1. Introduction to the *Research Handbook on Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*

*Jonathan M. Scott, Paresha Sinha, Jenny Gibb
and Michèle Akoorie*

AIM AND SCOPE OF THIS HANDBOOK

This *Handbook* aims to provide a range of *contextualized* perspectives on entrepreneurship in emerging economies. Context is defined as the ‘circumstances, conditions, situations or environments that are external to the respective phenomenon and enable or constrain it’ (Welter, 2011, p.168), further classified as ‘a multiplex phenomenon which cuts across levels of analysis and influences entrepreneurship directly or indirectly’ (ibid., p.176). We start by recognizing that the theories, processes and practices of entrepreneurship in emerging economies are likely to vary markedly from those in developed post-industrial economies. This perspective is adopted because the national context that shapes incentives for both opportunity and necessity entrepreneurial efforts differs in emerging economies. For example, in these economies the state’s capacity to provide the foundations for the functioning of markets is lower, a greater degree of political instability is present, a clear regulatory framework is absent, and accountable rule enforcement mechanisms are underdeveloped (Amorós et al., 2019). Entrepreneurs in emerging economies thus face more uncertainty and risk than those in more developed economies (Puffer et al., 2010).

We believe emerging economies provide an interesting setting to study the interplay between micro (individual-level) and macro (environment) factors, given individuals in these economies need to overcome both resource constraints and institutional hurdles to pursue entrepreneurship (Lim et al., 2016). Importantly, the complex interplay between the individual and the institutional context makes it ‘improbable that entrepreneurship can be explained solely by reference to a characteristic of certain people independent of the situations in which they find themselves’ (Shane and Venkataraman, 2000, p. 218). Similarly, Armanios et al. (2017) explain how institutional intermediaries can be leveraged by emerging

economy entrepreneurs to acquire resources. Entrepreneurship research can be contextualized along various dimensions (Baker and Welter, 2018; Welter, 2011, 2019; Welter and Gartner, 2016; Welter et al., 2016, 2017, 2019; Zahra, 2007; Zahra et al., 2014) that include, for example, ‘historical, temporal, institutional, spatial and social contexts’ (Welter, 2011, p. 165). Context is about uniqueness and differences, or even a ‘critical mess’, rather than ‘generalizable’ patterns or behaviours (Welter et al., 2016). Thus Welter (2011) had earlier identified these various contextual dimensions as critical to understanding differences in ‘entrepreneurial opportunities and boundaries for . . . actions’, including those in transition economies. According to the United Nations, some ‘regions’ (more accurately: continents or subcontinents) such as Europe are developed, and others are developing, for example Asia excluding Japan (UN Statistics Division, 2019). And yet within these (sub) continents exist both so-called ‘developed’ countries or economies and ‘developing’ countries (or emerging economies).

The contexts of relevance to entrepreneurship in this instance can be social (e.g. social networks, household/families), institutional (e.g. citing North’s (1990) formal [laws, regulation] and informal [‘norms and attitudes’] institutions – cultural), or spatial (differences between space and place) (Welter, 2011). It is the latter aspect, *institutional contexts*, that Welter (2011) identifies. There is a large body of relevant studies that have covered both formal and informal institutions. Formal institutions reflect the values that have been built by the society and relate to government policies and procedures, and financial and non-financial assistance to businesses in the economy, while social conditions, such as confidence and perceptions of the environment, concern informal institutions, and these tend to endure for longer (Aparicio et al., 2016).

Previous research that has examined the relationship between institutions and entrepreneurship in emerging economies – such as Russia and China – has analysed private property as a formal institution, and has considered trust and *blat/guanxi* as informal institutions (Puffer et al., 2010). Other authors have shown that perceived entry barriers (such as corruption) are associated with individuals being discouraged from entrepreneurship, especially in emerging economies (Aidis et al., 2008). However, control of corruption tends to have a positive but lower impact on opportunity entrepreneurship with respect to developed countries, as individuals in emerging economies tend to redefine their choices and use second-best solutions (Aparicio et al., 2016). More recent work has shown state fragility reduces incentives to engage in opportunity-driven entrepreneurial efforts, and that it increases the incentives for necessity-driven entrepreneurial efforts (Amorós et al., 2019).

However, in emerging economies the contextual drivers of entrepreneurial motivation are often more complex than the differences captured using the necessity versus opportunity dichotomy, and entrepreneurs are known to develop idiosyncratic balances between informal and formal institutions that better fit their unique circumstances (Puffer et al., 2010). Considering the importance of cognition (Brännback and Carsrud, 2016) and sensemaking (Gartner, 2016) as context, Thornton et al. (2011) suggest that informal institutions – for example, their cognitive dimensions such as confidence, motivation and opportunity perception (Hafer and Jones, 2015; Aparicio et al., 2016), although less dynamic – could impact entrepreneurship more than contracts, procedures, political structure and property rights, which are related to formal institutions. Aparicio et al. (2016) report that in emerging economies with higher rates of unemployment and a significant informal economic sector, control of corruption, availability of private credit as well as confidence in one's skills are fundamental to generating incentives in terms of opportunity entrepreneurship, which impact positively on economic growth.

Furthermore, the study of context must also include gender and entrepreneurship (Ettl and Welter, 2010; Welter et al., 2014) as it helps us to understand why women and men act differently as entrepreneurs: such as the role of motherhood and the wider meso–micro environment upon women's start-up rates and their enactment of entrepreneurship (Welter et al., 2014), hence the need for a 'gender-aware framework' (Brush et al., 2009). Additionally, Zahra (2007) focuses on contextual richness, depending on the novelty of the phenomenon being studied and the theory being applied. Zahra (2007, p.445) further argues that the application of 'theories developed in other disciplines with different phenomena in mind' is 'grounded in assumptions that reflect the nature of distant phenomena, actors and sites'. Indeed, through contextualization, specifically 'understanding the nature, richness and dynamics of their research contexts' (ibid., p.445), scholars can better explain the phenomena that matter to entrepreneurship, reinforced by later work (Zahra and Wright, 2011; Zahra et al., 2014). An additional important aspect of entrepreneurship in emerging economies lies much more in how the phenomenon can help to alleviate poverty, and yet with some exceptions (e.g. Hussain et al., 2019; Kimmitt et al., 2019) it remains relatively unexplored and in need of considerable further research beyond the limited consideration of how entrepreneurship contributes to economic development.

We now give some statistics on emerging economy entrepreneurship in order to establish a foundation from which to synthesize some key literature, before we outline the chapters that appear in this *Handbook*. We conclude with future research directions.

BASELINE: WHAT DO THE STATISTICS SUGGEST?

The emergent literature on National Systems of Entrepreneurship, as posited by Acs et al. (2014, p.477), suggests three extant country-level indicators or measurements of entrepreneurship: (1) *Output*: Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM); Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)-Eurostat Entrepreneurial Indicators; World Bank Entrepreneurship Survey; and the Flash Eurobarometer Survey; (2) *Attitude*: Eurobarometer Survey; GEM; the International Social Survey; and (3) *Framework*: GEM National Experts Survey; World Bank Doing Business index; and the OECD Entrepreneurship Indicators Program. However, Acs et al. (2014, p.481) suggest these indicators do not offer sufficient contextualization as they tend to excessively aggregate individual indicators into national datasets, while they do not provide sufficient explanation on how entrepreneurial processes occur. There have been calls for gender-oriented research in emerging economies. Kobeissi (2010) has found key differences in education, economic activity, earnings, fertility and empowerment. While prior research indicates a ‘U shaped relationship’ exists between entrepreneurship and economic development (Wennekers et al., 2005; see also Carree et al., 2002, 2007), especially for women, we currently know relatively little about how entrepreneurial women contribute to economic development, especially in emerging economies (Brush and Cooper, 2012) with their various associated challenges.

Naegels et al. (2018) discuss how perceptions of gendered cognitive and normative institutions determine whether a woman entrepreneur in Tanzania applies for a formal loan to start her business. Women’s entrepreneurship in emerging economies is only addressed by a few chapters in this *Handbook* as it deserves a separate dedicated volume; though see, for example, the excellent earlier *Handbook* on women’s entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial ecosystems (Manolova et al., 2017); see also Brush et al. (2018) and Sandhu et al. (2017).

Various attempts have been made using mainly GEM as well as OECD and World Bank Global Entrepreneurship (WBGES) data to compare cross-country entrepreneurship development as a measure or proxy of start-up within both developed and developing economies (e.g. Acs et al., 2008; Acs and Amorós, 2008; Desai, 2009; Kelley et al., 2013; Stenholm et al., 2013; Amorós and Bosma, 2014). For example, Acs and Amorós (2008) illustrate how Latin American countries provide a rich field for further research into entrepreneurship and competitiveness, showing that total economic activity (TEA) declines as countries become more developed; yet higher levels of competitiveness do not result in decreased

necessity entrepreneurship, whilst levels of opportunity entrepreneurship and the associated international (export) orientation were found to be relatively low.

Although GEM and WBGES metrics have been assessed in terms of measuring entrepreneurship in developing countries (e.g. Acs et al., 2008; Desai, 2009), we also need to consider how they influence economic performance.¹ With more evidence of early-stage entrepreneurship in GEM than WBGES, and entrepreneurial start-up rate diversity being largely explained by institutions and the external environment rather than economic development (Acs et al., 2008), it remains unclear as to what extent these sources do, in fact, provide an accurate and plausible picture of entrepreneurship in emerging economy contexts. Notwithstanding these caveats, drawing on the Porterian (Porter, 1990; Porter et al., 2002) stage model of competitiveness and economic development with its factor-, efficiency- and innovation-driven stages,² Acs et al. (2008a, p.220), argue that: ‘the broad nexus between entrepreneurship, economic development and institutions is a critical area of inquiry . . . in helping understand why the relative contributions of entrepreneurship can vary significantly across countries and regions.’

More recent cross-country comparative evidence suggests that institutions and thus the resultant business environment determine start-up rates and also which type of start-ups emerge based on analyses of GEM, Index of Economic Freedom and the World Bank Doing Business Report (Stenholm et al., 2013). Indeed, Stenholm et al. (2013) added the ‘conductive’ element to the cognitive, regulative and normative (cf. Scott, 1995) aspects in understanding and interpreting country-level differences in the start-up rate and its type.

Further consideration of country-level differences in ‘context-sensitive’ entrepreneurship research – given the importance of choosing the right methodologies for such studies (Chlosta, 2016) and following Stenholm et al.’s (2013) novel ‘conductive’ dimension – might adopt a contextualized mixed methods approach to investigate the micro- and meso-processes. In addition, Welter (2011) has called for more temporally contextualized entrepreneurship research, while Stenholm et al. (2013, p.190) suggest that researchers take a temporal approach to analysing ‘changes in the relevant dimensions over time’ (see more recently: Fletcher and Selden,

¹ In addition to OECD data in the latter paper, with a distinction between the following: ‘formal–informal, legal–illegal, and necessity–opportunity’ (Desai, 2009).

² Acs et al. (2008) clarify these stages: (1) the factor-driven stage, involving mainly ‘commodities or low value-added products’, for example most ‘developing’ countries; (2) the efficiency-driven stage in between; and (3) the innovation-driven stage including developed countries, plus more recently South Korea, Israel and Taiwan.

2016; Lippmann and Aldrich, 2016; Wadhwani, 2016a, 2016b). In addition, Valliere and Peterson (2009), in extending Wong et al.'s (2005) model, analysed GEM and Global Competitiveness Report (GCR) data to suggest that 'high-expectation entrepreneurs exploit . . . national investments in knowledge creation and regulatory freedom' to increase gross domestic product (GDP) in the GEM data, but find no evidence of such in the GCR data. However, we next consider how we 'theorize' context given the need for 'greater precision' by 'deep engagement with contexts and then integration into our research as a lens, not as a simple variable' (Welter et al., 2016, p.11).

THEORIZING ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND SMALL BUSINESS OWNERSHIP: DEVELOPED AND DEVELOPING COUNTRIES IN COMPARISON

The requirement for global comparisons of entrepreneurship and small business to be 'strongly contextual', in particular, linking structure (e.g. institutions) and agency (the actions or behaviour of individuals), is reinforced by Roper (2013). He suggests: the 'inadequacy – or perhaps more accurately, the irrelevance – of many of the standard taught “models” of entrepreneurial behaviour for many countries' (Roper, 2013, p. 2). Indeed, Stam (2016, p.95) defines context as 'the surrounding environment of the agent' and emphasizes the importance of careful choice of the 'meta-theoretical foundations' (p. 94) and the 'modes of analysis' (p. 95) in context-specific entrepreneurship research.

However, most entrepreneurship research is concentrated in the US, and follows the so-called 'US model' that ignores 'indigenous lenses' (Bruton et al., 2018) and elsewhere in the West, rather than Africa or Latin America where theories have been mis-applied from these Western locations. Here there has been a general lack of contextualization (Bruton et al., 2008), with theories contained in 'silos' and not taking into account, for example, theories of practice (Anderson and Ronteau, 2017). The extant literature has, indeed, been criticized in terms of its weak definitions and lack of contextualized and context-specific conceptualization (Roper, 2013; Bruton et al., 2008) because many studies of entrepreneurship in emerging economies are poorly executed, misconceived or draw erroneous conclusions. Evidently theories developed in the US have been applied to emerging economies despite the marked differences in opportunities in the latter (Lingelbach et al., 2005).

Although some authors suggest that opportunity entrepreneurship (OE), not necessity entrepreneurship (NE), contributes to economic development (Acs and Varga, 2005), their assumptions are based on

the exogenous, externalized conceptualization of economic development that negates the role of endogenous growth which is involved in NE. Furthermore, the longer-term developmental model is where NE is the start of the entrepreneurial journey and OE is likely to follow. Extant research also ignores the ‘social’ element of much entrepreneurship (e.g. Anggadwita et al., 2017; Ashraf et al., 2019; Rivera-Santos et al., 2015; Zahra and Wright, 2016; Zhao and Lounsbury, 2016), self-employment, community entrepreneurship and microenterprise within developing countries. That is not surprising, given that the very characterization of NE and OE is itself often inconsistent. Emerging from Bögenhold’s (1987) original Western-centric conceptualization of entrepreneurs who started businesses for *socio-economic* need versus self-actualization, the concept of NE has since been extended particularly by GEM and applied subsequently (for example, Kautonen and Palmroos, 2010; Kautonen et al., 2009, 2010; Valdez et al., 2011; Valliere and Peterson, 2009; Wennekers et al., 2008; Williams and Nadin, 2010; Williams et al., 2009).

Smallbone and Welter (2009, pp. 46–7), on the other hand, consider this typology as a ‘crude dichotomy’ which serves to ‘oversimplify, but at worst distort the reality of business behaviour’, due to a ‘mixture of so-called opportunity and necessity drivers’ that ‘change over time’. Although their findings are drawn from transition economies that were then engaging in an ongoing transformational process from state socialism to market economies (involving ownership, markets and institutions), these findings could apply to developing countries too.

These extant studies demonstrate a variety of different experiences in the post-Soviet and Eastern bloc countries in respect of entrepreneurship, in some cases (e.g. Belarus and Estonia) where private firms were illegal and others (e.g. Poland) where they were permitted or were restricted, such as worker cooperatives, and the later development of privatized and ‘*de novo*’ enterprises (Smallbone and Welter, 2009, pp. 46–7). Other similarities might include *blat* (connections and favors exchanged) in the former Soviet union, similar to, but weaker than, *guanxi* (ibid., p. 42) and the existence of Scasean (Scase, 2003) ‘proprietorship’, as distinct from entrepreneurship. Although there were clear differences in the extent of private sector development in the various former Soviet and Eastern bloc countries, they had a ‘common path’ (Smallbone and Welter, 2009, p. 226), experienced a sudden skyrocketing of the entrepreneurial start-up rate, and had a prevalence of micro enterprises (ibid, p. 228).

What then can we learn about entrepreneurship and small business owner-management in these emerging economy contexts that we do not already know? Entrepreneurship has been classically linked to economic development in emerging economies (Hoselitz, 1952; De Forest, 1965; Heller,

1968; Leibenstein, 1968; Awad, 1971; Bertrand, 1972; Koo, 1976; Diaku, 1977; Leff, 1978; Ferdows, 1980; Hu, 1981; Dawson, 1982; Encarnation, 1982; Delorme et al., 1986; El-Namaki, 1988; Huff, 1989; Brockhaus, 1991; Giamartino, 1991; Harper, 1991). Nonetheless, there remain a number of significant research gaps and opportunities to make novel contributions. The distinction between some of the literature cited above, originating from the 1950s through to the early 1990s, was that much of these considerations of the role of entrepreneurship in economic development (with their focus on developing countries) until 1979/80 preceded the advent of Reaganomics and Thatcherism in the West (the so-called ‘Washington consensus’ – Naudé, 2009), which followed the decline of the large-scale companies of the 1960s and 1970s post Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) oil crises and the general economic malaise of that period. In addition, the earlier studies were much more concurrent with the end of the colonial era and the initial attempts of the developing countries to implement import substitution and export promotion (Acs and Virgill, 2009, 2010), as well as being prior to Perestroika and the post-Soviet transition era after 1989.

Institutions have been argued to be the major determinant of the contribution of entrepreneurship to economic development in developing countries (Naudé, 2009), and yet the author considers within the entrepreneurship research field:

the case for entrepreneurship being an indispensable driver for economic development at least in developing countries is weak. For one, most of the concerns in this literature [are] not about development, but about economic growth . . . in the conceptual models and empirical studies . . . entrepreneurship is only contributing to economic growth in already advanced economies. For poor, developing countries, the implication is very similar to that found in the development economic literature: entrepreneurship does not matter. (Naudé, 2009, p. 13)

As a result, Naudé (2009) identifies how this literature devalues the small business owner and does not categorize him or her to be an entrepreneur, because of the rather Anglocentric view that innovation is central to entrepreneurship. At the heart of these misconceptions, we could conclude, are mistaken, confused and erroneous de-contextualized Westernized definitions or conceptualizations of entrepreneurship. Further, Naudé (2009) argues that studies of entrepreneurship and economic development have results that are not ‘robust’, that are hampered by ‘weak methodologies’ and that feature ‘macro level, cross-sectional’ research which is not considered to be ‘hard evidence’. Naudé (2009) also claims that they engage in ‘data mining’ and change their definitions of entrepreneurship based upon empirical evidence and the results fitting their initial biased, presupposed,

invalid (mis)conceptions of entrepreneurship. He illustrates this final, most relevant and insightful point by identifying how self-employment, total entrepreneurial activity (TEA) and opportunity entrepreneurship have each been adopted as measures of entrepreneurship but, as they do not show what the scholars expected, they have ultimately been jettisoned. Naudé (2010, p.2) further observed that a lack of engagement with the extant literature on development economics was an ‘important blind spot in the entrepreneurship and small business literature’, while development economics itself has ‘neglected’ entrepreneurship (*ibid.*, p.3).

Other research on developing countries has focused on the role of education and how it affects entry decisions into entrepreneurship and the subsequent effects on income (Van der Sluis et al., 2005), incubation in developing and transition economies (Carayannis and von Zedtwitz, 2005), whilst Koo (1976) suggested that ‘marginal migrant workers’ in Korea pursue entrepreneurship as a different option to civil service employment. Clearly, given some of the major problematic issues with, and criticisms of, the preceding research, there is a need to start afresh by contextually re-conceptualizing what we mean by entrepreneurship in developing countries. For example, as well as multi-level agentic-structural studies that explore the interplay between structure and individual agency, Roper (2013, p.128) argues that high growth entrepreneurial ventures in emerging economies have been neglected by prior literature. Furthermore, and in light of the critical importance of embeddedness as context (Drakopoulou Dodd et al., 2016), Bruton et al. (2008, pp.10–11) offer what was at that time an agenda for future research on emerging economies (in which we can include developing countries more generally) that includes direct contextual comparisons between them and developed/‘mature’ economies, across countries other than China and the former Soviet Union, the role of culture in entrepreneurship, and finally also including ‘historical context’ (i.e. temporal, as suggested by Welter (2011) and others) in our analyses and pointing out: ‘entrepreneurs from emerging economies are embedded in ongoing institutional structures that have an effect on their activities. They can also act to shape their institutional environments’ (Bruton et al., 2008, p.11).

Welter et al. (2017) suggest that we take into account the context of entrepreneurship but also seek to look beyond the economic outcomes of wealth and the creation of jobs as the primary goal. Welter et al. (2017) further argue that we often overlook the issues involved in the course and context of particular entrepreneurs (such as women) and they call for more focus to be given to the increasing economic and social inequalities at play across economies (Baker and Powell, 2016), for example poverty alleviation (Hussain et al., 2019; Kimmitt et al., 2019). We hope that this *Handbook* goes some way towards addressing these gaps in the literature.

THE CHAPTERS IN THIS VOLUME

The *Handbook* commences with Part I, which comprises four chapters that focus on the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region. Mohsen, Ramadani and Dana (Chapter 2) investigate the prospects for, and challenges facing, green entrepreneurship in Afghanistan; Forouharfar (Chapter 3) examines how entrepreneurship and political instability influenced the ‘Arab Spring’; Zarrouk, Galloway, Sherif, Elkaroui and Al Mulla (Chapter 4) consider entrepreneurial orientation (EO) in Abu Dhabi small firms; and Sarfaraz (Chapter 5) explores how economic development can be categorized in emerging economies.

Ahsanullah Mohsen, Veland Ramadani and Léo-Paul Dana (Chapter 2) investigate the barriers and drivers of green entrepreneurship in Afghanistan, including what motivates the individual green entrepreneurs. Involving factor analysis of 100 quantitative student questionnaires, the authors discover how consumer demand for, and awareness of, organics is rapidly expanding such that there are lucrative business opportunities for these green entrepreneurs who are primarily motivated by doing good.

Next Amir Forouharfar (Chapter 3) analyses official data from a range of supranational bodies to explore the connection between political (in) stability and entrepreneurship in the important context of the Arab Spring. He finds a crucial connection between political stability, demographics (e.g. enlarged cohorts of young people), levels of employment/unemployment, job creation and entrepreneurship as far as the disaffected youth of ‘Rentier’ Arab states are concerned.

Hajer Zarrouk, Laura Galloway, Mohamed Sherif, Elarbi Elkaroui and Anas Al Mulla (Chapter 4) consider how entrepreneurial orientation (EO) in the unique context of the oil-rich, expatriate-heavy Abu Dhabi (United Arab Emirates (UAE)) impacts on small firm behaviour. Their analysis of qualitative interviews of 27 owner-managers reveals that risk-taking was enabled by the autonomy of business ownership, and leads to entrepreneurially oriented small firms that are proactive and competitive.

Leyla Sarfaraz (Chapter 5) makes the argument that the rate of entrepreneurship alone is unlikely to provide sufficient information about a country’s performance and its impact on economic development. Instead, she proposes and tests a new method for classifying countries in developed and emerging economies by their respective levels of development based on the impact of entrepreneurial activity on their economic growth.

Part II of this *Handbook* focuses on South Asia and Latin America, with three chapters: Peiris, Akoorie and Sinha analyse contextual embedded-

ness and opportunity in Sri Lanka (Chapter 6); Tunio (Chapter 7) next examines academic entrepreneurship in emerging economies with specific focus on Pakistan; and then Dana (Chapter 8) reveals some important contextual aspects of entrepreneurship in Bolivia.

Indu Peiris, Michèle Akoorie and Paresha Sinha (Chapter 6) conducted a contextual analysis of embeddedness and opportunity of Sri Lankan indigenous international entrepreneurs exporting Ceylon tea by exploring the bi-directional relationship between external contextual factors and entrepreneurial actions. Drawing on two cases, they reveal the way in which knowledge of local industry is transmitted to resource-constrained, change-agent local entrepreneurs who enabled norm breaking and new venture creation by drawing on their social networks.

Muhammad Nawaz Tunio (Chapter 7) examines the influence of universities in enabling academic entrepreneurship, and the way in which it can contribute to economic development in emerging economies. He then presents a case study of this phenomenon in the specific and unique context of Pakistan in order to explain how new venture creation and job creation can be enabled through academic entrepreneurship, in a higher education section that has become increasingly entrepreneurial.

In a beautiful and classic chapter originally published in 2007,³ Léo-Paul Dana (Chapter 8) reveals contextual aspects of entrepreneurship in Bolivia, such as standards of living, urbanization and rural-to-urban in-migration as people shift from rural economic activities (such as agriculture) to more urban activities. He also reveals social barriers and draws upon a qualitative ethnographic approach involving interviewing and observation to explore this important and under-researched area.

Part III of the *Handbook* comprises four chapters that focus on East Asia and Maritime Southeast Asia, with Febriansyah, Watson and Gkikas (Chapter 9) examining how entrepreneurial universities in Indonesia support rural economic development; Anggadwita and Palalić (Chapter 10) investigating some contextual aspects of Indonesian entrepreneurship; Dye and Dye (Chapter 11) exploring how creative deviance enables Filipino/a entrepreneurs to respond to institutional anomie; and Flynn, Birdthistle and Fang (Chapter 12) studying Chinese immigrant students' entrepreneurial intentions (EI) in the Republic of Ireland.

Hary Febriansyah, C.W. Watson and Aineias Gkikas (Chapter 9),

³ Dana, L.P. (2007). 'Bolivia: land of the Aymarás and Quechuas', in L.P. Dana (ed.), *International Handbook of Research on Indigenous Entrepreneurship*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 445–57.

focusing on small enterprises in villages and their relationship with the higher education sector in Indonesia, examine how entrepreneurial universities support rural economic development. They do so by reviewing various projects that seek to enable the empowerment of people from rural communities and student engagement with these communities to support entrepreneurship.

Grisna Anggadwita and Ramo Palalić (Chapter 10) provide an overview of entrepreneurship development in Indonesia by focusing on its creative industries. They discuss the current state of entrepreneurship in Indonesia, in particular examining the business environment and opportunities, and identify the challenges such as access to credit, access to international markets and other social and economic constraints faced by entrepreneurs. The authors discuss informal entrepreneurship in Indonesia.

Bruce Dye and Kelly Dye (Chapter 11) study the individual's motivations for entering entrepreneurship in developing economies where institutions are strained and higher order needs such as social mobility and educational goals are not being met. They study the lived experience of 22 necessity-driven entrepreneurs in the Philippines, who entered entrepreneurship as a means of resisting harsh socio-economic-political conditions. Analysis of their qualitative data revealed in this context that necessity-driven entrepreneurship was a creatively deviant way for entrepreneurs to achieve personal aspirations, which they believed could not be achieved by traditional means. The authors argue that Institutional Anomie Theory (IAT) does apply to these necessity-driven entrepreneurs and serves as an effective framework for gaining insight into entrepreneurial motivation in developing economies.

Antoinette Flynn, Naomi Birdthistle and Boyu Fang's (Chapter 12) study examines how well the theory of planned behaviour (TPB) explains the entrepreneurial intentions (EI) of immigrant Chinese students in the Republic of Ireland (RoI) in order to recommend self-employment as a career option for the returning Chinese students. Their study finds that the TPB somewhat differently explains the EI of Chinese students in the RoI and that there are significant gender differences in entrepreneurial intentions among Chinese students. Overall, this study deepens the understanding of the Chinese entrepreneurial spirit and its findings can assist the relevant government departments in developing more favourable policies for those potential international entrepreneurs by encouraging them to contribute more to the Republic's small and medium-size enterprise (SME) economy.

The three chapters in Part IV of the *Handbook* concentrate on Mainland Southeast Asia, with Lwin, Sinha and Gibb's (Chapter 13) consideration of how Myanmar entrepreneurs overcome institutional constraints using

trust-based social capital. Then Nyugen and Pham (Chapter 14) conduct a study of contemporary Vietnamese entrepreneurs, and Mustafa (Chapter 15) examines how bazaar entrepreneurship can be conceptualized as a largely social and institutional practice.

Khine Tin Zar Lwin, Paresha Sinha and Jenny Gibb (Chapter 13) consider how informal and formal institutional constraints are overcome by Myanmar entrepreneurs using trust-based social capital. They find various informal (such as changing norms and values) and formal institutional constraints (such as funding constraints) that impede their attempts at entrepreneurial development, reflecting underdeveloped business support services, but which are overcome by trust-based social capital and accessing financial and human resources through their social networks. Hang T.T. Nguyen and Hanh Song Thi Pham (Chapter 14) explain how the contemporary characteristics of entrepreneurship in Vietnam are comprised of the historical foundations of this country, as well as the current economic, social and political forces that are at play.

Hasri Mustafa (Chapter 15) takes a social accounting perspective to examine bazaar entrepreneurship in Malaysia. He highlights how bazaar owners are not required to engage in proper account reporting systems yet the outcome from their activity positively impacts on the performance of these individual owners as well as more generally on human well-being and social responsibility.

The three final chapters in the Part V are specifically based in sub-Saharan Africa: Pattinson and Wanjiru (Chapter 16) introduce a conceptual model for social enterprise governance; Igwe and Icha-Ituma (Chapter 17) review ten years of empirical research on African entrepreneurship; and Kolade, Egbetokun, Rae and Hussain (Chapter 18) reveal how spiritual capital can influence the resilience of entrepreneurs based in turbulent environments.

Steven Pattinson and Roseline Wanjiru (Chapter 16) introduce a novel conceptual model of social enterprises' business models in sub-Saharan Africa. Drawing on a narrative systematic review, they explain how 'sustainable' and 'inclusive' social change can be enabled, explicating a set of themes focusing on the environment, institutions, informal economic entities and access to finance to develop their model linking social enterprises to other key stakeholders in this unique context.

Paul Agu Igwe and Afam Icha-Ituma (Chapter 17) conduct a systematic literature review focusing on entrepreneurial ecosystems in sub-Saharan Africa with a particular consideration of institutions and sociocultural aspects. Taking as its timeframe 2009–18, the literature review highlights key barriers and challenges faced by entrepreneurs in the African entrepreneurial ecosystem, offering a framework for future research.

Table 1.1 Chapters: geography, themes, method(s) and key finding(s) in respect of context

Chapter: Authors	Geo	Theme	Method(s)	Key Finding(s) in respect of CONTEXTUALIZING ENTREPRENEURSHIP
PART I: MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA				
2. Mohsen, Ramadan and Dana	Afghanistan	Green entrepreneurship – prospects and challenges	Quantitative questionnaires	How consumer demand for, and awareness of, organics is rapidly expanding such that there are lucrative business opportunities for these green entrepreneurs who are primarily motivated by doing good
3. Forouharfar	Arab states	Political instability and the Arab Spring	Analysis of official data	A crucial connection between political stability, demographics (e.g. enlarged cohorts of young people), levels of employment/unemployment, job creation and entrepreneurship as far as the disaffected youth of ‘Rentier’ Arab states are concerned
4. Zarrouk, Galloway, Sherif, Elkaroui and Al Mulla	United Arab Emirates	Entrepreneurial orientation (EO) in small firms	Qualitative interviews	Risk-taking was enabled by the autonomy of business ownership, and leads to entrepreneurially oriented small firms that are proactive and competitive
5. Sarfaraz	35 emerging & 18 developed countries	Levels of entrepreneurship across emerging and developing economies	Quantitative study	The levels of job creation expectations, innovation and industry sector participation, are used as early stage entrepreneurial activity growth indicators to differentiate between developing and emerging economies.
PART II: SOUTH ASIA AND LATIN AMERICA				
6. Peiris, Akoorie and Sinha	Sri Lanka	Contextual embeddedness and opportunity	Qualitative case studies	How the transmission of knowledge of local industry to resource-constrained, change agent local entrepreneurs enable norm breaking and new venture creation by drawing on their social networks

7. Tunio	Pakistan	Academic entrepreneurship	Qualitative case study	How new venture creation and job creation can be enabled through academic entrepreneurship, in a higher education section that has become increasingly entrepreneurial
8. Dana	Bolivia	Contextual aspects of entrepreneurship	Ethnographic study	The nature of contextual aspects of entrepreneurship in Bolivia, such as standards of living, urbanization and rural-to-urban in-migration as people shift from rural economic activities (such as agriculture) to more urban activities

PART III: EAST ASIA AND MARITIME SOUTHEAST ASIA

9. Febriansyah, Watson and Gkikas	Indonesia	Entrepreneurial universities and rural economic development	Review of extant projects	Those projects that seek to enable empowerment of people from rural communities and student engagement with those communities to support entrepreneurship
10. Anggadwita and Palalić	Indonesia	Entrepreneurship development in a developing economy, with a focus on creative industry	Analysis of official data	How Government could support 'creative entrepreneurs' to develop their businesses and suggestions for further development of entrepreneurship in Indonesia in terms of its business environment, opportunities and challenges for small and medium enterprises are provided.
11. Dye and Dye	Philippines	Individuals' motivations for entering entrepreneurship in developing economies	Qualitative interviews	Individuals become entrepreneurs to improve the circumstances of others and lift others from poverty and how 'Creative deviance' in response to institutional anomie is a phenomenon that is also visible in necessity entrepreneurs' activity.
12. Flynn, Birdthistle and Fang	Ireland/ China	Entrepreneurial intentions of immigrant Chinese students in Ireland	Quantitative study	EI influences immigrant Chinese students' career choice, under the 'attitude towards the act' of entrepreneurship. Gender differences that manifest within the various components of the three main inputs to the Theory of Planned Behaviour are identified.

Table 1.1 (continued)

Chapter: Authors	Geo	Theme	Method(s)	Key Finding(s) in respect of CONTEXTUALIZING ENTREPRENEURSHIP
PART IV: MAINLAND SOUTHEAST ASIA				
13. Lwin, Sinha and Gibb	Myanmar	Institutional constraints, social capital and trust	Qualitative interviews	Various informal (such as changing norms and values) and formal institutional constraints (such as funding constraints) that impede their attempts at entrepreneurial development, reflecting underdeveloped business support services, but which are overcome by trust-based social capital and accessing financial and human resources through their social networks.
14. Nguyen and Pham	Vietnam	Entrepreneurship in transitional & emerging economy.	Secondary data	Entrepreneurship in Vietnam is a product of the combination of both old and new ideologies and the mixed market mechanism (a socialist-oriented market economy). Entrepreneurs remain on the path towards fine-tuning their operation and position in the current economy.
15. Mustafa	Malaysia	Bazaar entrepreneurship, social accounting	Secondary data	Malaysian accounting researchers should consider a broader range of research styles and calls for a wide-ranging debate of transparency, accountability and sustainability, particularly into the social accounting aspects of bazaar entrepreneurship.

PART V: SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

16. Pattinson and Wanjiru	Sub-Saharan Africa	Social enterprise, business models	Conceptual	Social enterprises in sub-Saharan Africa are influenced by the following four themes, leading to a novel business model that links social enterprises and key stakeholders: (1) environmental factors; (2) institutions; (3) the informal economy; and (4) access to finance.
17. Igwe and Icha-Ituma	Sub-Saharan Africa	Entrepreneurial ecosystems, institutions, socio-cultural aspects	Literature review	Reviews topics focusing on institutions and sociocultural aspects, and highlights key barriers/challenges faced by entrepreneurs in the African entrepreneurial ecosystem, offering a framework for future research.
18. Kolade, Egbetokun, Rae and Hussain	Nigeria	Spiritual capital, entrepreneurial resilience	Quantitative survey	Based on a sample that is highly educated (42% graduates), mainly male (37% women), mostly informal enterprises, and predominantly manufacturing and services businesses. Although linking social capital improves entrepreneurial resilience, other forms of social capital (bonding or bridging) do not. Finally, religious or spiritual beliefs have positive effects on entrepreneurial resilience whereas prayer and worship do not.

Notes: Ec Dev – level of economic development. Using Porter’s categorization (Porter, 1990; Porter et al., 2002), the emerging economies have been identified as a mix of efficiency-driven and factor conditions.

Finally, the book concludes with a keynote chapter by Oluwaseun Kolade, Abiodun Egbetokun, David Rae and Javed Hussain (Chapter 18), who reveal the important role of spiritual capital, which they define as ‘the set of personal, intangible, and transcendent resources that emanate from an individual’s spiritual or religious beliefs and experiences and may be used in economic activity’, as an element of social capital to deploy resources and to strategize effectively. Their quantitative survey of Nigerian SMEs indicates that both linking social capital (not bonding or bridging) and religious or spiritual beliefs (but not worship or prayer as elements of spiritual capital) have positive effects on entrepreneurial resilience.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

We aim in this *Handbook* to offer a contextualized (Baker and Welter, 2018; Welter, 2011, 2019; Welter and Gartner, 2016; Welter et al., 2016, 2017, 2019; Zahra, 2007; Zahra et al., 2014) view of entrepreneurship in emerging economies. In seeking to explore data, the novel concept of National Systems of Entrepreneurship (Acs et al., 2014) and the U-shaped relationship that links entrepreneurship as a start-up phenomenon and the rate of economic development (Wennekers et al., 2005; Carree et al., 2002, 2007) are important underpinning dimensions of context: that being *differences*, rather than similarities, in entrepreneurship. In terms of future research agendas, cross-country comparisons have been particularly instructive (e.g. Acs et al., 2008; Acs and Amorós, 2008; Desai, 2009; Kelley et al., 2013; Stenholm et al., 2013; Amorós and Bosma, 2014). Furthermore, Stenholm et al.’s (2013) critique of the often used ‘single entrepreneurship indicator’ and their novel extension of Scott’s (1995) institutional pillars to include the conducive dimension is also worthy of further exploration, in particular – through contextualized micro-level mixed methods – the micro- and meso-processes that convert the conducive dimension into high quality entrepreneurship, which would also address the calls of both Welter (2011) and Stenholm et al. (2013, p. 190) for longitudinal and temporally contextualized empirical research.

Such research, for example, given the importance of the temporal context (Fletcher and Selden, 2016; Lippmann and Aldrich, 2016; Wadhwani, 2016a, 2016b), could incorporate time and temporality using longitudinal processual case studies (Dawson, 2013, 2014a, 2014b). In exploring the literature, although the spatial differences in entrepreneurship are crystal

clear and yet have been under-researched, there is a need to link structure, i.e. institutions and human agency (Roper, 2013), when we conceptualize context as ‘the surrounding environment of the agent’ (Stam, 2016, p. 95). Further, Roper’s (2013) observations that research is hampered by a lack of contextualization or of applying models that are relevant to those spatial contexts, is confirmed by Lingelbach et al. (2005).

Whilst the links between entrepreneurship and economic development are apparent (Acs and Szerb, 2007), there remain significant research gaps outside of the developed core, as confirmed in various studies (Bruton et al., 2008; and in terms of gender specifically: Brush and Cooper, 2012 and Kobeissi, 2010); in addition the role of poverty alleviation is neglected (except, for example, Hussain et al., 2019; Kimmitt et al., 2019). Much research has examined what is perhaps one of entrepreneurship’s greatest ‘red herrings’ – OE and NE. And yet, whilst entrepreneurship might well involve elements of reluctantly acting as well as intentional opportunity-seeking agency (e.g. Acs and Varga, 2005; Kautonen and Palmroos, 2010; Kautonen et al., 2009, 2010; Valdez et al., 2011; Valliere and Peterson, 2009; Wennekers et al., 2008; Williams and Nadin, 2010; Williams et al., 2009), it is a-social and, indeed, according to Smallbone and Welter (2009, p. 46) a ‘crude dichotomy . . . oversimplif[ies], but at worst distorts the reality of business behaviour’, with temporal variations lying behind such oversimplifications and misconceptions. Future research might challenge and debunk this myth further.

Of perhaps greatest potential, considering the importance of forms of capital as ‘inter-subjective’, ‘mutable’ and ‘embedded’ contexts (Drakopoulou Dodd et al., 2016), for example in *emergent* entrepreneurial ecosystems (Sandhu et al., 2017), would be the role of social capital and human capital in countries at different stages of economic development. Institutions, once again, are more informative about how entrepreneurship varies both temporally and spatially and, indeed, linking to Stenholm et al.’s (2013) conducive pillar. While history and path dependency are, of course, critical to our understanding of spatial variations in both post-Soviet (Smallbone and Welter, 2009) and post-colonial (Acs and Virgill, 2009, 2010) economic development and entrepreneurship contexts, as well as where groups have existed (Leff, 1978), they appear to be alarmingly poorly incorporated into cross-country and even country-specific entrepreneurship research.

Indeed, Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa (the BRICS) and their US\$100 billion New Development Bank (www.ndb.int) based in Shanghai may well offer avenues for exciting future research into entrepreneurship and small business in the *rapidly economically emerging economies* of the world, and which relate to the many significant research

gaps, thus providing opportunities to make novel contributions to the literature.

Clearly, the link between institutions, particularly the conducive pillar (Stenholm et al., 2013) and human agency (Roper, 2013), highlight the critical importance of not neglecting the individual- or team-based entrepreneur(s) who is the person, or are the people, who act and, therefore, shape entrepreneurship in whatever spatial, historio-temporal, industrial, socio-organizational, or institutional/governance context in which it is enacted (Welter, 2011; Zahra et al., 2014). Hence the authors in this book continue at the point where prior scholars have reached, and we believe offer some excellent directions for future research.

REFERENCES

- Acs, Z.J. and Amorós, J.E. (2008), 'Entrepreneurship and competitiveness dynamics in Latin America', *Small Business Economics*, **31** (3), 305–22.
- Acs, Z.J. and Szerb, L. (2007), 'Entrepreneurship, economic growth and public policy', *Small Business Economics*, **28** (2–3), 109–22.
- Acs, Z.J. and Varga, A. (2005), 'Entrepreneurship, agglomeration and technological change', *Small Business Economics*, **24** (3), 323–34.
- Acs, Z.J. and Virgill, N. (2009), 'Entrepreneurship in developing countries', Jena Economic Research Papers, 2009-23, Friedrich Schiller University and Max Planck Institute of Economics: Jena, Germany.
- Acs, Z.J. and Virgill, N. (2010), 'Entrepreneurship in developing countries', in Z.J. Acs and D.B. Audretsch (eds), *Handbook of Entrepreneurship Research*, New York: Springer, pp.485–515.
- Acs, Z.J., Autio, E. and Szerb, L. (2014), 'National systems of entrepreneurship: Measurement issues and policy implications', *Research Policy*, **43** (3), 476–94.
- Acs, Z.J., Desai, S. and Klapper, L.F. (2008), 'What does "entrepreneurship" data really show?', *Small Business Economics*, **31** (3), 265–81.
- Aidis, R., Estrin, S. and Mickiewicz, T. (2008), 'Institutions and entrepreneurship development in Russia: A comparative perspective', *Journal of Business Venturing*, **23** (6), 656–72.
- Amorós, J.E. and Bosma, N. (2014), *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2013 Global Report: Fifteen Years of Assessing Entrepreneurship Across the Globe*, London Business School, London: Global Entrepreneurship Research Association.
- Amorós, J.E., Ciravegna, L., Mandakovic, V. and Stenholm, P. (2019), 'Necessity or opportunity? The effects of State fragility and economic development on entrepreneurial efforts', *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, **43** (4), 725–50.
- Anderson, A. and Ronteau, S. (2017), 'Toward an entrepreneurial theory of practice: Emerging ideas for emerging economies', *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, **9** (2), 110–20.
- Anggadwita, G., Luturlean, B.S., Ramadani, V. and Ratten, V. (2017), 'Socio-cultural environments and emerging economy entrepreneurship: Women entrepreneurs in Indonesia', *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, **9** (1), 85–96.
- Aparicio, S., Urbano, D. and Audretsch, D. (2016), 'Institutional factors, opportunity entrepreneurship and economic growth: Panel data evidence', *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, **102** (1), 45–61.
- Armanios, D.E., Eesley, C.E., Li, J. and Eisenhardt, K.M. (2017), 'How entrepreneurs leverage institutional intermediaries in emerging economies to acquire public resources', *Strategic Management Journal*, **38** (7), 1373–90.

- Ashraf, M., Razzaque, M.A., Liaw, S.T., Ray, P.K. and Hasan, M.R. (2019), 'Social business as an entrepreneurship model in emerging economy: Systematic review and case study', *Management Decision*, **57** (5), 1145–61.
- Awad, M.H. (1971), 'The supply of risk bearers in the underdeveloped countries', *Economic Development & Cultural Change*, **19** (3), 461–8.
- Baker, T. and Powell, E.E. (2016), 'Let them eat bricolage? Toward a contextualized notion of inequality of entrepreneurial opportunity', in F. Welter and W.B. Gartner (eds), *A Research Agenda for Entrepreneurship and Context*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp.41–53.
- Baker, T. and Welter, F. (2018), 'Contextual entrepreneurship: An interdisciplinary perspective', *Foundations and Trends® in Entrepreneurship*, **14** (4), 357–426.
- Bertrand, T.J. (1972), 'Decision rules for effective protection in less developed economies', *American Economic Review*, **62** (4), 743–6.
- Bögenhold, D. (1987), *Der Gründerboom: Realität und Mythos der Neuen Selbständigkeit*, Frankfurt: Campus.
- Brännback, M. and Carsrud, A.L. (2016), 'Understanding entrepreneurial cognitions through the lenses of context', in F. Welter and W.B. Gartner (eds), *A Research Agenda for Entrepreneurship and Context*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp.16–27.
- Brockhaus Sr, R.H. (1991), 'Entrepreneurship education and research outside North America', *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, **15** (3), 77–84.
- Brush, C.G. and Cooper, S.Y. (2012), 'Special Issue: Female entrepreneurship and economic development: An international perspective', *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, **24** (1–2), 1–6.
- Brush, C.G., de Bruin, A. and Welter, F. (2009), 'A gender-aware framework for women's entrepreneurship', *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, **1** (1), 8–24.
- Brush, C., Edelman, L.F., Manolova, T. and Welter, F. (2018), 'A gendered look at entrepreneurship ecosystems', *Small Business Economics*, 1–16.
- Bruton, G.D., Ahlstrom, D. and Obloj, K. (2008), 'Entrepreneurship in emerging economies: Where are we today and where should the research go in the future', *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, **32** (1), 1–14.
- Bruton, G.D., Zahra, S.A. and Cai, L. (2018), 'Examining entrepreneurship through indigenous lenses', *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, **42** (3), 351–61.
- Carayannis, E.G. and von Zedtwitz, M. (2005), 'Architecting gloCal (global–local), real-virtual incubator networks (G-RVNs), as catalysts and accelerators of entrepreneurship in transitioning and developing economies: Lessons learned and best practices from current development and business incubation practices', *Technovation*, **25** (2), 95–110.
- Carree, M.A., van Stel, A.J., Thurik, A.R. and Wennekers, A.R.M. (2002), 'Economic development and business ownership: An analysis using data of 23 OECD countries in the period 1976–1996', *Small Business Economics*, **19** (3), 271–90.
- Carree, M., van Stel, A., Thurik, R. and Wennekers, S. (2007), 'The relationship between economic development and business ownership revisited', *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, **19** (3), 281–91.
- Chlosta, S. (2016), 'Methodological approaches towards context-sensitive entrepreneurship research', in F. Welter and W.B. Gartner (eds), *A Research Agenda for Entrepreneurship and Context*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp.109–19.
- Dawson, L.M. (1982), 'Opportunities for small business in third world markets', *American Journal of Small Business*, **7** (1), 19–26.
- Dawson, P. (2013), 'The use of time in the design, conduct and write-up of longitudinal processual case study research', in M.E. Hassett and E. Paavilainen-Mäntymäki (eds), *Handbook of Longitudinal Research Methods in Organisation and Business Studies*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp.249–70.
- Dawson, P. (2014a), 'Reflections: On time, temporality and change in organizations', *Journal of Change Management*, **14** (3), 285–308.

- Dawson, P. (2014b), 'Temporal practices: Time and ethnographic research in changing organizations', *Journal of Organizational Ethnography*, **3** (2), 130–51.
- De Forest, J.D. (1965), 'Entrepreneurship and economic development', *Challenge*, **13** (5), 27–31.
- Delorme Jr, C.D., Kamerschen, D.R. and Mbaku, J.M. (1986), 'Rent seeking in the Cameroon economy: Krueger's analytic technique helps to account for development lag in colonial states', *American Journal of Economics & Sociology*, **45** (4), 413–23.
- Desai, S. (2009), 'Measuring entrepreneurship in developing countries', UNU-WIDER research paper 2009/10, Helsinki: UNU-WIDER.
- Diaku, I. (1977), 'Small industries in developing countries: The Nigerian experience', *Annals of Public & Co-operative Economy*, **48** (2), 207–26.
- Drakopoulou Dodd, S., Pret, T. and Shaw, E. (2016), 'Advancing understanding of entrepreneurial embeddedness: Forms of capital, social contexts and time', in F. Welter and W.B. Gartner (eds), *A Research Agenda for Entrepreneurship and Context*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 120–33.
- El-Namaki, M.S.S. (1988), 'Encouraging entrepreneurs in developing countries', *Long Range Planning*, **21** (4), 98–106.
- Encarnation, D.J. (1982), 'The political economy of Indian joint industrial ventures abroad', *International Organization*, **36** (1), 31–49.
- Ettl, K. and Welter, F. (2010), 'Gender, context and entrepreneurial learning', *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, **2** (2), 108–29.
- Ferdows, K. (1980), 'Start-up of small manufacturing ventures in developing countries', *American Journal of Small Business*, **5** (2), 12–22.
- Fletcher, D. and Selden, P. (2016), 'A relational conceptualization of context and the real-time emergence of entrepreneurship processes', in F. Welter and W.B. Gartner (eds), *A Research Agenda for Entrepreneurship and Context*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 79–92.
- Gartner, W.B. (2016), 'Narrating context', in F. Welter and W.B. Gartner (eds), *A Research Agenda for Entrepreneurship and Context*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 16–27.
- Giamartino, G. (1991), 'Will small business be the answer for developing economies?' *Journal of Small Business Management*, **29** (1), 91–3.
- Hafer, R.W. and Jones, G. (2015), 'Are entrepreneurship and cognitive skills related? Some international evidence', *Small Business Economics*, **44** (2), 283–98.
- Harper, M. (1991), 'Enterprise development in poorer nations', *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, **15** (4), 7–11.
- Heller, F.A. (1968), 'The role of management in economic development', *Management International Review (MIR)*, **8** (6), 63–75.
- Hoselitz, B.F. (1952), 'Entrepreneurship and economic growth', *American Journal of Economics & Sociology*, **12** (1), 97–110.
- Hu, Y.-S. (1981), 'The World Bank and development finance companies', *Journal of General Management*, **7** (1), 46–57.
- Huff, W.G. (1989), 'Entrepreneurship and economic development in less developed countries', *Business History*, **31** (4), 86–97.
- Hussain, J., Mahmood, S. and Scott, J. (2019), 'Gender, microcredit and poverty alleviation in a developing country: The case of women entrepreneurs in Pakistan', *Journal of International Development*, **31** (3), 247–70.
- Kautonen, T. and Palmroos, J. (2010), 'The impact of a necessity-based start-up on subsequent entrepreneurial satisfaction', *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, **6** (3), 285–300.
- Kautonen, T., Down, S., Welter, F., Vainio, P. and Palmroos, J. (2010), '"Involuntary self-employment" as a public policy issue: A cross-country European review', *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, **16** (2), 112–29.
- Kautonen, T., Palmroos, J. and Vainio, P. (2009), 'Involuntary self-employment in Finland – a bleak future?', *International Journal of Public Policy*, **4** (6), 533–48.

- Kelley, D.E., Brush, C.G., Greene, P.G. and Litovsky, Y. (2013), *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2012 Women's Report*, London: Global Entrepreneurship Research Association, London Business School.
- Kimmitt, J., Muñoz, P. and Newbery, R. (2019), 'Poverty and the varieties of entrepreneurship in the pursuit of prosperity', *Journal of Business Venturing*, forthcoming.
- Kobeissi, N. (2010), 'Gender factors and female entrepreneurship: International evidence and policy implications', *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, **8** (1), 1–35.
- Koo, H. (1976), 'Small entrepreneurship in a developing society: Patterns of labor absorption and social mobility', *Social Forces*, **54** (4), 775–87.
- Leff, N.H. (1978), 'Industrial organization and entrepreneurship in the developing countries: The economic groups', *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, **26** (4), 661–75.
- Leibenstein, H. (1968), 'Entrepreneurship and development', *The American Economic Review*, **58** (2), 72–83.
- Lim, D.S., Oh, C.H. and De Clercq, D. (2016), 'Engagement in entrepreneurship in emerging economies: Interactive effects of individual-level factors and institutional conditions', *International Business Review*, **25** (4), 933–45.
- Lingelbach, D.C., De La Vina, L. and Asel, P. (2005), 'What's distinctive about growth-oriented entrepreneurship in developing countries?', International Finance Corporation, UTSA College of Business Center for Global Entrepreneurship Working Paper No. 1.
- Lippmann, S. and Aldrich, H.E. (2016), 'The temporal dimension of context', in F. Welter and W.B. Gartner (eds), *A Research Agenda for Entrepreneurship and Context*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 54–64.
- Manolova, T.S., Brush, C.G., Edelman, L.F., Robb, A. and Welter, F. (eds) (2017), *Entrepreneurial Ecosystems and Growth of Women's Entrepreneurship: A Comparative Analysis*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Naegels, V., Mori, N. and D'Espallier, B. (2018), 'An institutional view on access to finance by Tanzanian women-owned enterprises', *Venture Capital*, **20** (2), 191–210.
- Naudé, W. (2009), 'Entrepreneurship is not a binding constraint on growth and development in the poorest countries', UNU-WIDER 2009/45 research paper, UNU-WIDER: Helsinki.
- Naudé, W. (2010), 'Entrepreneurship, developing countries, and development economics: New approaches and insights', *Small Business Economics*, **34** (1), 1–12.
- North, D. (1990), *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Porter, M.E. (1990). *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*, New York: Macmillan.
- Porter, M., Sachs, J. and McArthur, J. (2002), 'Executive summary: Competitiveness and stages of economic development', in M. Porter, J. Sachs, P.K. Cornelius, J.W. McArthur and K. Schwab (eds), *The Global Competitiveness Report 2001–2002*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 16–25.
- Puffer, S.M., McCarthy, D.J. and Boisot, M. (2010), 'Entrepreneurship in Russia and China: The impact of formal institutional voids', *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, **34** (3), 441–67.
- Rivera-Santos, M., Holt, D., Littlewood, D. and Kolk, A. (2015), 'Social entrepreneurship in sub-Saharan Africa', *Academy of Management Perspectives*, **29** (1), 72–91.
- Sandhu, N., Scott, J.M., Gibb, J., Hussain, J., Akoorie, M. and Sinha, P. (2017), 'Exploring entrepreneurial finance and gender in an emergent entrepreneurial ecosystem: The case of the Punjab, northern India', in T. Manolova, L. Edelman, A. Robb, F. Welter and C. Brush (eds), *Entrepreneurial Ecosystems and Growth of Women's Entrepreneurship: A Comparative Analysis*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 172–96.
- Roper, S. (2013), *Entrepreneurship: A Global Perspective*, London: Routledge.
- Scase, R. (2003), 'Entrepreneurship and proprietorship in transition: Policy implications for the SME sector', in R. McIntyre and R. Dallago (eds), *Small and Medium Enterprises in Transitional Economies*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 64–77.
- Scott, W.R. (1995), *Institutions and Organizations*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Shane, S. and Venkataraman, S. (2000), 'The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research', *Academy of Management Review*, **25** (1), 217–26.
- Smallbone, D. and Welter, F. (2009), *Entrepreneurship and Small Business Development in Post-socialist Economies*, London: Routledge.
- Stam, E. (2016), 'Theorizing entrepreneurship in context', in F. Welter and W.B. Gartner (eds), *A Research Agenda for Entrepreneurship and Context*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 93–108.
- Stenholm, P., Acs, Z.J. and Wuebker, R. (2013), 'Exploring country-level institutional arrangements on the rate and type of entrepreneurial activity', *Journal of Business Venturing*, **28** (1), 176–93.
- Thornton, P.H., Ribeiro-Soriano, D. and Urbano, D. (2011), 'Socio-cultural factors and entrepreneurial activity: an overview', *International Small Business Journal*, **29** (2), 105–18.
- United Nations Statistics Division (2019), 'Standard country or area codes for statistical use (M49)', accessed 12 June 2019 at <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49regin.htm>.
- Valdez, M.E., Doktor, R.H., Singer, A.E. and Dana, L. (2011), 'Impact of tolerance for uncertainty upon opportunity and necessity entrepreneurship', *Human Systems Management*, **30** (3), 145–53.
- Valliere, D. and Peterson, R. (2009), 'Entrepreneurship and economic growth: Evidence from emerging and developed countries', *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, **21** (5–6), 459–80.
- Van der Sluis, J., van Praag, M. and Vijverberg, W. (2005), 'Entrepreneurship selection and performance: A meta-analysis of the impact of education in developing economies', *World Bank Economic Review*, **19** (2), 225–61.
- Wadhvani, R.D. (2016a), 'Entrepreneurship in historical context: Using history to develop theory and understand process', in F. Welter and W.B. Gartner (eds), *A Research Agenda for Entrepreneurship and Context*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 65–78.
- Wadhvani, R.D. (2016b), 'Historical methods for contextualizing entrepreneurship research', in F. Welter and W.B. Gartner (eds), *A Research Agenda for Entrepreneurship and Context*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 16–27.
- Welter, F. (2011), 'Contextualizing entrepreneurship: Conceptual challenges and ways forward', *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, **35** (1), 165–84.
- Welter, F. (2019), *Entrepreneurship and Context*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Welter, F. and Gartner, W.B. (2016), 'Advancing our research agenda for entrepreneurship and contexts', in F. Welter and W.B. Gartner (eds), *A Research Agenda for Entrepreneurship and Context*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 156–60.
- Welter, F., Baker, T. and Wirsching, K. (2019), 'Three waves and counting: The rising tide of contextualization in entrepreneurship research', *Small Business Economics*, **52** (2), 319–30.
- Welter, F., Brush, C. and de Bruin, A. (2014), 'The gendering of entrepreneurship context', Working Paper, Institut für Mittelstandsforschung (IfM), Bonn 01/14.
- Welter, F., Gartner, W.B. and Wright, M. (2016), 'The context of contextualizing context', in F. Welter and W.B. Gartner (eds), *A Research Agenda for Entrepreneurship and Context*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 1–15.
- Welter, F., Baker, T., Audretsch, D.B. and Gartner, W.B. (2017), 'Everyday entrepreneurship: A call for entrepreneurship research to embrace entrepreneurial diversity', *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, **41** (3), 311–21.
- Wennekers, S., van Stel, A., Thurik, A.R. and Reynolds, P. (2005), 'Nascent entrepreneurship and the level of economic development', *Small Business Economics*, **24** (3), 293–309.
- Wennekers, S., van Stel, A., Thurik, R. and Reynolds, P. (2008), 'Nascent entrepreneurship and the level of economic development', *Small Business Economics*, **30** (3), 325–25.
- Williams, C.C. and Nadin, S. (2010), 'Entrepreneurship and the informal economy: An overview', *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, **15** (4), 361–78.
- Williams, C.C., Round, J. and Rodgers, P. (2009), 'Evaluating the motives of informal

- entrepreneurs: Some lessons from Ukraine', *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, **14** (1), 59–71.
- Wong, P.K., Ho, Y.P. and Autio, E. (2005), 'Entrepreneurship, innovation and economic growth: Evidence from GEM data', *Small Business Economics*, **24** (3), 335–50.
- Zahra, S. (2007), 'Contextualizing theory building in entrepreneurship research', *Journal of Business Venturing*, **22** (3), 443–52.
- Zahra, S. and Wright, M. (2011), 'Entrepreneurship's next act', *Academy of Management Perspectives*, **25** (4), 67–83.
- Zahra, S.A. and Wright, M. (2016), 'Understanding the social role of entrepreneurship', *Journal of Management Studies*, **53** (4), 610–29.
- Zahra, S., Wright, M. and Abdelgawad, S. (2014), 'Contextualization and the advancement of entrepreneurship research', *International Small Business Journal*, **32** (5), 479–500.
- Zhao, E.Y. and Lounsbury, M. (2016), 'An institutional logics approach to social entrepreneurship: Market logic, religious diversity, and resource acquisition by microfinance organizations', *Journal of Business Venturing*, **31** (6), 643–62.