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Abstract
Diasporas are shaping the economic landscape; the new Argonauts co-developed the Silicon Valley, and places like Tallinn and Tel-Aviv compete openly for the mobile talent to increase their international competitiveness. Transnational diaspora entrepreneurs bring with them their businesses, new ideas and resources; thus, their impact on the receiving region is even higher. Still, the diasporans’ viewpoints remain underexplored and little is known about their migratory/location strategies. This qualitative study examines the migratory path of Jewish diaspora entrepreneurs, and how they choose a particular location. The findings illustrate differences in entrepreneurial types and contexts.
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Introduction
Jewish diaspora entrepreneurs are theoretically interesting, because they are globally dispersed with historical linkages to various host countries (e.g. Cohen, 2008), yet often only weak ties to the ancient homeland. They present global businesses, select unusual entrepreneurial locations, and have triggered theory on transnational entrepreneurship (Drori, Honig & Ginsberg, 2006; Drori, Honig & Wright, 2009). According to Riddle, Hrvnak & Nielsen (2010, p.398) “Transnational diasporan entrepreneurs are migrants and their descendants who establish entrepreneurial activities that span the national business environments of their countries of origin and countries of residence’.

Diaspora communities, particularly entrepreneurs, are relevant to the regional development of their host countries (i.e. recipient regional economies) as they carry new ideas and innovation, knowledge, novel business models and investments, and even facilitate clusters (e.g. Elo et al., 2015; Sonderregger & Täube, 2010). Hence, entrepreneurs setting up business
are particularly relevant for receiving regions, through benefits from both short and long term-inflow of resources and entrepreneurial commitment (cf. Hernandez, 2014).

Particularly Jewish diaspora entrepreneurs who do decide not to ‘return’ migrate to Israel to do Aliyah, but migrate elsewhere, are highly interesting cases as they continue their ‘dispersion’ for individual purposes which are often related to business and opportunities (cf. Elo & Volovelsky, 2016). There is a vast literature on Jewish history and culture, but very little attention has been paid to the question how (Jewish) diasporans actually decide to migrate and how they select their new location (i.e. host country), and what attracts them to a certain region, especially in terms of their entrepreneurial activity. Moreover, entrepreneurs who are engaged in multiple ventures in multiple places go through unique processes, which remain to be explained and understood (Morrish, 2009). Migration policies attract skilled workforce and entrepreneurs, moreover, religion may influence entrepreneurship per se (e.g. Dana, 2009). International entrepreneurs are driven by business opportunities (Mainela, Puhakka & Servais, 2014; Elo et al., 2015), but at the same time, families influence entrepreneurial location and group formation (e.g. Discua Cruz, 2010). Jewish migration decisions are multifaceted and influenced by many factors, such as business opportunities and lack of antisemitism (e.g. Cohen, 2008; Elo & Volovelsky, 2016, see also Meyer, 2000). Jewish diaspora and its subgroups are like invisible nations outside of Israel (their historical country of origin) that connect Israel to the global Jewish network and its business scape (cf. Appadurai, 1996; Beine et al., 2001). Understanding this location related dynamism and decision processes may assist other diaspora entrepreneurs to learn for their location strategies as well as regions to develop their attractiveness and optimize their migration policies.

It is notable that within the global Jewish diaspora there is a range of entrepreneurs hailing from different contexts. There are people with a refugee background and others who are part of cosmopolitan elite, which makes the cohort of Jewish diaspora entrepreneurs quite heterogeneous in terms of their resource structure. Despite the extensive body of knowledge on diaspora, it seems that the studies focusing on the interplay of home-host country is dominant (e.g. Gillespie, Riddle, Sayre & Sturges, 1999; Aliaga-Isla & Rialp, 2013), leaving paths that involve multiple migration, (i.e. several host countries) with less attention. The global character of the overall Jewish diaspora provides a relevant case for addressing this global entrepreneurial mobility.
Thus, we aim to improve understanding of entrepreneurial migration dynamics, and ask what attracts Jewish diaspora entrepreneurs to certain regions and why and how they decide to migrate. This qualitative study interviews Jewish diaspora entrepreneurs and explores their narratives in different locations and settings. It attempts to identify country characteristics (i.e. pull effects for attracting Jewish diaspora entrepreneurs) and dynamics, and it analyses the nature of this pull-influence as a migratory trigger (i.e. decision-making) using data collected 2012-2015 offering insights into numerous diaspora entrepreneurs’ histories. It illustrates migratory and entrepreneurial development of 20 Jewish diaspora entrepreneurs covering various countries of origin and host countries of entrepreneurial activities. Hence, it provides insights to multiple regions and their attractiveness from the Jewish diaspora-entrepreneurial perspective. Our findings disentangle various aspects that influence diaspora entrepreneurs’ location decisions at country and regional level (cf. Elo & Riddle, 2016).

This study contributes to location choice, regional development and diaspora entrepreneurship studies. It addresses the criticism on simplistic dichotomies in diaspora research (Liu & van Dongen, 2016). Further, it questions the rigid idea of dyadic country setting and single venture-focus, and contributes to the multifocality of doing business and understanding multiple entrepreneurship in circular and cosmopolitan diaspora (versus mono-directional paths) (cf. Rezaei, Light and Telles, 2016). Finally, we provide implications for theory, management and policy and for future research.

The theoretical framework
The theoretical approach consists of a synthesis of approaches, as this is a hybrid phenomenon located in-between diaspora entrepreneurship, migration and regional development theories. In fact, several diaspora and migration studies inherently involve regional development both ways, having the perspective of a sending or receiving region (e.g. Knapp & Gravest, 1989; Wescott & Brinkerhoff, 2006; Tung, 2008; Harima, 2014). This synthesis takes into consideration the multifaceted nature of the phenomenon by integrating the analytical levels of the entrepreneur, the respective migration flows and the outcome and business activity on the regional level.

Migration, location choices and regional development
Migration is a topic in many disciplines; especially economic geography and sociology have examined the flows of migrants to new place and their economic, social, and cultural
adaptation and integration (Berry, 2001, Edvardsson et al., 2007). In terms of migrants’ economic adaptation the host country view naturally forms the main interest, while the sending country research has increasingly been interested in the resulting brain drain or gain (e.g. Portes & Zhou, 1993; Portes, Guarnizo & Haller, 2002; Straubhaar, 2000; Wescott & Brinkerhoff, 2006). The reasons that trigger migrants to migrate to specific locations are extensively researched in the form of push and pull factors, but in the migratory paths and circulation remains an individual level process (Teferra, 2005). On the other hand, not all migrants stay in their host country, and as León and Hernández Alemán (2016) illustrate there are socioeconomic and psychological factors explaining immigrants’ decisions to stay (e.g. negative emotions, expectations, social integration).

Location choice of migrants vary according to their cohort, as labor migration (Dugan & Edelstein, 2013; Karppi, 1998), highly-skilled elite migration (Leinonen, 2012) and entrepreneurial migration (Riddle & Brinkerhoff, 2011; Elo et al., 2015; Elo, 2016) have different dynamics and criteria influencing their migration strategies. Migration policies and regimes radically delimit individual choices (Karppi, 2006, Kultalahti, Karppi & Rantala, 2006). Push factors for migration relate to war, crisis, natural catastrophes, unemployment, economic problems and lack of future perspectives, and pull factors constitute of employment and better career opportunities, higher wages, social mobility, education, safety and family reasons, among others (e.g. Kultalahti et al., 2006). However, the way how push and pull factors influence individual cases vary and may be idiosyncratic (e.g. Zimmermann, 1994) although there are attempts to address these dynamics as law-like phenomena (Dorigo & Tobler, 1983). Once in the host country, Zorlu and Mulder (2008) found, that the initial and subsequent location choices of migrants involved distinct settlement trajectories for asylum and other non-Western immigrants, and suggest that the presence of co-ethnics and members of other ethnic minorities, but also socio-economic neighbourhood characteristics play an important role in determining location choice. In terms of entrepreneurship and business, location choice is linked to amenity values, such as wages, rents and local prices (Knapp & Gravest, 1989).

Location represents a country or a specific region. In research literature, host country can be the country of residence (COR) of the entrepreneur and/or her/his venture, also multiple CORs are possible when the entrepreneur is circulating/cosmopolitan. There are several outcomes of migration that influence the receiving country or region. Integration problems,
segregation and ghetto-building have been reported (Berry, 2001; James 1994; Heikkilä & Peltonen, 2002), however, these studies have not explicitly focused on entrepreneurs.

One particularity of Jewish diaspora is in its country of origin and its locations, as it is spread across several regions globally. For example, Russian and Central Asian Jews mass-migrated after the collapse of the Soviet Union to Israel, USA, Austria, Germany and other countries (e.g. Tolts, 1995; Levin, 2014). While the holocaust had forced Jews to leave Germany and other European countries (e.g. Meyer, 2000), in the middle ages Sephardist Jews were persecuted out of the Iberian Peninsula dispersing them to other locations (cf. Stein, 2006; Cohen & Stein, 2010). Hence, the Jewish diaspora has a traditionally mobile trajectory, including entrepreneurship (e.g. Hakkarainen, 2013, see also Elo & Volovelsky, 2016).

Economic adaptation and integration of migrants in their host context, i.e. in the receiving region, is a diachronic topic in research and entails both labour and entrepreneurial dimensions (e.g. Portes, Guarnizo, & Haller, 2002; Karppi, 1998). The perspective of the host country or region as the recipient of influence, change and economic and social activity crystallizes in policy making and governance (e.g. Karppi, 1998). In China, the state attempts to create transnational governance and diaspora policies to benefit from the phenomenon of migration (see more in Liu & van Dongen, 2016). Liu and van Dongen (2016, p. 3) highlight that both migration and trade have been leading to an increasing institutionalization of transnational mechanisms.

The seminal discussion on the creative class and its importance on development policies directed research more towards the city view – as opposed to migration studies that mainly focus on country views- and underlined the need of regions and cities to attract talent for innovation that supports urban development and economic competitiveness in the global context (e.g. Florida, 2005). The view that links innovation and talent attraction with new labor opportunities and generation of creative economy is still debated (Cruz, 2016).

Incoming firms and entrepreneurship are correlated with increased or different creativity and entrepreneurial dynamism (e.g. Acs & Storey, 2004; Lee, Florida & Acs, 2004; Elo et al., 2016) that facilitate regional development. Foreign entrepreneurs and diasporas foster creativity and facilitate creative cluster building (e.g Saxenian, 2007; Sonderregger & Täube, 2010), potentially adding to the diversity of local inter-firm linkages. The number of
immigrants also have a positive, statistically significant and economically meaningful effect on the export propensity of firms to the migrant’s country of origin (Pennerstorfer, 2016).

Sacchetti (2009) examines the inter-firm geographical linkages, their nature and motivation, and found that such linkages need to be considered beyond spatial proximity as the complexity and knowledge intensity follow specific firms’ profiles and patterns of specialisation of activities. Lee, Florida and Acs (2004) highlight that new firm formation is positively associated with cultural creativity and diversity, and that one should pay attention to the social habitat of a region to boost a regional entrepreneurial dynamics. They refer to the importance of low barriers of entry into the regional labor market together diverse culture that facilitates the influx of particular kind of human capital promoting innovation and accelerating information flows, thus increasing new firm formation. However, a recent study illustrates that there are limitations on the knowledge spillover theory of entrepreneurship; it suggests that knowledge spillover happens differently in different economic contexts, indicating that in developing economies there is a more limited connection between knowledge spillovers, innovation and entrepreneurship than in developed economies (González-Pernía, Jung & Peña, 2015).

The attractiveness of receiving regions differs between ethnic diasporans and foreign investor-entrepreneurs without altruistic or homeland sentiments (cf. Nkongolo-Bakenda & Chrysostome, 2013). Thus, host countries that are less attractive to non-diaspora investors because of small domestic market size, inadequate infrastructure, or less-attractive structural characteristics might still benefit from diaspora entrepreneurship and investments (Gillespie et al, 1999). In a similar vein, emerging market economies that suffer from institutional voids (e.g. lack of specialized intermediaries, structural challenges) make it challenging for firms to succeed in these environments (Khanna and Palepu, 2010), but diaspora-owned and managed firms may overcome such institutional voids easier (Elo, 2016). Therefore, incoming diaspora entrepreneurs are particularly important for these contexts (Riddle, Hrivnak & Nielsen, 2010; Ramamurti, 2004, Huang and Khanna, 2003; Buckley et al., 2007).

Diaspora entrepreneurship and its international dimension
Research focusing on diaspora and its roles in international business, development and entrepreneurship illustrates its numerous influences locally and globally (e.g. Wescott & Brinkerhoff, 2006; Kuznetsov, 2006; Cohen, 2008; Brinkerhoff, 2009; Elo, 2015). Scholars
have discussed the economic, business and entrepreneurial potential of diaspora and its links to the global competitiveness (e.g. Kuznetsov, 2006; Tung, 2008). In fact, Kuznetsov and Sabel (2006) consider diaspora networks as search networks and bridge institutions that link global opportunities to the local capabilities. They also underline the importance of the development of problem-solving skills and certain types of managerial culture as crucial to economic development, and consider diaspora networks as the fundament for such knowledge-based development. Newland and Tanaka (2010) claim that diaspora entrepreneurs are uniquely well equipped to recognize opportunities in their countries of origin. They have an advantage over other entrepreneurs in exploiting such opportunities as ‘first movers’, and they are especially motivated to contribute to job creation and economic growth underlining the significance of global diasporas as a resource and knowledge base.

Cross-border entrepreneurs have entrepreneurial activities for which they form cooperations and partnerships (cf. Smallbone & Welter, 2012). Diaspora entrepreneurs are inherently international and in the contemporary setting, they are increasingly involved digitally (Brinkerhoff, 2009), which introduces a novel borderless and global dimension to their scope of activities apart from the neighbouring, cross-border setting (cf. Tung, 2008). According to Riddle, Hrvinak & Nielsen (2010) transnational diaspora entrepreneurs link their countries of origin and countries of residence and also act as change agents and generate new business models and solutions (cf. Riddle & Brinkerhoff, 2011). The impact of growth-oriented large migrant founded enterprises (e.g. Intel, Google, eBay, Sun Microsystems, Tesla) is notable and stretches across markets and regions beyond ethnic enclaves (Ndofor & Priem, 2011; Arrighetti, Bolzani & Lasagni, 2014). Even small transnational diaspora businesses shape the business landscape and influence urban development (Wong & Ng, 2002). Diaspora-founded firms deploy a continuum of strategies from an enclave to dominant market venture strategy (Ndofor & Priem, 2011).

Jewish diaspora entrepreneurs are transnationally oriented as opposed to ethnic enclave economies that are found in many ethnic diasporas (Dana, 2010; Light, Bozorgmehr & Der-Martirosian, 1994). Transnational and international entrepreneurship are related, but not synonymous (Jones et al., 2011). Transnational entrepreneurs (TEs) are defined as ‘...individuals that migrate from one country to another, concurrently maintaining business-related linkages with their former country of origin, and currently adopted countries and communities’ and as ‘social actors who enact networks, ideas, information, and practices for
the purpose of seeking business opportunities or maintaining businesses with dual social fields, which in turn force them to engage in varied strategies of action to promote their entrepreneurial activities’ (Drori, Honig & Wright, 2009, p. 1001). TE builds on the international dimension, on the cross-border entrepreneurship and bifocality, as ‘TEs occupy two geographical locations’ (Drori, Honig & Wright, 2009, p. 1001).

Those individuals who become transnational diaspora entrepreneurs (Riddle et al., 2010), develop economic relationships with their countries of origin and their host contexts. Some entrepreneurs are more internationally connected, more cosmopolitan than others, which influences their entrepreneurial behaviour (Long, 1972). Diaspora entrepreneurs may combine transnational lifestyle – and cosmopolitan lifestyle- with circular migration or migrate further, which enables them to combine family and business or to follow business opportunities (cf. Elo, 2016). In a previous study, the findings indicated that in case of repatriated diaspora entrepreneurs (i.e. returnee entrepreneurs) their family members did not automatically repatriate, but created a dyadic or triangular life across the locations for the entrepreneur (Elo, 2016). Especially mixed marriages and generational status influenced the willingness to migrate completely to a new location (e.g. Leinonen, 2012; Elo, 2016). Despite family constraints, returnee entrepreneurship plays an important role in connecting opportunities, resources and talent across regions (e.g. Wang & Liu, 2016). The case of Chinese diaspora illustrates well the immense impact of the two-way flow of entrepreneurial activity (Wang & Liu, 2016). Within diasporas, there are also multi-entrepreneurs who act as serial and portfolio entrepreneurs, business generators, and habitual entrepreneurs (cf. MacMillan, 1986; Morrish, 2009) further amplifying the effect.

Methods and data
The purpose of the study is to explore and understand entrepreneurial migratory dynamics and location choices, which is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon. Therefore, a qualitative research approach is appropriate (Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2010; Marschan-Piekkari & Welch, 2004). As there is no (single) extant theory explaining the phenomenon that could be tested, it employs an explorative interdisciplinary research design for theory development (Carsrud & Brännback, 2014). The theories explaining the phenomenon are either partial from its viewpoint or in a pre-paradigmatic state (Kenworthy & McMullen, 2014). In addition, using value-laden a priori hypothesis is avoided as it might construct bias
and lead the research process in a limited or wrong direction (Dana & Dana, 2005). Inductive-style and non-quantitative research is particularly suitable for entrepreneurship, since the learning during the research process reduces errors (Dana & Dana, 2005).

The research team was international and designed to include native views and skills, through co-ethnic members with interdisciplinary backgrounds (Salmi, 2010). Russian, Uzbek, Tajik, Hebrew, Chinese, German and English language competences and insight into the Jewish religion are provided by the research team to improve the quality of the primary research material (Marschan-Piekkari & Reis, 2004). For example, the interviewer-researcher responsible for China has long-term personal diaspora experience in China and the access and capacity to conduct in-depth observations in this context that he shares. Similarly, the interviewer-researchers in the other settings of Israel and Uzbekistan may “go native’ (Chapman, Gajewska-De Mattos & Antoniou, 2004) and collect data, which is facilitated by common trust. This approach has similarities with participant observation in ethnography, being ‘invisible’ and making the ideal match of interviews and observations (Dana & Dana, 2005).

This approach builds on the analysis of multiple real-life cases and their trajectories. These cases are documented from the perspective of the entrepreneur, presenting their narratives and explanations in a retrospective manner. The trajectories assist to develop and generate theory to understand this theoretical intersection of migration, location and Jewish diaspora entrepreneurship (Eisenhard, 1989; Stake, 1995; Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2005).

Data collection and analysis
The case selection is purposeful and theoretically driven for rich qualitative detail (Dana & Dana, 2005), it targeted individuals of Jewish origin with entrepreneurial activities and with a diasporic background. Information on potential cases was obtained from organizations like Chamber of commerce, but also from diaspora organisations and using snowballing. Printed materials, such as diaspora newspapers, business magazines, company websites, Internet sites and forums were deployed as source of information. The entrepreneurs have various countries of origin from Central Asia and Israel, but also other areas. To the extent possible, the team attempted to find entrepreneurs in diverse businesses and industries, such as tourism, consumer goods, consulting, management, textile, and investment business. In terms of Jewishness, the cohorts consisted of ethnic Ashkenazi (Jewish people and their
offspring who originated from the following countries: Germany, France and Europe Eastern countries, such as: Russia, Hungary, Poland, where the Yiddish language was spoken), Sephardi Jews (Jews that originated from: Spain, Portugal, North America and the Middle East and their offspring)¹ and Bukharian Jews. The respondents were not pre-labelled into any categories, instead, an emic style self-definition as an identity and as an interpreter of events was employed. This is important for the quality of the data as the Jewishness is a broad term that may involve people of many different degrees of religiosity, various ethnic backgrounds and language groups, as well as political views that stem from the previous Soviet Union or from the US. The diversity of the respondent-cases increases the quality and reliability of the findings.

The actual data consisted of both primary and secondary data from multiple sources, and representing multiple types of data (Silverman, 2001; Alasuutari, 1995). The primary data includes in-depth interviews on site of the entrepreneur, these were carried out in the native language of the entrepreneur and audio-recorded and transcribed (Eisenhardt, 1989). The interviews had both semi-structured part for socio-economic data and a narrative story telling part allowing them to tell their own stories and experiences and enabling a free flow of naturally occurring data (Silverman, 2001). The interviews (when necessary) were translated into English or xxx², which were the common languages of the research team. Due to budget limitations back-translation (Brislin, 1970) was not possible, but the problem of interpreting meanings correctly was moderated by the linguist-interviewer and the co-ethnic research team members. The team collected field notes, observations and photographic material, in addition, Linkedin, Facebook and other internet-based sources were used to collect data on the cases and to triangulate for the analysis. Visits and field trips to Uzbekistan and China safeguarded and double-checked the reliability of the material. In addition, also extant studies, statistics and reports were used for triangulation. The data collection started 2012 and continued through 2015.

The interview phase faced several problems due to respondents’ fear and rejections. After initial contact several respondent-candidates hesitated or rejected the idea. The location of


² Anonymized in order not to risk double blind review.
diaspora entrepreneurs in non-Western countries and different regimes hindered their willingness to participate and reduced their trust regarding research projects (cf. Michailova & Liuhto, 2001, Voldnes et al., 2014). To address these concerns the researchers filled a research protocol together with the respondent and guaranteed anonymous reporting.

The idea behind the data collection was to generate material that serves to compare (replicate) the phenomenon in a systematic way, and to explore its dimensions and the dynamics (Ghauri, 2004). In the analytical part of the research - the more etic part - the theory gained importance following the idea of progressive focusing (Sinkovics and Alfoldi, 2012). In total, 20 entrepreneurial cases and narratives were collected. The data was stored, coded and analysed supported by the NVivo software, and then reported in a tabular form (see Table 1 in appendix). This increased the reliability and trustworthiness of the data, and at the same time, this structure of the study reduced the “messiness” of the research process (Sinkovics & Penz, 2011, Sinkovics & Alfoldi, 2012). The qualitative analysis, based on thematic analysis was structured on the items that were appearing in the interviews as code categories, and on analysis and interpretation of other data with meaningful and/or symbolic content of data. The items were linked around the questions why and how the migration took place, how the host country influenced the migration decision (e.g. immigration regulation, market, opportunity, socio-cultural reasons), what kind of pull and push forces influenced the entrepreneurship (e.g. necessity, opportunity, family tradition), what type of entrepreneurship they were involved (single or multiple entrepreneurship), and what was the background and family of the entrepreneur (refugee, other migrant, generation, family members as co-ethnics). The generation of items was supported by previous research on Jewish diaspora entrepreneurs (e.g. Elo & Jokela, 2013; Levin, 2014; Elo & Volovelsky, 2015; Elo, 2016; Elo & Vemuri, 2016).

Findings
Migratory paths, location and entrepreneurship
Table 1 presents the analysis in a tabular form. The findings are based on fifteen male and five female Jewish entrepreneurial cases and their migratory paths. These diaspora entrepreneurs belong to two main COO cohorts, one with an origin in Central Asia (Uzbekistan and Tajikistan) and the other with an Israeli or mixed origin. The majority of the participants share a particular feature in their family context and migrant status, 14 out of 20 have a refugee background themselves or their parents were refugees (two cases out of 14).
The entrepreneurship consisted mainly of a single enterprise, out of which four were local businesses and 11 were transnational businesses. The remaining five were multi-enterprise cases of entrepreneurship. In terms of migratory path the majority of entrepreneurial activity emerges after first or second migration process, and interestingly, 11 out of 20 entrepreneurs migrated at least twice, not once. This presents a theoretically interesting notion of multiple migration within the individual migratory path instead of the COO-COR dyad.

The cohort included immigrant entrepreneurs not having international business activities, circular entrepreneurs who shared their lives across locations, one classic returnee entrepreneur, four transnational/cosmopolitan returnees who have shifted their (family) residence but not their activity and life completely in a country of origin. The data illustrates much richer migratory paths than expected based on extant research. Moreover, it presents bi- and multidirectional entrepreneurial activities and a form of cosmopolitan entrepreneur whose life and business covers not only two countries but many, and whose strategies and activities are proactive and drive global markets similarly as market driving multinationals (Buckley & Ghauri, 2004; Ghauri, Tarnovskaya & Elg, 2008). Numerous interviews brought up the importance of addressing the right time window and being a first-mover entrepreneur in the host context, even for smaller businesses (cf. Elo et al., 2015).

The research question what attracts Jewish diaspora entrepreneurs or to-be-entrepreneurs to certain regions has both generic and idiosyncratic answers. On the level of receiving region and its attractiveness, there are reasons such as: host region pull effect generated by various business opportunities and livelihood perspectives, policies and political reasons, especially, regimes supporting migrant entry and refugees, possibilities offered by new and emerging markets, market gaps and emerging nature of markets and lack of international competition. In addition, also safety, lack of antisemitism, family roots and relatives, cultural and diaspora connections, historical ties, religious ties and freedom, even cemeteries, and gratitude towards the historical welcoming of Jews (Shanghai) played a role in making a location attractive for Jewish diaspora entrepreneurs. On the other hand, the impact of these reasons may be idiosyncratic and may vary according to different cohorts of Jewish diaspora entrepreneurs.

One diaspora entrepreneur with a refugee background points out how the necessity side locked them in: ‘I was 16,5 when we got to Israel and I did not know Hebrew and that is why
I could not go to study and I needed to do something. We were stuck in Vienna for 3 years before we got here... My father was a butcher and for generations from his side and four generations from my mother’s side were in this business’ (Interview, 2013). One returnee highlighted the attractive opportunities: ‘In recent years the tourism develops very well in Uzbekistan, and the old city of Bukhara is a very impressive, touristic place’. (Interview, 2013) as did a circular one ‘in the countries with fast growing population, like Uzbekistan, the building business boomed –naturally’ (Interview 2013). Another transnational diaspora entrepreneur pointed out the time window: “During the Soviet era there was almost no good products available anywhere, but after the collapse of the USSR, the products just disappeared. Therefore, it was the right time to start this business in this region.’ (2013). A cosmopolitan entrepreneur states: ‘I started in Mexico, I understood there is potential for my business in China. I met Chinese in L.A and they suggested me to check China... I planned to be in China 2 weeks and stayed for few months. Started in Suzhou because silk was popular at that time and Suzhou was the center of Silk... later I moved to Shanghai because it was a modern city and I thought it would be more convenient for me,’ another diaspora entrepreneur continues: ‘Interesting and dynamic place [Beijing]. Gained a lot of business experience and networks from previous companies I worked for, the potential here is huge.’ The attractiveness of the place is emphasized also by this cosmopolitan diaspora entrepreneur:’ PRC – is the most important place in the world for business, I believe the future will show that China is/will be the center of the business world. I do business also in other locations, South America, Europe and Africa, but the major business is in China.’ However, even cosmopolitan multi-entrepreneurs were not alone in assessing the attractiveness of a certain location as the comment shows: ‘One major reason I have not done it yet [new location] – my wife doesn’t want to live there’.

In general, the why and how they decide to migrate as individuals is naturally related to their COO push forces, such as unemployment, lack of opportunities, career impediments, perceived theological difficulties and relocation of tradition (cf. Elo, 2016), not just related to attractive opportunities offered by a new location. On the pull effect side, individual diasporans were influenced by relatives and extended family ties, but also by previous experiences abroad and later by foreign or non-local spouses.
Talent flow and the new prototype of a diaspora entrepreneur
This study illustrates that within one diaspora there is a plurality of entrepreneurial types. What is novel and has not been classified beyond the Saxenian style ‘new Argonauts’ is the type of a transnational and/or cosmopolitan entrepreneur who carries out multifocal, multinational activities beyond the dyadic transnational activity scape, employing more than one entrepreneurial activity or firm by doing so. However, the data indicate an important difference as these entrepreneurs did not migrate to locations that were migrant-innovation clusters like Silicon Valley (see also Sonderegger & Täube, 2010) and had aggregated migrant population, instead they found unusual and emerging settings as attractive places to venture and shifted to new locations once they felt saturation by other entrants. Thus, the idea of attractiveness building on the gravity of talent (cf. incoming flow) and resulting innovation is not at all central for this group. Interestingly, the role of wages, rents and costs structures were not central in attracting them either being opposite to expectations (Knapp & Gravest, 1989).

These entrepreneurs were early movers, if not first or second movers (Liberman & Montgomery, 1988). The business represent serial entrepreneurship or portfolio entrepreneurship, and its nature is very different from the classic ethnic entrepreneurship focusing on host country location and often on an ethnic enclave. Moreover, this novel type of a diaspora entrepreneur follows the call of attractive locations globally, without strong bonds to a COO or COR concerning residence and life. Cosmopolitan, circular and multimobile lifestyle defines this entrepreneur, even lack of permanent residence. It seems that family members are not anchoring the life in a particular location either, as they may be also dispersed in different locations that are more attractive to the family. Thus, separating different sectors of like and business into specific locations. This type of a diaspora entrepreneur lives in a hybrid, transnational space (Levitt, 2001; Appadurai, 1996) and differs in terms of the location-commitment and diasporanness (cf. Cohen, 2008) radically from the classic diasporan, shifting more toward the notion of the transmigrant (cf. Schiller et al., 1995).

Thus, we propose:

1. The expected opportunities in the host country positively affect the Jewish diaspora entrepreneurs and those who migrate in order to become entrepreneurs
2. The expected opportunities are moderated by the overall positive features of the location, such as lack of antisemitism
3. The host country and region selection is positively influenced by high attractiveness of the context, which is perceived from the individual and network perspective and not based on economic indicators.
4. The host country and region selection is negatively influenced by the co-existence of a large number of foreign and other Jewish entrepreneurs, or an enclave, unless the business is serving only the ethnic community
5. Refugee status diaspora entrepreneurs with significant transit experiences in their migratory path are negatively influenced by the transit period and establish less transnational and international businesses
6. The higher the number of CORs, more experienced and well-connected the diaspora entrepreneur is, the more this influences the propensity to venture internationally and to become a multi-entrepreneur.

Discussion and Conclusion
Theoretical implications
All of the cases compared host countries and intentionally chose the most suitable alternative, also in the case of multiple migration, and in the case of refugee status to the extent possible. The decision-making was not taken on the firm level as in the SME literature, but on the individual and family level including influence from the relatives due to collective culture. Migration and entrepreneurial paths of various Jewish populations differ and are probably case/cohort (cf. Immigration waves per place) specific regarding Jewish diaspora entrepreneurship. Their host country selection is likely to be influenced by their Jewishness.

Beyond the life and business planning, their entrepreneurial traditions and religion influenced the host country choice and the choice of businesses established (diamonds, textile, trade, consulting, health, etc.) by reflecting the demand and opportunity and the accessible resources. Migration and business policies supporting entrepreneurial entry and emerging market opportunities were important pull effects. On the other hand, policies creating transit periods for refugee migratory paths formed exits and interruption of entrepreneurial traditions, which were linked to more necessity-style entrepreneurship later. Refugees were more likely to enter forms of local entrepreneurship (service, retail,
gastronomy, etc.) than non-refugee entrepreneurs, at least in the early phases. Jewish diaspora entrepreneurs were more likely to enter emerging/transition market economies and encounter less institutional voids than enterprises from developed countries. The role of accumulation of knowledge seemed to make circular and cosmopolitan diaspora entrepreneurs more likely to become multi-entrepreneurs (serial/portfolio/habitual) and international entrepreneurs than migrants who migrated only once. This supported the “particular form of entrepreneurship embodied in specific actors who transcend multiple spaces, territories, and scales” (Yeung, 2009, p.211)

Managerial implications
These diaspora entrepreneurs, particularly in China and Central Asia, were often first movers, addressing innovation, new products and business models. They migrated proactively to avoid competition and act early, often employing their global Jewish diaspora networks for knowledge and support, but also building local political relations and understanding. Once the receiving context became more competition and matured, the locational attractiveness decreased. More mature markets (Austria, Israel, Germany) were penetrated by incoming diaspora entrepreneurs mainly with service, retail and other local business types by focusing on some sort of tradition, knowledge or particular capability (and less multi-entrepreneurship). Those who become multi-entrepreneurs were active in more than one field of business, having diversified portfolios of activities. Moreover, most of the emerging market-based entrepreneurs created a transnational or cosmopolitan life that assists them to relocate or shift operations to other locations if necessary.

Policy implications
Policies regulating religion and religious freedom as well as supporting the secular nation state were considered suitable for business creating an attractive social space. For example, China’s policy was perceived as hospitable and with lack of antisemitism. Overall security and policies regulating family matters for migrant, returnee and mixed marriage families played on important role especially concerning the future of the business as long-term plans included the family matters.

The emerging and transition economies were considered attractive host countries with high potential, but the importance of functioning local relations to overcome institutional voids was emphasized for diaspora entrepreneurs resulting in significantly more multi-entrepreneurship.
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