There are no specific entry policies for foreign-born, diasporic entrepreneurs or repatriates, also called returnees. A work permit for a foreigner is relatively expensive (compared to the local salary level), and is valid for no more than 1 year. Private entrepreneurship is young due to the Soviet system and despite the support programmes and instruments (EBRD, TACIS, the Chamber of Commodity Producers and Entrepreneurs, the Association of Dekhkan Establishments and Farms, and numerous incubators), its conditions are complex and the lack of capital and credit hinder development opportunities (Khalmurzaev 2000). Khalmurzaev (2000) lists the key problems for foreign companies as follows: constantly changing laws and regulations, an inadequate banking system, a poor communication system, currency conversion problems, a lack of basic information, shortage of necessary suppliers and corruption. Thus, it is not surprising that the number of foreign, non-Central-Asian entrepreneurs is rather limited. Bukharian Jewish diasporans (Ochildiev et al. 2007) represent an exception as international entrepreneurs, but they are a minority with Uzbek origin. Due to their international networks and Israeli support, they have managed to facilitate trade relations, repatriation and entrepreneurship in Uzbekistan. With the direct participation of the Centre for International Cooperation of the MASHAV (Israel's Ministry of Foreign Affairs), a Consulting Centre for small and medium-scale business (KSMSB) was established in 2003, intended to lend informational and consulting support to small and medium-scale business, mainly in agriculture (Chlenov 2009,

pp. 414–415). Bukharian Jews, along with Koreans, Chinese, and neighbouring ethnicities, form the most important groups of international entrepreneurs. Koreans represent a significant diaspora population of 200,000 in Central Asia (Seo 2010). It is estimated that there are millions of Uzbek migrant workers abroad, a large number of them in Russia (http://www.uznews.net/news_single.php?lng=en&cid=0&nid=23494, 28.1.2014) and Kazakhstan (Libman 2008), which illustrates the nature of Uzbekistan as a sending country (Hanks 2000).

Uzbekistan is an emerging market, still developing its economic system and framework; “since gaining independence in 1991, Uzbekistan has adopted new legislation at a rapid pace. It remains a country in transition and its legal system is in continuing development” (Doing Business in Uzbekistan 2009, p. 9). Uzbekistan has chosen an evolutionary strategy rather than a revolutionary one in reforms and is not yet considered a market economy, but instead an emerging market (Irnazarov 2009). For foreign-born entrepreneurs and SMEs, the impediments are notable, and there is lack of pull forces. As the country overview indicates, Uzbekistan with its “sending country” and negative characteristics is a suitable sample market for studying incoming international and transnational DE. In the next section, theories related to DE are reviewed.

Transnational diaspora entrepreneurship

Historically, the economic influence of diaspora is well documented. A trade- and business-based diaspora represents a nation of socially inter-dependent but spatially dispersed communities, in which family and kin, the creation of a common commercial culture and religion, among other factors, provide the ties that bind (Cohen 2008, p. 83). Historically, diasporans have been approached as “pariah people” who have lost their territories, were confined to particular occupations and were endogamous in terms of dietary prohibitions, religious practices and social intercourse (cf. Cohen 2008). Diasporas are also referred to as “middlemen minority” in the cases of Jews, Indians, Chinese, Lebanese and Greeks (Cohen 2008). In short, the impact of blocked opportunities, lack of alternatives, hostility and ethnic cohesiveness has been considered relevant in the creation of extrinsic and intrinsic motivations for entrepreneurship.

International entrepreneurship (McDougall and Oviatt 2000) involves numerous domains and themes but does not incorporate diaspora entrepreneurship (Jones et al. 2011). However, characteristics of international entrepreneurs are present in related domains such as ethnic, minority, immigrant, transnational, transnational diaspora and diaspora entrepreneurship (e.g. Aliaga-Isla and Rialp 2012, 2013; Bolt 1997; Carmichael et al. 2010; Chung and Tung 2013; Drori et al. 2006, 2009; Light and Gold 2000; Menzies et al. 2000; Ojo 2012; Portes et al. 2002; Riddle 2008; Riddle et al. 2010; Waldringer et al. 1990). Transnational entrepreneurship has been described as a social realm of immigrants operating in complex, cross-national domains with dual cultural institutional and economic features that facilitate various entrepreneurial strategies (cf. Riddle et al. 2010). DE, transnational DE and transnational entrepreneurship are closely related, and the terms are often employed synonymously, although there are some ontological differences in their definitions. This paper acknowledges these differences, but employs the terms diaspora entrepreneurship and transnational diaspora entrepreneurship interchangeably, since it focuses on contemporary diaspora as transnational, that is, connected to two (or more) cultures and societies (cf. Vertovec 1999).

Contemporary research on diaspora entrepreneurs approaches entrepreneurship in multiple ways concerning the logic and triggers (cf. Aliaga-Isla and Rialp 2013; Xavier et al. 2012). As Putz (2003) notes, there are particularities in drivers and entrepreneurial motivation. Limited employment opportunities due to language barriers and discrimination are seen to drive immigrants to self-employment in order to secure their livelihood. However, DE should not be approached as an extrinsically forced alternative, since the role of the entrepreneur is dissimilar to that of a victim of circumstances: In parallel with extant limitations, the entrepreneur can also possess important entrepreneurial resources (cf. Lähdesmäki and Savela 2006). Motivational structures vary in previous studies and present a continuum from unemployment and “forced entrepreneurship,” which represents a common stream of thought in diaspora and immigration research, to opportunity development, growth and success leading to increased quality of life (cf. Heinonen 2010; Joronen and Ali 2000) that is more similar to entrepreneurship theory (Bolton and Thompson 2004; Cassis and Minoglou 2005). The emergence of immigrant communities (cf. Ojo 2012) can form entrepreneurial opportunities in areas such as ethnic food and clothing; thus, immigrant communities develop a unique subculture that may encourage and support self-employment (Riddle and Brinkerhoff 2011). According to Pütz (2003, p. 555) such a subculture (cf. Jenssen and Kristiansen 2004) inspires some ethnic groups to be more entrepreneurial, thereby generating stereotypes such as “having business in their blood.” However, there are differences in the entrepreneurial patterns (Kaplan 2003), as well as entrepreneurial traditions and activity among different ethnicities (Light and Gold 2000).

Diaspora produces enablers for business, as they carry an “immigrant effect” in their activities; they perceive, compare and analyse opportunities and threats differently from the way in which mono-cultural entrepreneurs do (e.g. Enderwick et al. 2011; Chung and Tung 2013; Nkongolo-Bakenda and Chrysostome 2013; Riddle et al. 2010). They also possess different ethnic resources that assist them socially, particularly those with a lower level of education (Light and Gold 2000). Such resources consist of ethnic culture, social networks, values, attitudes towards entrepreneurship and economic behaviour, religion, cultural institutions and family structures (Light and Gold 2000). The diaspora effects with innovative social organisation may be advantageous to the diaspora, its homeland and its place of settlement (Cohen 2008; Riddle 2008). Still, a common ethnic background is not automatically a bond between actors or a guaranty of solidarity, and the existence of diaspora networks does not necessarily mean that they are employed for business and entrepreneurial purposes (cf. Waldringer et al. 1990); they can also be more relevant for social activities and information sharing (cf. Brinkerhoff 2009; Hepp et al. 2011; Jenssen and Kristiansen 2004). Effect towards the country of origin influences the engagement and behaviour of diasporans (Barnard and Pendock 2012). Barnard and Pendock (2012) claim that international business research should pay greater attention to this individual level, and especially to emotional aspects, since negative feelings have very different effects compared to positive ones. Again, this influences investment behaviour and motivation (Newland and Tanaka 2010).

Diaspora entrepreneurs often invest in their COO, and thus contribute to its economic development while supporting their family and enhancing their social standing in the COO and/or the diaspora community (e.g. Riddle and Brinkerhoff 2011). Such community-driven behaviour, personal referrals and informal relationships in business

are employed in collective cultures (Ali et al. 1997). “Elite immigrants” and their entrepreneurial activities are also influenced by their social context, especially family ties and marriage (Leinonen 2012); the social effect is particularly strong in a collective society like Uzbekistan (Welter and Smallbone 2010). Family ties can influence business strategies in the establishment stage (Vissak and Zhang 2012). Both economic and non-economic actions are “socially embedded”; thus, business and social ties are intertwined (Ellis and Pecotich 2001; Granovetter 1973, 1985; Poros 2011), which also influences decisions to become a DE (Heinonen 2010) and may assist in international business (Schotter and Abdelzaher 2013). However, DE may be burdened with challenges that spring from the differences in the COO and COR institutional and business environments (Riddle et al. 2010), as well as the inherent emotional “heritage” (cf. Barnard and Pendock 2012). As Heinonen (2010) notes, different cultures and religions may have significant expectations concerning the contributions and success of the diaspora entrepreneur.

The economic effects of diaspora have been examined from the perspective of remittances sent to the families in the COO (Cohen 2005), how diaspora networks act as facilitators of international trade and networking (Chung and Tung 2013; Cohen 2008; Mullings 2011; Wong and Salaff 1998), how foreign direct investment (FDI) is positively affected by information flowing across international borders (Javorcik et al. 2011) and how DDI influences transitional economies (Abdurakhmonov 2003; Azizov 2007; Debass and Ardivino 2009; Sattarov 2012). The social effects of diaspora vary in purpose and activity (Gill and Bialski 2011; Harvey 2008). Diaspora entrepreneurs belong to a multi-faceted socio-cultural constellation; they have competencies in at least two cultures (COO and COR), and due to continuous reformation, they may evolve towards further transnationalism and cosmopolitanism (cf. Riddle et al. 2010; Vertovec 2009; Vertovec and Cohen 2002). Diasporas act as conduits and agents for international competitiveness employing “brain circulation” (e.g. Tung 2008).

It can be concluded that diaspora entrepreneurs operate in a complex interplay of business and socioeconomic environments and are subject to being driven, lured, pushed, motivated and de-motivated on the individual, family, social, business and macro-levels. In short, both extrinsic and intrinsic motivations influence their entrepreneurship together with other determinants. In the next part, the paper discusses the meaning of the entrepreneur’s origin and DE target country.

Development of theory with the typology of diaspora entrepreneurship and understanding DE determinants

Transnational diaspora entrepreneurship is one intersection that contributes to the call for domain expansion of international entrepreneurship (cf. Jones and Nummela 2008). This study is positioned close to “international comparisons of entrepreneurship” and addresses the inherent combinations of cross-country and cross-culture views at the level of individual entrepreneurs (Jones et al. 2011, p. 636). It responds to the call on contextualising IB and IE research (e.g. Michailova 2011; Welter 2011). Due to missing contextualisation, many aspects of DE have remained undisclosed or only partially explained. Many determinants of DE have been interpreted as generic ones and the distinct and diverse nature of different DE types has been neglected (cf. Nkongolo-

Bakenda and Chrysostome 2013). Deducing from previous research, it is expected that different types of DE entrants have stand-alone theory-mechanisms and distinct contexts (e.g. innovation, market, time and place). DE may suffer (e.g. Chaudhry and Crick 2004) or benefit (e.g. Elo et al. 2015) from the contextual asymmetry between COO and COR; also, the determinants of DE can be linked to this asymmetry. In order to address the diverse DE “types” and their dynamics, they need to be set into a context that allows their analysis per type. Thus, a typology on DE is employed to contextualise DE into nine types for increased analytical rigor and clarity (Fig. 1). This specific framing introduces and explores novel diaspora types, such as rich-to-emerging diasporas. This DE typology is an analytical framework that contextualises DE (cf. Johanson and Mattsson 1988; Minoglou 2005) based on the host country’s (COR, i.e., the location of entrepreneur and her/his company) character and the character of the COO regarding the entrepreneur (Fig. 1) (Elo 2013, see also Elo et al. 2015). The typology divides the “origin/heritage” country and the “residence/entrepreneurial activity” country into three categories—developing, emerging and developed markets—referring to their overall level of development² (cf. OECD, DAC list of ODA recipients 2014). The asymmetry of the country setting influences DE and the determinants of DE. Here, asymmetry relates to the economic imbalance between settings, the institutional voids and socio-cultural divergences, and the inherent need for transformation from the perspective of the entrepreneur. The institutional side regulating DE (e.g. migration policy, entrepreneurship policy and support systems) may provide particular impediments for high asymmetry contexts (Fig. 1c, g), while this impact may be weaker in cases of lower degree of asymmetry as institutional agreements (formal or informal) with neighbouring countries may be less restrictive or even welcoming. In the following research analysis, Afghanistan is categorised as a (least) developing country, Kirgizstan and Tajikistan as developing countries and Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Pakistan, Iran and China as middle-income countries, referred to here as emerging markets. The USA, Germany, Israel and South Korea are developed countries.

This typology is theoretical and analytical; it does not aim to present the ideal types of Max Weber, but rather to assist in organising and analysing types of diaspora and entrepreneurship constellations in a framework that helps to position the contextual setting for research (cf. Cohen 2008, p. 161). As Cohen (2008) writes, “*The ideal is a yardstick, an abstraction and a simplification, a means of showing up similarities and differences in trying to encompass an array of possibilities that would otherwise have little form or shape... a typology will help to delineate, analyse and compare many diasporic phenomena*” (p. 161). Analytically, this typology does not include the variants of diaspora as second and multi-generation phenomena and the evolutionary path, or circular diaspora per se, take into account hybrid and transnational forms of culture and identity of the entrepreneur or his/her level of skills, or differentiate between “hot spots” and rural areas; rather, generalises any intra-country and intra-category aspects with vigorous effect. Still, it is a necessary tool for analysis and contextualisation, as it explicates the other missing types of DE flows and illustrates how heavily the current diaspora and DE research stream has focused (research perspective bias) on the following categories: C developing to developed, that is, high

² Rating according to ODA recipients.

asymmetry-based classic DE, and F emerging to developed, that is, medium asymmetry-based classic DE (cf. Fischer and Reuber 2001). The DE types relevant for Uzbekistan (emerging economy) are B, E and H, representing very different types compared to the common C or F types.

The framework on approaching the dynamics and determinants of DE is guided by types B, E and H that cover all origin variants of incoming DE in this emerging economy, thus allowing a comparison of types, cases and determinants within them. Leaning on proposed DE determinants for developing country of origin context (Nkongolo-Bakenda and Chrysostome 2013), the analysis works from country level (cf. context friendliness, receptivity of the country, integration and support systems) towards more individual-level influences (cf. entrepreneurial opportunity, need of social recognition, altruistic motivation). To frame the analysis, this study deduces propositions from extant literature and research guiding the development of the theoretical framework, and the analysis phase of this research process. First, previous literature has identified country origin-specific flows of DE, such as Chinese or Indian DE (e.g. Chand and Ghorbani 2011). This study proposes that DE determinants and assumptions are not similar for these nine different types but potentially context-specific (cf. Chand and Ghorbani 2011; Nkongolo-Bakenda and Chrysostome 2013) as diasporas are not homogenous entities (Cohen 2008), and each country has particular pull and push factors addressing the respective DE.

Proposition 1. Diaspora entrepreneurship dynamics (determinants) are dissimilar in different country contexts (nine types), because both the sending and receiving country influence the dynamics of DE.

Therefore, it is assumed that there are three types of DE in Uzbekistan. It is anticipated that diaspora entrepreneurs who act in an emerging market context (“Emerging” column, Fig. 1) differ from diaspora entrepreneurs in developed markets (“Developed” column, Fig. 1), as they apply other perspectives and frameworks with higher uncertainty and country risks to start businesses. This is not explainable by origin alone, as the target area and its degree of difficulty and respective learning are also relevant. High asymmetry is expected to be more demanding to cope with, thus, it seems to be linked to strong individual-level determinants, especially to opportunities but also to altruistic and social aspects that may be associated with either the COO or the COR. Medium and especially low asymmetry make coping in the host country easier. Medium and low asymmetry are expected to be more connected to country- and market-level determinants and perceived opportunities. Low asymmetry involves fewer imbalances and may support entrepreneurship and integration better than medium or high asymmetry venturing which have a more demanding context and higher risks due to higher uncertainty. In the case of post-Soviet transition, there was no legacy of private entrepreneurship to build on and the circumstances were very challenging for any investor. In fact, the institutional problems and restrictions posed an element of demotivation for investment (cf. Peng 2003; Suhir and Kovach 2003; Wright et al. 2005). Further, current research assumes that country-level economic factors determine DE emergence in the receiving country, since rich countries attract migration and venturing while poorer countries act as recipients of remittances (e.g. Vaaler 2011). This view emphasises the role of economic level and catching up processes. Therefore,

the DEs are theoretically flowing from poorer to richer countries, but not vice versa. Here, this assumption is reflected with new empirical findings illustrating flows and directions of DE beyond this flow and the typology employed closes the theoretical “direction bias gap” by framing the country setting beyond poor-to-rich flows and introducing emerging and developing economies as targets (cf. Elo 2013; Elo et al. 2015; Mayer et al. 2016; Harima 2015). It can be proposed that for DE, there are multiple directions of flows with context-specific dynamics (cf. Newland and Tanaka 2010) and not just one direction.

Proposition 2. There are “opposite” flows of DE entering emerging and less developed countries, therefore, there are potentially other than country-level economic determinants for DE.

Individual diaspora entrepreneurs build the DE establishment and investment decision making on their total constellation of positive and negative drivers and enablers, especially in the context of the transitional periphery, where institutional voids are significant. Previous findings indicate that DE is not a purely rational economic decision, but involves complex intertwined forces that are also based on emotions and socio-cultural factors (Elo and Jokela 2014). The determinants for DE are often considered to be contextual and generated by necessity or ethnic economies (cf. Light and Gold 2000). The developed country-origin DE is less confined and potentially more risk tolerant, while developing or emerging country-origin DE suffers usually from stricter constraints, also due to migration policy. Additionally, diasporans who have good opportunities to enter the labour market or to return to their more developed countries of origin or residence cannot be described as necessity or forced entrepreneurs in the same sense than the terms are employed on often discriminated, even marginalised migrants from developing countries (cf. Heilbrunn et al. 2010). Instead, it is claimed that the perceived opportunities the host markets offer in a particular spatio-temporal setting form potential determinants for DE (e.g. Riddle et al. 2010; Nkongolo-Bakenda and Chrysostome 2013); also, the entrepreneur’s capabilities in developing these opportunities into business are linked to these determinants.

Proposition 3. DE is influenced by the combination of necessity and opportunity determinants that are perceived by the entrepreneur and are context specific.

The growing stream of research on transnational DE linking two countries requires more insights into the interplay of individual entrepreneurs, their socioeconomic and country contexts, especially in emerging and developing country contexts. More understanding on the determinants generating DE, and how this early stage of private entrepreneurship and internationalisation is lived by diaspora entrepreneurs in an emerging economy, may assist in fostering DE and economic development.

Method and research design

The research process is designed to develop and assess DE theory (types and determinants) and to answer the question what makes people become entrepreneurs in a

transition economy like Uzbekistan, especially if they have other alternatives to prosper elsewhere (determinants of entrepreneurship generation in the context of Uzbekistan). The research strategy and theoretical framework follow the research questions. A qualitative approach combining case study and ethnographic methods is chosen because the study explores a current phenomenon in a real-life context, and this approach has approved fruitful (Caprar 2011; Ghauri and Grønhaug 2010; Stake 1995; Yin 1984; Alasuutari 1995). A case study is a useful method, as the area of research is relatively less known, and the researcher is engaged in theory-building research regarding the typology (Ghauri 2004). In addition, case study is suitable because the existing theory on DE is inadequate (cf. Eisenhardt 1989). More interpretative nature of case study here facilitates novel insights while exploring determinants (Piekkari et al. 2010).

The research strategy is twofold: first, the theoretical framework and propositions developed rather deductively (the “Development of theory with the typology of diaspora entrepreneurship and understanding DE determinants” section) form the theory-analysis design and guide the structuring of the study towards its theoretical implications; second, a more explorative strategy in data collection and analysis discovers the perceptions and interpretations of the entrepreneurs on their entrepreneurship, its establishment and its development in Uzbekistan. The research process compares them guided by the analytical typology (cf. Alasuutari 1995; Cohen 2008).

The purpose of data collection in the comparative case study method is to compare (replicate) the phenomenon (e.g., DE formation) in a systematic way, to explore different dimensions of the research issues or to examine different levels of research variables (Ghauri 2004). In this study, the comparative element is limited to the comparison regarding the entrepreneurial path and the typology as replicability on in-depth level analysis is not expected (Jick 1979). In addition, the international researcher team applies an ethnographic approach that documents culture, behaviour and their interconnectedness in a more holistic manner and goes beyond a priori data structuring towards a more emic research approach in data collection (cf. Alasuutari 1995; Piekkari et al. 2010; Silverman 2001). The more theory-driven etic research part—in line with the progressive focusing model in Sinkovics and Alfoldi (2012, 825)—appeared first in the mature analytical phase. This approach safeguarded the reliability and trustworthiness of the primary data and reduced dangers of bias (Sinkovics and Alfoldi 2012)

The data collection involved both primary and secondary data to enable a context-embedded view of the cases. It was supported by an 11-day field trip to Uzbekistan in 2012 with the purpose of collecting observations, field notes and photographic material. In winter 2012–2013, the research questions were developed building on DE literature and the guiding questions were pre-tested for understanding and appropriateness. The researchers applied snowballing and purpose sampling methods while selecting the entrepreneur-cases based on being diasporan and entrepreneur with business activities located in Uzbekistan (cf. Ghauri 2004; Heinonen 2010). They addressed the reasons for DE and completed eight case studies on locally based entrepreneurship, representing the following ethnicities: Uzbek, Bukharian Jewish, Korean, Tajik and German. The researchers included one mainstream culture of Uzbek entrepreneur for a reference point and used two expert interviews for overviews (cf. Khakhar and Rammal 2013). The selection of cases was set to find origin diversity to apply the data for the analytical DE types. The empirical study focuses on a novel and distinct type of DE: it examines the entrepreneurial types in the “Emerging” column in Fig. 1. The researchers

identified emerging-market DE (Type E) and pioneer-style DE (Type H), but could not obtain any “pure” developing country representative beyond the Tajik entrepreneur (Type B). Many of the less wealthy and less educated B type candidates (from Afghanistan, Kyrgyzstan) the researchers identified (e.g. shoe repairer, tradesman) refused to talk about their entrepreneurial activities due to fear of getting into troubles.

For access and quality of interpretations (Salmi 2010; Marschan-Piekkari et al. 1999), a native Uzbek research assistant with dual ethnicity, who was a linguist with specialisation in German, visited the entrepreneurs personally in 2013 and conducted in-depth interviews with guiding questions for comparability (Eisenhardt 1989). The employment of a native research assistant in the team of international researchers reduced linguistic-cultural distance (cf. Marschan-Piekkari et al. 1999; Salmi 2010; Voldnes et al. 2014) and avoided problems in interpreting concepts and coding (Sinkovics and Penz 2011). This approach eliminated many research problems related to foreign researchers and the research difficulties in post-Soviet transition economies and thus increased the quality of the study (Voldnes et al. 2014; Michailova and Liuhto 2001). The interview topics and questions covered a variety of aspects to obtain a wider understanding of the informant’s relation to his/her socio-cultural setting, motivations and entrepreneurial activities. The interviewees were informed that the researchers were interested in their entrepreneurship and socio-cultural setting. Many candidates refused due to fear (cf. Michailova and Liuhto 2001). The researchers used trusted individuals to facilitate contact in some cases, but they did not have any role in the actual data collection after the contacting. The interviews lasted about 1.5 h and were recorded and transcribed as they occurred (Pettigrew 1990). They were carried out in combinations of Russian, Uzbek, Tajik, German and English according to the interviewee’s language, and then translated into German; German and English replies were not translated.

Analysis and research findings

The data analyses moved from the emic to etic approach and explored the material with a view to fulfilling the purpose of the research, that is, to understand entrepreneurs’ decisions and reasoning on DE in the context of the emerging market in Uzbekistan (cf. Salmi 2010). A systematic approach was employed to enhance equivalence by creating a comparable data on each case. Interplay of research, analysis and interpretation took place over time, as the team posed follow-up questions and revisited elements both at the material and researcher level (cf. Halinen et al. 2013; Salmi 2010). The reliability, trustworthiness and quality of data was supported by structuring the overall process to reduce “messiness” and by employing technical solutions to deal with multiple data (Sinkovics and Penz 2011; Sinkovics and Alfoldi 2012).

All three types of DE in Uzbekistan (B, E and H) appeared already during data collection. Next, to explore and understand these DE inflows, their drivers and resources and mechanisms that form and regulate DE, the analytical process considers four essential analytical levels (from macro to micro, including embeddedness) for the respective drivers and enablers (Fig. 2).

The analytical approach considers that the reasons, motivations and processes for becoming an entrepreneur in an emerging market need to be particularly significant to overcome the deficits of transition economies characterised by high uncertainty,

1. Country-level macro-drivers and impacts, such as degree and trend of economic development (COO & COR & previous CORs)
2. Market/business level-drivers, such as opportunities and pull/push factors
3. Socio-cultural embeddedness-drivers, such as family, solidarity, obligations and support
4. Entrepreneur-level personal drivers, such as professional goals, life strategy, dreams and other reasons

Fig. 2 Analytical levels for the determinants

numerous business problems and even political instability. The selection of place, that is, the business environment, is interesting, because the focal entrepreneurs here could have chosen something else, another country or career path, but selected the transition periphery setting to live and do business. Motivations and reasoning for entrepreneurship in this post-Soviet economy are examined to understand what drives the decision to start business in an “opposite flow” context and where these motivational influences originate. Embeddedness as a source of resources to make the business viable and its role as constraint is one under-researched dimension of entrepreneurial SME internationalisation (cf. Kyle 1999; Welter and Smallbone 2010).

The collection and analysis of data was organised to address the second research question on the individual determinants to become an entrepreneur in Uzbekistan. The researchers examined the perceptions and explanations of the entrepreneurs, along with their views and interpretations of their entrepreneurship in their individual context working with interpretative analysis based on primary data (Welch et al. 2010). The interview data were not pre-determined or limited in scope; instead, they were guided (explanation of determinants integrated) and stimulated by open-ended questions (cf. Alasuutari 1995). The interview data were initially analysed via content and thematic clusters (responses in the interviews), then triangulated with other data (photos, observations, etc.); in two cases, follow-up interviews were needed to verify the interpretation or clarify missing aspects. Finally, the paper presents the analysis and findings in an aggregated form (thematic clusters) complemented with extracts from the narratives, paying particular attention to hindering traceability and applying high research ethics (Kuula 2006; Weijer et al. 1999).

The research materials were aggregated and organised using NVivo 10 software. Case data were categorised, clustered, evaluated, triangulated and compared (cf. Fig. 2), and finally organised into a thematic table (see Table 1 and Table 2; cf. Kottak 2006). The analysis employed intense triangulation of data (across material, researchers and data collection methods) increasing the quality and trustworthiness of the analysis and findings; in addition, careful planning, research audits and systematic analysis enhanced credibility and neutrality (Denzin 1978; Jick 1979; Golafshani 2003). Triangulation was also necessary as both data collection and analysis required interplay between foreign theoretical and native contextual understanding (cf. Salmi 2010; Jick 1979).

The findings concerning the typology were clear; the types B, E and H DEs were identified and confirmed as in the typology (Fig. 1). One clear case of “pioneer-style DE,” type H was case 1, and mixed forms of it in cases 3, 5, and 6. These three cases involve circular or second-generation diasporans, and thus it was not possible to find the “ideal type” for them, as they belonged to different categories in the business lifecycle (cf. Cohen 2008). Type H had the highest freedom to decide, she had

Table 1 Individual and socio-cultural influences on becoming an entrepreneur (understanding individual and embedded endogenous determinants on DE)

Cases	Case 1 (H)	Case 2 (B)	Case 3 (H/E)	Case 4 (E)	Case 5 (E/H)	Case 6 (E/H)	Case 7 (E)	Case 8 (E)
Ethnicity	German	Tajik	Korean	Bukharian Jew	Bukharian Jew	Bukharian Jew	Bukharian Jew	Uzbek
Gender	Female	Male	Male	Female	Female	Male	Male	Male
Type of country in background	Developed/emerging	Developing/emerging	Developed/emerging	Emerging/emerging	Emerging/developed/emerging	Emerging/developed/emerging	Emerging	Emerging
Company establishment	2012	2008	2003	1998	2007	1996	2001	2006
Business idea and risk	Introduction of a new concept and products, no direct competitors yet. Risk not mentioned	Service business in real estate, risk not perceived as a particular obstacle, commission-based business	Authorised dealer of electronics, a network of three retail shops. Considerable risk in the beginning	Emigrant sister offered to import cosmetics to Russia. Limited risk	Sales of tourism-related products, considerable risk	Construction business, its local growth and importance, experience and knowledge from the USA in the same business, risk moderate	Inherited a jewellery business from his grandfather for which he needed a bank loan, but risk was considered low. Today, he has a beauty clinic, a boutique for clothing and shoes, a health clinic and a leather production business.	Producer of food products, idea stems from childhood on a farm, numerous reforms towards sufficient food product supply stimulated the idea
Previous situation	Active in other sectors as entrepreneur in Germany, 14 years' experience	Student in architecture and construction	Educated teacher, had little potential to enter a suitable position, a chance was needed	Unemployed	Repatriation from Israel, null start	Architect, experience from the sector in the USA, first company established in the USA	Student with entrepreneurial family tradition	Veterinarian, educated in agronomy
Intrinsic motivation.	Freedom, self-realisation, being able to live one's skills	Continuation in a business with focus on architecture and construction	Livelihood, income	To provide Russian women with quality cosmetics, prosperity and income	Return home, livelihood, income, new start in life after repatriation	To follow opportunities, lucrative business, as architecture and construction are his passion. His education was not acknowledged in the USA	To continue the family tradition, expand and prosper as an entrepreneur	To convert his favourite activity/hobby into business, to continue traditions and to do private business as an entrepreneur

Table 1 (continued)

Cases	Case 1 (H)	Case 2 (B)	Case 3 (H/E)	Case 4 (E)	Case 5 (E/H)	Case 6 (E/H)	Case 7 (E)	Case 8 (E)
Role of family	Little understanding of doing business abroad, particularly for Uzbekistan, ex ante support	Parents, relatives and friends helped to open the business; they were not taken seriously at first	He had to sell his car and his house to get the start capital; parents were very worried about the risks and the entrepreneurship idea	Her sister helped a lot as the supplier of the products; her husband is a co-owner and both sons work in management of the company	Her husband and her children provided the start capital and supply some of the products (from Israel)	Father-in-law provided the start capital; his wife had similar interest and agreed to establish a business; his parents lived in the "host country", so the whole family was happy	Inheritance, his lawyer father helps him from the beginning, entrepreneurial family supports him and relatives from the USA supply him with medical instruments/machinery	Family supported the idea and helped to set up the business, many family members are employed, sons take part in management discussions
Role of friends and business partners	Operational support, information exchange, knowledge transfer	Co-owner friends with similar background, numerous partners (Tajiks, Uzbeks, Iranians) in business, "community business".	His Tajik and Uzbek friends helped to set up the business, now some of them work in his business; his previous work generated business contacts in South Korea and provided the COO network	A good Uzbek friend helped to establish the business, her sister supplies over 70 % of the goods and they exchange market knowledge, Israel-Uzbek Chamber of Commerce provides advice	Uzbek neighbours were sceptical about the business plans, one friend warned them about starting a business, which would ruin them, later a daughter of a friend started working in one shop	Friends (Bukharan Jews) in the USA and Israel were happy that he started the business; he has strong social and business ties with them (cooperation, supply). The friends helped him to establish business relationships in other countries and to sell there. Some local Uzbek friends are also suppliers	His friends wanted to emigrate and establish joint ventures, many friends emigrated, and good business partnerships in supply and trade are supportive	A friend in a bank helped to organize the financing and leasing aspects, local business organisation shares knowledge and discusses business

Table 1 (continued)

Cases	Case 1 (H)	Case 2 (B)	Case 3 (H/E)	Case 4 (E)	Case 5 (E/H)	Case 6 (E/H)	Case 7 (E)	Case 8 (E)
Role of other socio-cultural elements	Pioneering work, social status and expatriation	Establish-ment of the real estate business model in the post-Soviet era, financial support for others	Friends, family and neighbours receive better business conditions, they are also often helped, reciprocity	She employs many, assists friends, takes care of the family cemetery in Uzbekistan and donates to the World Congress of Bukharian Jews	Privately, they participate in their local community, in social and religious life. They employ a daughter of a friend, but cannot donate yet	Local business network, numerous friends, partners and family ties. Takes care of his mother, supports and helps the community with donations and construction projects, multiple roles and activities, employs 15 young neighbours, proud of Bukharian Jewish oligarchs	Family tradition, relatives, and local community play an important role in business and private life. Donates to and helps the Bukharian Jewish community and people in particular conditions, but not the main target group. Helps friends in their businesses	Family traditions are strong, all employees are family or neighbours, religious and social structures guide his entrepreneurship, strong responsibility as the head of the family and employer, helps family, old people and orphans, supports the local mosque
Identity	German, pioneer entrepreneur	Tajik	Inhabitant of a certain city	Transnational (spiritually young)	Bukharian Jew, wife, mother and grandmother	Businessman and Bukharian Jew (transnational)	Bukharian Jewish entrepreneur	Good father and Uzbek

Table 2 The influence factors stemming from the country and business market context (understanding macro- and meso-level exogenous determinants on DE)

Cases	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4	Case 5	Case 6	Case 7	Case 8
Personal cultural proximity to Uzbekistan	No cultural proximity, only local friends	Strong cultural proximity to a particular city ("home")	Strong cultural proximity to a particular city and to Uzbekistan	Strong cultural proximity to Uzbekistan	Strong cultural proximity to Uzbekistan, to a particular city	Strong cultural proximity to Uzbekistan	Strong cultural proximity to Uzbekistan	Strong cultural proximity to Uzbekistan
Linkages to other countries	Germany, United Arab Emirates	Tajikistan	South Korea	Russia, Kazakhstan, Kirgizstan, Israel, Sweden	Israel, USA	USA, Israel, indirect to Ukraine and Belarus, latent to Russia, Kazakhstan, Europe	USA	Turkey
Opportunity identification	Via travel and local friends, search for a place with a social network, German Chamber of Commerce assisted with advice	Own interest, friends, market situation and social business contacts	South Korean contacts from earlier life, in Korean language	Lack of supply of cosmetics and the collapse of the Soviet Union, experiential knowledge and sister's active support from Israel	Idea from Israel and the emerging tourism sector, children supported with information	Stimuli from the USA, family especially and market-specific knowledge from Uzbekistan, personal and from social contacts	Family tradition, observation of evolving markets and business needs, social contacts	Continuation of a tradition in a transition period, changes in possibilities after numerous reforms that enabled his plans
Opportunity development	With local friends and neighbours, with the local tourism sector, local German institutions	With a non-Tajik friend as co-owner, local friends and relatives, other local businesses	With a Tajik friend and other local Uzbek friends, supported by the importance of the Daewoo case and the growing market	With her husband, an Uzbek friend and sister, later with her sons	Children helped to establish the company financially, local administration more helpful than in the Soviet era, children and Israeli suppliers assisted	With family: father-in-law and wife, Bukharan Jewish friends who helped to establish the relationships abroad	With family, especially the father as legal expert, also friends and business partner, bank as finance provider	With external finance, support of family and neighbours, policy reforms

Table 2 (continued)

Cases	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4	Case 5	Case 6	Case 7	Case 8
Growth and expansion motivation	Expansion of the concept planned, first in other cities in Uzbekistan	Local expansion, no expansion to other places due to lacking trust and nature of the business not feasible	Expansion from one dealership to three, further expansion inside Uzbekistan, dependent on Korean producers	Expansion from Russia to Central Asian markets, from a start-up to four companies with 69 employees, further expansion in same region with additional suppliers	From one to two shops in one city, more lifestyle entrepreneurship, no growth orientation in terms of expansion, only local	Strong growth orientation in construction business, currently two companies, also expansion plans to other businesses that build on the import-export knowledge gained	Business expansion as personal motivation and life style, diverse market expansions, currently local-based and in trade and services	Only local growth and expansion, no travelling or foreign business also due to health issues and interest
Location advantage and relevance to business	Purpose-driven specific location, advantage as inside the tourism area, location and building most relevant, "local people would not consider appropriate because of age and condition"	Business market exists in Uzbekistan due to the transition from Soviet plan economy toward an emerging market economy, location-based social resources crucial	Business market in an introduction phase with a large, young population, significant opportunity to grow, but highly local, proximity to end-customers	Location with its shortage was the stimulus, location provides the high demand structure and expansion to culturally related areas as understanding the context is relevant, location-based organic growth orientation	Purpose-driven specific location in the tourism area, most relevant to the business, access and proximity to tourists	Location with its shortage was a key stimulus, location's potential, structure and the related knowledge most relevant to the business, competence in "Central-Asian business"	Location was given, the businesses evolved around the opportunities of the given location, for service businesses proximity to customer important	Location is inherent in the business idea, it employs the whole family and builds on the traditional local product, reforms and policies relevant
Growth and long-term orientation	No explicit plan	Growth and long-term orientation, to give further to the son	Long-term orientation, to grow and provide the alternative to his children, or to sell and retire.	Growth and long-term orientation, sons already active in management.	Active until pension, no explicit orientation beyond as children and grandchildren live in Israel.	Growth and long-term orientation, his son manages the USA company, daughter will work as legal counselor in the company.	Growth and long-term orientation, a link in the long chain of family tradition, perhaps the children will continue	Long-term orientation, sons will continue

Table 2 (continued)

Cases	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4	Case 5	Case 6	Case 7	Case 8
Post-Soviet implications for business	An emerging business model in its introduction phase, import business, no extant knowledge	The structure for the business opportunity, the common language, Russian, for business with various regional ethnicities	Mobile technology (the products) covers the gaps of the post-Soviet fixed infrastructure, bilateral agreements with South Korean companies beneficial	The unsatisfied need that resulted from the limitations of the Soviet Union, non-existent distribution and retail systems, large gap to fill	Tourism sector growth beyond internal tourism, easier administration and more pro-SME attitude of authorities	The unsatisfied market provided a significant opportunity for imports, as there was no such local industry, the post-Soviet business was "easy"	Emphasis on cultural tradition of jewellery, new customer behaviour, emerging market opportunities after the limitations of Soviet Union, large gaps to fill, easier business	Structural and reform aspects, resulting policies, previously not possible

numerous alternatives for DE in Uzbekistan; she could find employment, migrate again or return to COO. Type E “Emerging market DE” represented the majority of cases (cases 4, 5, 7, and partially 3 and 6), which is expected since the region has a vivid multicultural history and trade network. Most of these cases had alternatives, such as employment or migration, only case 5 had basically no other alternative in Uzbekistan. Case 2 was a mixed version of type B “lonely starter-style DE” and type E “emerging-market DE,” since the entrepreneur was not first-generation Tajik diasporan; as the Tajik diaspora in Uzbekistan has integrated well into the multicultural business environment, the national origin has become less relevant for such 1, 5-generation diasporan. The pure “lonely starters” of type B (shoe repairer and tradesman) did not allow us to interview them, but we documented their existence. Type B entrepreneurs had the least alternatives; they were struggling for livelihood and remittance creation via entrepreneurial activity as there were fewer options for employment, return or migration elsewhere. The findings on the reasons to become an entrepreneur (compared to career in employment or migration to a more developed country) and choose Uzbekistan as the place of business were mainly linked with local opportunities and socio-cultural diaspora-generated factors (see Fig. 3, Table 2.), but also with necessity aspects as their narratives illustrate (Fig. 3). Interestingly, the repatriated diaspora entrepreneur³ in case 5 was more driven by necessity than the other diasporans whose situation involved more choices, while all of them acknowledged the role of some opportunity *in* Uzbekistan. Thus, it was not the lack of alternatives that drove them to become entrepreneurs but an idiographic configuration of opportunity and necessity related to the host country Uzbekistan. The type B entrepreneurs chose Uzbekistan due to its better opportunity structure compared to their COO, but they had very few alternatives both in COO and COR.

The major part of the analysis focused on the individual determinants for becoming a diaspora entrepreneur in general; it explored the individual micro level and the socio-cultural embeddedness factors (Table 1). Here, the drivers were generation of an idea and underlying personal dynamics such as background, possession of local or diasporic business-lens, and socio-cultural aspects. It is important to note that in this study, the entrepreneur’s country background was mainly a combination of location and cultural heritage, not a single country, except in cases 7 and 8. The type of socio-cultural embeddedness and their degree of transnationalism varied over culture, generations and time, but also over the number of country connections. Therefore, circular and multi-generational diaspora may have different—even accumulated—implications than two-country-based transnational diaspora on their entrepreneurship. A low level of transnationalism may also influence the nature of the resulting DE, for example, producing rather local than international business activities.

³ Diaspora entrepreneur refers to a person who acts as an entrepreneur and is or has been in diaspora, i.e. dispersed from the country of origin, or is strongly influenced by diasporic family, circularity or transnational diaspora so that the person’s context has diasporic features (cf. Brubaker 2005).

"Freedom. Self-realization. Being able to live my skills. -Good opportunity for that kind of business, no predecessor, no competition"

"Samarkand stays always in my heart, for me it is the best and most beautiful city of the world! -The opportunity appeared to open up a private company."

"Sales of electronics in Uzbekistan is a win-win business"

"I liked the business immediately because I could travel a lot and market my goods extremely fast, at that time there was almost no competition. – I know the traditions, preferences and habits of the people here."

"In the USA I learned the newest products and materials and so we decided to establish a business. With the fast growing population like in Uzbekistan, it booms.."

"Uzbekistan is a young and fast growing developing market where one can develop good business by respecting the local traditions and mentality."

"We decided to return to our quiet and peaceful Buchara. We started the business because we a

"It is our real homeland"

Fig. 3 Individual-level reasons of entrepreneurial entry (DE) in Uzbekistan

The reason why they wanted to choose Uzbekistan as the host country for their venture was a set of individually perceived determinants. All of them (limited in case 8) had the opportunity to choose another country, or other alternative, such as employment or migration. In fact, cases 4, 5, and 6 had wholly or partially repatriated and were content with their decision. This indicates many opposite flow-DE cases, which was not expected based on migration statistics. All cases illustrated venture reasons (see Tables 1 and 2) relating to life strategy, personal dreams, competences and plans, income and economic benefit, opportunity identification and exploitation, local network connectedness and the particular willingness to work in Uzbekistan. No dominant push factor (e.g. war or other crisis) was found in the interviews, but for type B, entrepreneurs who refused the interview were potentially pushed by their necessity situation (developing country COO). Interestingly, none of the cases considered another country to start their business; however, some of them (cases 1, 4, and 6) had previous businesses in Germany, Russia or the USA. It seems that many determinants for business establishment on micro-level were rather idiographic (see Tables 1 and 2).

In the second part of the empirical analysis, the emerging market-, country- and institutional-level opportunities and other factors influencing the DE are examined (Table 2). In this analysis, both the country and the market-level contextual determinants are explored. Particularly, the role of the market and the location of the business, opportunity development, connectedness and growth and long-term orientations were identified and analysed.

Finally, the comparison of the determinants for DE from previous research and the explored determinants in this context pointed out several differences. The determinants are organised with the logic of analytical levels (as in Fig. 2), then the explored determinants are reflected on the extant ones, and the results of the comparison of these two flow contexts (cf. Harima 2015) are illustrated in Table 3.

Table 3 Comparison of DE determinants

Determinants for DE	Entrepreneur-level personal drivers	Socio-cultural embeddedness-drivers	Market/business level-drivers	Country-level macro-drivers and impacts
Previous determinants (on COO context) by Nkongo-lo-Bakenda and Chrysostome (2013)	Altruistic motivations	Need of social recognition Societal integration	Entrepreneurial opportunities Support for the entrepreneur	Receptivity of the country friendliness of the context
Type B	Necessity-driven motivations	Obligations concerning the sending family context Need of social recognition in COO	Host country market opportunities for livelihood	n.a. (irregular migrants are influenced by policy changes and implementation)
Type E	Entrepreneurial, but also some altruistic motivations by repatriated/circular entrepreneurs	Need of social recognition Societal integration Socio-cultural drivers (obligations, support, traditions).	Opportunities for livelihood, new business and additional business.	The opening of the private entrepreneurship Emergence of the institutional framework for entrepreneurship
Type H	Entrepreneurial motivations. Dreams/pioneering	Acceptance from sending family context.	Entrepreneurial opportunity.	Economic trends and policies (concerning the industry)
Different in COR context with Uzbekistan as host country	Altruistic motivations not common, only for repatriated or circular entrepreneurs Personal dreams and goals more important	Importance of social embeddedness determinants follow the economic development level of the sending country with type H the least impacted	Opportunity is a key determinant Support systems not indicated	Receptivity and friendliness were not indicated; the context was purposefully chosen and understood as it was Economic growth and emerging nature of the country are important determinants

Conclusions and discussion

Theoretical implications

DE theory needs better conceptualisation and contextualisation (cf. Michailova 2011). As the findings illustrate, there seems to be no “one ideal case” of diaspora entrepreneurship or generic determinants that provide theoretical grounding for a universal model (cf. Nkongolo-Bakenda and Chrysostome 2013). Emerging country-hosted entrepreneurship has country-specific settings influencing incoming DE flows (cf. Libman 2008); therefore, these types of DE may vary greatly and be idiosyncratic. The degree of contextual asymmetry (COO and COR) influences the determinants of diaspora entrepreneurship: higher asymmetry requires a stronger set of DE determinants, while lower asymmetry seems to be more moderate in terms of the DE determinants. This difference may also be the result of migration policies and institutional restrictions on entrepreneurial activity of “foreigners” and not of the entrepreneurship-level determinants. DE seems to emerge and evolve more naturally in a lower asymmetry context, also because diasporans are used to cope with the required transformations in emerging economies. Higher asymmetry in developed or developing host contexts might bring different findings. The findings underline that the “emerging” context is distinct from a “rich” or “developing” one, for example, in terms of institutions and economic characteristics (cf. Peng 2003; Suhir and Kovach 2003; Wright et al. 2005) but also in terms of DE motivations and drivers. Since the theoretical research inquiry is constructed on testing and developing the typology on its emerging column types towards a theoretical-analytical tool for DE, the interest is particularly high on the existence of the three distinct types B, E and H. The discovery and existence of these three types function as the support for proposition 1:

Proposition 1. Diaspora entrepreneurship dynamics (determinants) are dissimilar in different country contexts (nine types), because both the sending and receiving country influence the dynamics of DE.

Moreover, the country of origin and motivation-related factors were very dissimilarly constructed, despite the common role of opportunity as a determinant. The level of transnationalism was different in different types. The implicit role of other CORs with entrepreneurial and resource networks for DE suggests that the COO-COR typology is too limited for circular diasporans. Hence, it is suggested that generalisation across DE types without assessing the types and the context are flawed. The findings illustrate opposite flow examples from developed countries and support proposition 2:

Proposition 2. There are “opposite” flows of DE entering emerging and less developed countries; therefore, there are potentially other than country-level economic determinants for DE.

These cases illustrate the heterogeneous nature of DE and their different determinants (cf. Table 3). Their determinants were not identical to determinants for COO-based DE, but had similarities in socially constructed determinants and opportunities. As Nkongolo-Bakenda and Chrysostome (2013) suggest, diaspora international

entrepreneurship depends not only on their level of altruistic motivation, need of social recognition and entrepreneurial opportunities, but also on the friendliness and receptivity of the home country, as well as integration of and support to immigrants. In the case of Uzbekistan, the role of intrinsic motivation and opportunity—even social networks—were significant, but there was no evidence for the role of country-level friendliness, receptivity or any migrant integration or support programmes. The employed typology and comparison of different cases has its limitations too. DE, particularly concerning the first generation, differs from the other local or foreign forms of emerging market-based entrepreneurship, representing dissimilar resources, initiation and growth dynamics. First, DE may be more greenfield-based and family entrepreneurship and employ less acquisition and joint venture modes of entry (cf. Meyer et al. 2009). Second, its ownership and entry characteristics differ from those of incumbent firms—often state-owned enterprises—and privatised firms, local entrepreneurial start-ups and foreign entrants, thereby creating a category of its own (cf. Peng 2003; Wright et al. 2005). Third, the individual embeddedness has a stronger effect on DE than on the previous types and their entry-exit behaviour has socio-cultural dimensions (cf. Elo and Jokela 2014; Urbano et al. 2011). The findings in this emerging market context show two important intertwined dynamics that need to match to stimulate DE, which support the findings on the interplay of necessity and opportunity (Welter and Smallbone 2010). These are as follows: (1) the development of the market per se and its attractiveness, particularly recognised opportunities, in comparison to other perceived alternatives, and (2) the strategic life planning of the entrepreneurs, including family embeddedness, phase in life, and personal goals, necessity and dreams. These dynamics may explain why foreign entrepreneurs and diaspora returnees choose to venture in Uzbekistan instead of another more developed country.

Concerning DE motivations and drivers, the study found drivers for elements 2–3 on the individual level (Fig. 2). There were enablers in all thematic categories that may—when missing—constitute obstacles or barriers to entry. Interpersonal networks and access to social infrastructure were crucial. It did not find any significant DE consideration related to labour costs, taxation, legislation, capital supply or political country-level effects of a transition economy, which is contradictory to extant findings emphasising institutional difficulties (Suhir and Kovach 2003).

Proposition 3. DE is influenced by the combination of necessity and opportunity determinants that are perceived by the entrepreneur and are context specific.

This proposition was mainly supported (except case 5) while the role of opportunity was dominant, surprisingly, as necessity is an inherent feature in an emerging market context. Perceived opportunities assisted the entrepreneurs to turn their necessity factors into motivational determinants and fuel for the opportunity development. On the other hand, the study found a strong “immigrant effect” on their entrepreneurship enabling them to perceive and develop opportunities. This positive effect is very strong for the first generation diaspora, but may “transnationalise away” over time. This implies that the four leading conceptual perspectives on emerging country business (transaction cost, agency, resource-based and institutional theory) could be enriched with DE, explaining the relative insignificance of the effects of weak institutions,

uncertainty and instability with its socio-cultural embeddedness and employment of informal institutions (cf. Wright et al. 2005).

The context of a transition economy host country presented its own dynamism as a determinant for DE; the entrepreneurs were well aware of the development rate and its impact on their venturing. While the diaspora entrepreneurs are dynamic, adaptive and mobile in many ways, the host country is immobile and constitutes an object for comparison. The developments of their markets affect the strategy of diaspora entrepreneurs, influencing diasporans' perceptions of risk, trust and opportunities, but the contextual and socioeconomic embeddedness seemed to have a greater influence than just profit expectations. Indeed, some diaspora entrepreneurs have more choices, and in case of failure, they may select another strategy and exit. The interplay between DE entry choice and individual life includes several levels of dynamics and multiple micro influence factors. The final choice to invest is a sum of many factors to create a "fit" in life, and here, it was not dominated by altruistic or homeland sentiments. The findings suggest that in the transition and emerging economy context, necessity and opportunity evolve hand-in-hand with the formation of the business environment (see Wright et al. 2005). Thus, it can be summarised that it is less the country-level determinants and more the constellation of socioeconomic elements and opportunities that stimulate DE location and target country choices.

The character of the emerging country of Uzbekistan, which has undergone numerous reforms and institutional changes towards a kind of market economy, is still more a transition economy. Uzbekistan has tried to focus on promoting private business generation, the simplification of business establishment, reduction of institutional uncertainty and stability creation, but DE policies are yet inadequate to tap the full potential. The post-Soviet era in which these entrepreneurs have started up represents an interesting phase in the development of an emerging country, and their experiences and narratives illustrate that they have perceived numerous institutional improvements. In fact, their views on improvement occurred naturally in data, surprising against previous literature. Due to their diasporanness, they were able to overcome obstacles easier than others did. Despite the deficits encountered and the inefficiencies of transition, all entrepreneurs have been at least moderately successful. However, the study is limited to eight cases of entrepreneurship and investment in the post-Soviet era and provides only some in-depth views without representativeness and statistical relevance.

A central element for fostering entrepreneurial activities and growth has been the significant gap in the markets after independence and the collapse of the Soviet system; this gap, along with the changed entrepreneurial circumstances, provided the window of opportunity to fulfil a dream or to create a new livelihood. This evolving gap attracted DE as a perceived opportunity. In total, the role of family and friends, in Uzbekistan and abroad, played a key role in making the plans viable. The influence of foreign ties on inward activities was particularly emphasised in terms of supply, business networking and knowledge transfer. The outward activities were mainly in the ex-Soviet markets and were thus "ex-home markets." The ability to identify opportunities via the "immigrant effect" was validated, but it was also indirect, that is, from the diaspora network abroad, not necessarily the entrepreneur him/herself. The findings show that the diasporans were able to connect to the social capital and existing international experience and knowledge of their ties a priori and employed these

capabilities in their establishment phase and resulting business operations. This behaviour had similarities to that of born-globals; however, due to the emerging context, the inward flow (Uzbek perspective) was more significant than the outward flow was. These companies were “born (inward) international” (cf. Kundu and Katz 2003).

The role of support determinant, i.e. institutions, chambers of commerce, trade organisations and universities, was insignificant. Dimensions that may be relevant to Western SMEs such as research-based spin-offs, campus entrepreneurs, student entrepreneurs, support and certification mechanisms for business incubators and results-oriented knowledge transfer offices (cf. Wymenga et al. 2012) were not relevant for the DE context in this emerging market. Ethnic community, family ties and even the cemeteries of ancestors were more important (i.e. social recognition). In general, diaspora ties were significant in sourcing, partnering and sales, with a particular effect on the establishment phase in overcoming institutional difficulties. The emerging character gave impetus to informal institutional structures.

The entrepreneurial behaviour was closer to Bolton and Thompson’s (2004) view of entrepreneurs than McDougall and Oviatt’s (2000) definition, since the entrepreneurial behaviour was mainly carefully planned and risk-avoiding or limiting, the level of innovation focused more on transferring an extant model/idea from abroad to Uzbekistan, and the proactiveness seemed to be quite limited in scope, whereas the talent, dreams and socio-cultural drivers were strong. The inward orientation was significant, and the value creation often had a clear direction to the company and the family behind it, even if the family members were not co-owners (cf. Elo and Jokela 2014). Despite its location, the influence of family was significant for the entrepreneurship, both as support and as a driver for success, due to responsibility and strategic importance (cf. Leinonen 2012; Vissak and Zhang 2012). The “item” of business was often linked to the entrepreneur’s dreams, education or competences and the emerging opportunity.

Finally, the differences of the determinants of DE in the different contexts (emerging vs. developing, COR vs. COO) and the respective types of DE (see Table 3) illustrate that future research is needed to develop determinants for each type of DE with enhanced contextualisation (cf. Michailova 2011).

Managerial implications

The individual diaspora experience, and even social and managerial networks prior to entrepreneurship, were important as sources of contacts, ideas, advice, finance, support, perspectives and information in the emerging setting. The cases indicate that the entrepreneurs also benefitted from the diaspora in their family, not just their individual experience. Thus, this “immigrant effect” in perceptions, comparisons and opportunity/risk management was extended and had positive effects that were shared and transferred in the family and among friends (e.g. Chung and Tung 2013; Riddle et al. 2010). Other livelihood/career choices than DE in Uzbekistan were discarded because of the perceived benefits of becoming an entrepreneur, but they require careful a priori understanding. Business networking with locals and community members in the COO and COR was highly important for the venture. The findings suggest that entering entrepreneurs needs to understand the emotions of the people in the emerging market context, which can be especially challenging to foreigners; it found that effect is not relevant only in regard to the COO, as Barnard and Pendock (2012) claim, but also in

regard to the host country (COR). This interplay influences the engagement and behaviour of diasporans and their willingness to become entrepreneurs and investors (cf. Barnard and Pendock 2012). The cases presented no “victims” (cf. Cohen 2008); instead, active and often growth-oriented entrepreneurs shared opportunities with business partners and benefitted the community as socially oriented entrepreneurs. The collective style in business and social embeddedness were more facilitating factors than constraints; this was actually referred to as part of the purpose of doing business (cf. Ali et al. 1997; Ellis and Pecotich 2001; Granovetter 1985). The success factors and differences between the mainstream Uzbek entrepreneurship and DE require in-depth understanding to safeguard a prosperous growth pattern for DE and to avoid socio-political fragmentation and inertia. More research is needed on socio-cultural determinants for management of DE.

Methodological implications

The researchers had severe difficulties in obtaining data, as many people mistrust the regime and have in general negative perceptions about questions, and there were language barriers. Irregular migrants are not willing to be recorded or photographed. An emerging market provides additional methodological troubles; therefore, the researchers recommend involving native researchers in such settings, as they found this to be the only manageable way to collect interview material. Trusted persons (cf. snowballing), clear research protocols and high ethical standards (visible to respondents) facilitated the process and decreased ethics and trust problems. For large-scale studies, local high-quality partner institutions would be recommended

Policymaking

There is a significant tendency to employ social networks for business within and between various ethnic groups. The assistance and usage of official, institutional actors was insignificant in these DE narratives, possibly reflecting the FDI programme of the state encouraging MNC entry only. Therefore, the study suggests strategy modification to promote and increase small and family business establishment by diasporans advancing international entrepreneurship. It recommends events that bring people with common interests together, especially with cross-ethnic emphasis to reinvent the Silk Road and lingua franca spirit for business. The rise of sub-groupings, which easily develop religious and political disharmony and harm the investment climate, should be met by creation of competence clusters, mentoring systems and cultural and knowledge transfer systems on the local level, with a virtual dimension on the internet. The data indicated that awareness of possible SME support programmes was almost non-existent, which does not facilitate catching-up. Promotion of historical competences and traditions in trade and economic cooperation could connect the older and younger population quickly for enhanced opportunity creation. There is a danger that the common business language in the area—Russian—will become less popular and thus create communication problems and obstacles for interaction (cf. Libman 2008). Beyond that, it is not enough if the Uzbekistan-based diasporans consist only of people with developing and emerging country backgrounds, as diasporic diversity can advance international trade. For example, the ability of repatriates to act as “foreign” investors seems to benefit international business suggestion further improvements for migration policy (Riddle 2008; Kotabe et al. 2013). The

infrastructure and employment of the internet was not well developed, and this needs to be improved, as the internet has made it easier for smaller firms to overcome some of the barriers to internationalisation (cf. Internationalisation of European SMEs and Final 2010). Moreover, economic trade and investment incentives, the ramifications of entrepreneurship (e.g. DE) and the fight against corruption are aspects of common interest (cf. COO/COR). The external barriers and bottlenecks such as lack of capital, lack of adequate information and lack of adequate public support, as well as the costs of or difficulties with paperwork associated with transport and international business, require attention. Uzbekistan has potential for foreign-born DE, but it must be actively supported with a suitable institutional framework.

References

- Abdurakhmonov M (2003) FDI scenario in Uzbekistan—glancing at the first decade after the independence. *Econ J Hokkaido Univ* 32:183–200
- Aharoni Y (1966) The foreign investment decision process. Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, Boston
- Alasuutari P (1995) *Researching culture: qualitative method and cultural studies*. Sage Publications, London
- Ali A, Tagi A, Krishnan K (1997) Individualism, collectivism and decision styles. *J Soc Psychol* 137(1997): 629–637
- Aliaga-Isla R, Rialp A (2012) How do information and experience play a role in the discovery of entrepreneurial opportunities? The case of Latin-American immigrants in Barcelona. *Lat Am Bus Rev* 13(1):59–80
- Aliaga-Isla R, Rialp A (2013) Systematic review of immigrant entrepreneurship literature: previous findings and ways forward. *Entrep Reg Dev* 25(9–10):819–844. doi:10.1080/08985626.2013.845694
- Arslan A, Tarba SY, Larimo J (2015) FDI entry strategies and the impacts of economic freedom distance: evidence from Nordic FDIs in transitional periphery of CIS and SEE. *Int Bus Rev* 24(6):997–1008
- Azizov A (2007) Determinants of FDI in CIS countries with transition economy. (Unpublished master's thesis). Aarhus School of Business, Aarhus, Denmark
- Barnard H, Pendock C (2012) To share or not to share: the role of affect in knowledge sharing by individuals in a diaspora. *J Int Manag* 19(1):47–65. doi:10.1016/j.intman.2012.22.003
- Bikbaeva G, Gaibnazarova M (2009) Impact of microfinance on alleviating rural poverty in Uzbekistan. *Probl Econ Transit* 52(2):67–85
- Bolt P (1997) Chinese diaspora entrepreneurship, development, and the world capitalist system. *Diaspora* 6(2): 215–235
- Bolton B, Thompson J (2004) *Entrepreneurs: talent, temperament, technique*. Routledge, Oxford
- Brinkerhoff JM (2009) *Digital diasporas: identity and transnational engagement*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Brubaker R (2005) The “diaspora” diaspora. *Ethnic Racial Stud* 28(1):1–19
- Buckley PJ, Ghauri PN (2004) Globalisation, economic geography and the strategy of multinational enterprises. *J Int Bus Stud* 35(2):81–98
- Burns P (2001) *Entrepreneurship and small business*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke
- Caprar DV (2011) Foreign locals: a cautionary tale on the culture of MNC local employees. *J Int Bus Stud* 42(5):608–628
- Carmichael BA, Drori I, Honig B (eds) (2010) *Transnational and immigrant entrepreneurship in a globalized world*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto
- Cassidy Y, Minoglou IP (eds) (2005) *Entrepreneurship in theory and history*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke
- Chand M, Ghorbani M (2011) National culture, networks and ethnic entrepreneurship: a comparison of the Indian and Chinese immigrants in the US. *Int Bus Rev* 20(6):593–606
- Chaudhry S, Crick D (2004) The business practices of small Chinese restaurants in the UK: an exploratory investigation. *Strateg Chang* 13(1):37–49
- Chlenov M (Ed.) (2009) *Euro-Asian Jewish Yearbook—5768 (2007/2008)*. M.: Pallada, 2009. http://library-en.eajc.org/data/image/books/18/0/180_d.pdf
- Chung HFL, Tung RL (2013) Immigrant social networks and foreign entry: Australia and New Zealand firms in the European Union and Greater China. *Int Bus Rev* 22:18–31

- Cohen JH (2005) Remittance outcomes and migration: theoretical contests, real opportunities. *Stud Int Comp Devel* 40:88–112
- Cohen R (2008) *Global diasporas: an introduction*, 2nd edn. Routledge, New York
- Coudouel A, Marnie S, Micklewright J (1998) Targeting social assistance in a transition economy: the mahallas in Uzbekistan. UNICEF International Child Development Centre, Florence
- Debass T, Ardovino M (2009) Diaspora direct investment (DDI): The untapped resources for development. United States Agency for International Development. USAID publication, website: http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNADO983.pdf
- Denzin NK (1978) *The research act: a theoretical orientation to sociological methods*. Aldine, Chicago
- Doing Business in Uzbekistan (2009) Baker & McKenzie-CIS Limited. Tashkent, Uzbekistan, January 2009, pp 1–62
- Drori I, Honig B, Ginsberg A (2006) Transnational entrepreneurship: toward a unifying theoretical framework. *Acad Manag Proc* 2006(1):Q1–Q6
- Drori I, Honig B, Wright M (2009) Transnational entrepreneurship: an emergent field of study. *Enterp Theory Pract* 33(5):1001–1022
- Dunning JH (2006) Towards a new paradigm of development: implications for the determinants of international business. *Transl Corp* 15(1):173–227
- Eisenhardt KM (1989) Building theories from case study research. *Acad Manag Rev* 14(4):532–550
- Ellis P, Pecotich A (2001) Social factors influencing export initiation in small and medium-sized enterprises. *J Mark Res* 38:119–130
- Elo M (2013) Diaspora entrepreneurs in and from an emerging market: narratives from Uzbekistan. Paper presented at the 12th Vaasa International Business Conference, Vaasa, Finland, 21–23 August 2013
- Elo M, Jokela P (2014) Social ties, Bukharian Jewish diaspora and entrepreneurship: Narratives from entrepreneurs. In: Rapoo C, Coelho ML, Sarwar Z (eds) *New perspectives in diaspora experience*. Oxford: Inter-Disciplinary Press, <https://www.interdisciplinarypress.net/online-store/ebooks/diversity-and-recognition/new-perspectives-in-diasporic-experience>
- Elo M, Harima A, Freiling J (2015) To Try or Not to Try? A story of diaspora entrepreneurship. In: van Tulder R, Verbeke A, Droegendijk R (eds) *The Future of Global Organizing*. Progress in International Business Research, vol 10. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Bingley, pp 283–293
- Enderwick P, Tung RL, Chung HFL (2011) Immigrant effects and international business activity: an overview. *J Asia Bus Stud* 5(1):6–22
- Fischer E, Reuber AR (2001) Action frames for initiating exporting: antecedents and consequences for new and small firms. Paper presented at American Marketing Association Winter Educator's Meeting, Phoenix, AZ, February 2001, pp 1–61
- Ghauri P (2004) Designing and conducting case studies in international business research. *Handbook of qualitative research methods for international business*. In: Marschan-Piekkari R, Welch C (eds.) *Handbook of qualitative research methods for international business* (pp. 109–124). Edward Elgar Publishing, doi:10.4337/9781781954331.00019
- Ghauri PN, Grønhaug K (2010) *Research methods in business studies*, 4th edn. Pearson Education, Harlow
- Gill N, Bialski P (2011) New friends in the new places. Network formation among the Poles in the UK. *Geoforum* 42:241–249
- Gillespie K, Riddle L, Sayre E, Sturges D (1999) Diaspora interest in homeland investment. *J Int Bus Stud* 30(3):623–634
- Golafshani N (2003) Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *Qual Rep* 8(4):597–607
- Granovetter M (1973) The strength of weak ties. *Am J Sociol* 78:1360–1380
- Granovetter M (1985) Economic action and social structure: the problem of embeddedness. *Am J Sociol* 91: 481–93
- Halinen A, Törnroos JÅ, Elo M (2013) Network process analysis: an event-based approach to study business network dynamics. *Ind Mark Manag* 42(8):1213–1222
- Hanks RR (2000) Emerging spatial patterns of demographics, labour force and FDI in Uzbekistan. *Cent Asian Surv* 19(3–4):348–363
- Harima A (2015) The role of local partners for descending diaspora entrepreneurship: overcoming liability of foreignness. *Am J Entrepreneurship* 8(2):67–89
- Harvey W (2008) The strong or weak ties? British and Indian expatriates finding jobs in Boston. *Glob Netw* 8: 453–473
- Heilbrunn S, Kushnirovich N, Zeltzer-Zubida A (2010) Barriers to immigrants' integration into the labor market: modes and coping. *Int J Intercultural Relat* 34(3):244–252
- Heinonen J (2010) Maahanmuuttajayrittäjät ja vastuullinen liiketoiminta, kokemuksia, käsityksiä ja käytäntöjä. Coreco-hanke, Uskontotiede, Turun Yliopisto, Turku

- Hepp A, Bozdog C, Suna L (2011) *Mediale Migranten*, VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften. Wiesbaden, Germany
- Imazarov FK (2009) Transition strategies in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan since independence: paradoxes and prospects. Emerging Market Economies in Central Asia: The Role of Institutional Complementarities in Reform Processes-Project, Private University of Applied Sciences Göttingen, Germany, February 2009
- Javorcik BS, Özden C, Spatareanu M, Neagu C (2011) Migrant networks and foreign direct investment. *J Dev Econ* 94:231–241
- Jenssen JI, Kristiansen S (2004) Sub-cultures and entrepreneurship: the value of social capital in Tanzanian business. *J Entrep* 13(1):1–27
- Jick TD (1979) Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: triangulation in action. *Adm Sci Q* 24(4):602–611
- Johanson J, Mattsson LG (1988) Internationalization in industrial systems—a network approach. In: Hood N, Vahlne JE (eds) *Strategies in global competition*. Croom Helm, New York, pp 287–314
- Jones MV, Nummela N (2008) International entrepreneurship: expanding the domain and extending our research questions. *Eur Manag J* 26(6):349–353
- Jones MV, Coviello N, Tang YK (2011) International entrepreneurship research (1989–2009): a domain ontology and thematic analysis. *J Bus Ventur* 26(6):632–659
- Joronen T, Ali AA (2000) Maahanmuuttajien yritystoiminta Suomessa 1990-luvulla. In: Trux ML (ed) *Aukeavat ovet-kulttuurinen moninaisuus Suomen elinkeinoelämässä*. WSOY, Helsinki, pp 203–260
- Kaplan J (2003) *Patterns of entrepreneurship*. Wiley, Englewood Cliffs
- Khakhar P, Rammal HG (2013) Culture and business networks: international business negotiations with Arab managers. *Int Bus Rev* 22:578–590
- Khalmurzaev NA (2000) Small and medium-sized enterprises in the transition economy of Uzbekistan: conditions and perspectives. *Cent Asian Surv* 19(2):281–296
- Kotabe M, Riddle L, Sondergerger P, Täube F (2013) Diaspora investments and entrepreneurship: the role of people, their movements and capital in the international economy. *J Int Manag* 19:3–5
- Kottak C (2006) *Mirror for humanity*. McGraw-Hill, New York
- Kundu SK, Katz JA (2003) Born-international SMEs: BI-level impacts of resources and intentions. *Small Bus Econ* 20(1):25–47
- Kuula A (2006) Tutkimuseetiikka: aineistojen hankinta, käyttö ja säilytys. Vastapaino, Tampere
- Kuznetsov Y (2008) Mobilizing intellectual capital of diasporas: from the first movers to a virtuous cycle. *J Intellect Cap* 9(2):264–282
- Kyle D (1999) The Otavalo trade diaspora: social capital and transnational entrepreneurship. *Ethnic Racial Stud* 22(2):422–446
- Lähdesmäki M, Savela T (2006) *Tutkimus maahanmuuttajien yrittäjyyksikoulutuksen vaikuttavuudesta. Case Pro Maahanmuuttajayrittäjäkoulutus* (Web reports no.19). Turku, Siirtolaisuusinstituutti. Retrieved from <http://www.migrationsinstitute.fi/pdf/webreports19.pdf>
- Lasch F, Dana LP (2011) Contrasting contexts for entrepreneurship: capitalism by Kyrgyz Decree compared to gradual transition in Uzbekistan. *J Small Bus Entrep* 24(3):319–327
- Leinonen J (2012) “Money is not everything and that’s the bottom line”: family ties in transatlantic elite migrations. *Soc Sci Hist* 36:2 (Summer 2012)
- Libman A (2008) Regional integration in Central Asia: a firm-centered view. University of Muenchen. Retrieved from <http://mpr.ub.uni-muenchen.de/10939/>
- Light I, Gold S (2000) *Ethnic economies*. Academic Press, San Diego, CA
- Lin X (2010) The diaspora solution to innovation capacity development: immigrant entrepreneurs in the contemporary world. *Thunderbird Int Bus Rev* 52(2):123–136
- Majidov T (2007) *Entrepreneurship and business in Uzbekistan: historical perspective and current obstacles* (Unpublished PhD dissertation). University of Stirling, Stirling, UK. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/1893/321>
- Marschan-Piekkari R, Welch D, Welch L (1999) In the shadow: the impact of language on structure, power and communication in the multinational. *Int Bus Rev* 8(4):421–440
- Mayer SD, Harima A, Freiling J (2016) Network benefits for Ghanaian diaspora and returnee entrepreneurs. *Entrep Bus Econ Rev* 3(3):95–122
- McDougall PP, Oviatt BM (2000) International entrepreneurship: the intersection of two research paths. *Acad Manag J* 43(5):902–906
- Menzies TV, Brenner GA, Filion LJ, Lowry L, Perreault C, Ramagalay C (2000) Transnational entrepreneurship and bootstrap capitalism: social capital, networks and ethnic minority entrepreneurs. *École des hautes études commerciales, Chaire d’entrepreneurship Maclean Hunter*. Paper presented at the 2nd

- Biennial McGill Conference on International Entrepreneurship: Researching New Frontiers, McGill University, Montreal, 23–25 September 2000
- Meyer KE, Estrin S, Bhaumik SK, Peng MW (2009) Institutions, resources, and entry strategies in emerging economies. *Strateg Manag J* 30(1):61–80
- Michailova S (2011) Contextualizing in international business research: why do we need more of it and how can we be better at it? *Scand J Manag* 27(1):129–139
- Michailova S, Liuhto K (2001) Organization and management research in transition economies: towards improved research methodologies. *J East–West Bus* 6(3):7–46
- Minoglou IP (2005) Toward a typology of Greek diaspora entrepreneurship. *Diaspora entrepreneurial networks. Five centuries of history*. Berg, Oxford
- Mullings B (2011) Diaspora strategies, skilled migrants and human capital enhancement in Jamaica. *Glob Netw* 11(1):24–42
- Newland K, Tanaka H (2010) Mobilizing diaspora entrepreneurship for development. *Diasporas & Development Project, Migration Policy Institute, Washington*
- Nkongolo-Bakenda JM, Chrysostome EV (2013) Engaging diasporas as international entrepreneurs in developing countries: in search of determinants. *J Int Entrep* 11(1):30–64
- Ochildiev D, Pinkhasov R, Kalontarov I (2007) A history and culture of the Bukharian Jews. *Club Roshnoyi-Light, New York*
- Ojo S (2012) Ethnic enclaves to diaspora entrepreneurs: a critical appraisal of black British Africans' transnational entrepreneurship in London. *J Afr Bus* 13(2):145–156
- Peng MW (2003) Institutional transitions and strategic choices. *Acad Manag Rev* 28(2):275–296
- Peng MW, Luo Y (2000) Managerial ties and firm performance in a transition economy: the nature of a micro–macro link. *Acad Manag J* 43(3):486–501
- Pettigrew AM (1990) Longitudinal field research on change: theory and practice. *Organ Sci* 1(3):267–292
- Piekkari R, Plakoyiannaki E, Welch C (2010) “Good” case research in industrial marketing: insights from research practice. *Ind Mark Manag* 39(1):109–117
- Poros MV (2011) Migrant social networks: vehicles for migration, integration, and development. *Social Networks*, <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/migrant-social-networks-vehicles-migration-integration-and-development/>
- Portes A, Guarnizo LE, Haller WJ (2002) Transnational entrepreneurs: an alternative form of immigrant economic adaptation. *Am Sociol Rev* 67(2):278–298
- Poutziouris P, Wang Y, Chan S (2002) Chinese entrepreneurship: the development of small family firms in China. *J Small Bus Enterp Dev* 9(4):383–399
- Putz R (2003) Culture and entrepreneurship—remarks on transculturality as practice. *Tijdschr Econ Soc Geogr* 94:554–563
- Riddle L (2008) Diasporas: exploring their development potential. *J Microfinance/ESR Rev* 10(2):28–35
- Riddle L, Brinkerhoff J (2011) Diaspora entrepreneurs as institutional change agents: the case of Thamel.com. *Int Bus Rev* 20(6):670–680
- Riddle L, Hrivnak AG, Nielsen TM (2010) Transnational entrepreneurs in the emerging markets. Bridging international divides. *J Int Manag* 16:398–411
- Salmi A (2010) International research teams as analysts of industrial business networks. *Ind Mark Manag* 39(1):40–48
- Sattarov K (2012) Determinants of foreign direct investment in transition economies: a case study of Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan. (Unpublished master's thesis). Umeå Universit t, Ume , Sweden
- Schotter A, Abdelzaher D (2013) The boundary spanning effects of the Muslim diaspora on the internationalization processes of firms from Organization of Islamic Conference countries. *J Int Manag* 19(1):82–98
- Seo S (2010) A comparative study of the Korean, German and Polish diasporas in the Russian Far-East and Central Asia and the results of repatriation to their homelands. *Asian Soc Sci* 6(4):61–70
- Silverman D (2001) Interpreting qualitative data. *Methods for analysing talk, text and interaction*. Sage Publications, London
- Sinkovics RR, Alfoldi EA (2012) Progressive focusing and trustworthiness in qualitative research. *Manag Int Rev* 52(6):817–845
- Sinkovics RR, Penz E (2011) Multilingual elite-interviews and software-based analysis. *Int J Mark Res* 53(5):705–724
- Smallbone D, Welter F (2008) *Entrepreneurship and small business development in post-socialist economies*. London, Routledge
- Stake RE (1995) *The art of case study research*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks

- Stark M (2010) The developmental state as a reference model for transition economies in Central Asia. Emerging Market Economies in Central Asia: The Role of Institutional Complementarities in Reform Processes-project, Private University of Applied Sciences Göttingen, Germany, 2010
- Suhir E, Kovach Z (2003) Administrative barriers to entrepreneurship in Central Asia. *Center for International Private Enterprise*, <http://www.cipe.org/pdf/publications/fs/suhirkovach.pdf>
- Tung R (2008) Brain circulation, diaspora, and international competitiveness. *Eur Manag J* 26:298–304
- Urbano D, Toledano N, Ribeiro-Soriano D (2011) Socio-cultural factors and transnational entrepreneurship: a multiple case study in Spain. *Int Small Bus J* 29(2):119–134
- Vaaler PM (2011) Immigrant remittances and the venture investment environment of developing countries. *J Int Bus Stud* 42(9):1121–1149
- Vertovec S (1999) Conceiving and researching transnationalism. *Ethnic Racial Stud* 22(2):447–462
- Vertovec S (2009) *Transnationalism*. Routledge, London
- Vertovec S, Cohen R (eds) (2002) *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: theory, context and practice*. Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Vissak T, Zhang X (2012) The activities of Chinese immigrant entrepreneurs in Canada and China: a case study. Paper presented at the 38th Annual Conference of the European International Business Academy (EIBA), University of Sussex, UK, 7–9 December 2012
- Voldnes G, Grønhaug K, Sogn-Grundvåg G (2014) Conducting qualitative research in Russia: challenges and advice. *J East–West Bus* 20(3):141–161
- Waldringer R, Aldrich H, Ward R (1990) *Ethnic entrepreneurs: immigrant business in industrial societies*. Sage Publications, Newbury Park
- Weijer C, Goldsand G, Emanuel EJ (1999) Protecting communities in research: current guidelines and limits of extrapolation. *Nat Genet* 23(3):275–280
- Welch C, Piekkari R, Plakoyiannaki E, Paavilainen-Mäntymäki E (2010) Theorising from case studies: towards a pluralist future for international business research. *J Int Bus Stud* 42(5):740–762
- Welter F (2011) Contextualizing entrepreneurship—conceptual challenges and ways forward. *Enterp Theory Pract* 35(1):165–184
- Welter F, Smallbone D (2010) The embeddedness of women's entrepreneurship in a transition context. In: Brush CG, de Bruin A, Gatewood EJ, Henry C (eds) *Women entrepreneurs and the global environment for growth: a research perspective*. Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, pp 96–117
- Welter F, Smallbone D, Isakova NB (eds) (2006) *Enterprising women in transition economies*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., Burlington
- Wong S, Salaff J (1998) Network capital: emigration from Hong Kong. *Br J Sociol* 49:358–374
- Wright M, Filatovchev I, Hoskisson RE, Peng MW (2005) Strategy research in emerging economies: challenging the conventional wisdom. Guest editors' introduction. *J Manag Stud* 42(1):1–33
- Wymenga P, Spanikova V, Barker A, Konings J, Canton E (2012) *EU SMEs in 2012: at the crossroads (Annual report on small and medium-sized enterprises in the EU, 2011/12)*. European Commission, Rotterdam
- Xavier R, Kelley D, Kew J, Herrington M, Vorderwuelbecke (2012) *Global entrepreneurship monitor (2012 global report)*. GEM, Wellesley
- Yin R (1984) *Case study research*. Sage, Beverly Hills

On-line sources visited more than once during 2012–2014:

- http://www.centralasiaproject.de/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=10&Itemid=11
- http://www.centralasiaproject.de/index.php?option=com_wbgallery&Itemid=39
- <http://www.elie-project.eu>
- <http://www.oecd.org/>
- <http://www.sharnoffsglobalviews.com/uzbekistans-emerging-market/>
- <http://www.state.gov/e/eb/rls/othr/ics/2012/191261.htm>
- http://www.uzinfoinvest.uz/eng/living_in_uzbekistan/economy/
- http://www.uznews.net/news_single.php?lng=en&cid=0&nid=23494

Other sources:

- Internationalisation of European SMEs, Final Report, 2010 (2010) EU.
- Investment policy review of Uzbekistan 1999 (1999) UNCTAD, UN, New York & Geneva, 1999
- Statistical Review of Uzbekistan 2013.