

The interface between hospitality and tourism entrepreneurship, integration and well-being: A study of refugee entrepreneurs

Authors

Zaid Alrawadieh; Levent Altinay; Gurel Cetin; Dogus Simsek

Abstract

Previous hospitality and tourism entrepreneurship research has emphasized the economic and financial outcomes of entrepreneurship whilst paying less attention to social outcomes. Specifically, minimal academic attention, both in mainstream entrepreneurship research and hospitality and tourism scholarship, has been paid to entrepreneurship as a means to facilitate the integration of refugees and enhance their well-being. To address this gap, this study aims to showcase how entrepreneurial activities in the hospitality and tourism industry contribute to the integration and subjective well-being of entrepreneurs. Drawing on data collected through 38 semi-structured interviews with Syrian refugee entrepreneurs in Turkey and the UK, the findings reveal that several factors influence the contribution of entrepreneurial activities to the integration of entrepreneurs and their families within the host society. Entrepreneurial activities also appear to have positive spillover effects on subjective well-being. This paper offers new insights into the social outcomes of hospitality and tourism entrepreneurship by conceptualizing and empirically supporting the relationship between hospitality entrepreneurship, integration and well-being.

Keywords: Hospitality entrepreneurship, Refugee entrepreneurship, Small tourism businesses, integration, well-being, Syrian refugees

1. Introduction

Entrepreneurship promotes innovation, creates employment opportunities and contributes to the economic and social welfare of countries (Wong et al., 2005). The hospitality industry offers many entrepreneurship opportunities to individuals who aspire to pursue their entrepreneurial endeavors and can consequently play an important role in both the social and economic development of countries, destinations and societies (Fu et al. 2019). In particular, it helps with the re-generation and transformation of communities through the creation of a ‘social and economic exchange’ platform among different stakeholders including consumers, employees, suppliers, community and hospitality businesses (Altinay, 2010).

Previous hospitality entrepreneurship literature (See Fu et al., 2019) has investigated the antecedents of entrepreneurship in the hospitality industry. Among these antecedents, personal aspects including personality traits, education, industry experience as well as motivations have been identified as influential in hospitality business start-ups (Altinay et al., 2012). The literature also has covered how destination-related factors including government policies, incentives, cultural climate and technological advancements stimulate and trigger entrepreneurial activities (Fu et al., 2019). In addition, previous hospitality entrepreneurship literature went one step further and investigated the outcomes of hospitality entrepreneurial activities including the growth, market share, profitability and innovation (Altinay & Altinay, 2006). Entrepreneurship also contributes to the economic and social development of a destination as well as its economic, social and environmental sustainability (Bosworth & Farrell, 2011; Hallak & Assaker, 2013).

These studies make a significant contribution to the existing body of hospitality and tourism entrepreneurship literature by identifying and analyzing the antecedents and outcomes of entrepreneurship, however, they place emphasis on the economic antecedents and outcomes of entrepreneurship and neglect the social antecedents and outcomes of hospitality

and tourism entrepreneurship. This is surprising because the existing literature has increasingly acknowledged the contribution of entrepreneurship to the subjective well-being of the entrepreneurs and their immediate family members (Wiklund et al., 2019). It is within this context that this study examines the interface between refugee entrepreneurship, integration and well-being. In so doing, we draw from the perspectives of Syrian refugee entrepreneurs within the host societies of Turkey and the UK. We evaluate the influence of refugee entrepreneurship on the integration of refugees venturing into the hospitality and tourism industry. More importantly, we discuss the perceived positive effects of entrepreneurship on the well-being of refugees, their families and co-ethnic communities. This study is driven by the premise that minimal academic attention, both in mainstream entrepreneurship research as well as hospitality and tourism scholarship has been paid to refugee entrepreneurship (Refai et al, 2018; Wauters & Lambrecht, 2008). Specifically, there is little understanding of the reasons why refugees engage in entrepreneurial activities and how these entrepreneurial activities help with their integration and improve their and their families' well-being (Shneikat & Alrawadieh, 2019; Simsek, 2018). Indeed, there are increasing calls for further research into the associated effects of entrepreneurship on the well-being of entrepreneurs and their families (Bhuiyan & Ivlevs 2019; Wiklund et al., 2019).

The role of tourism in enhancing individuals' well-being is widely acknowledged (e.g., McCabe et al., 2010; McCabe & Johnson, 2013; Pesonen & Komppula, 2010). Although limited, a growing stream of research also delves into the well-being of hospitality and tourism entrepreneurs (Peters & Schuckert, 2014; Peters et al., 2019). In their study, Peters et al (2019) found that a better quality of life was associated with enhanced business growth. More recently, Bichler et al. (2020) highlighted the role of hospitality entrepreneurs' quality of life in shaping entrepreneurship and emphasized that entrepreneurs' well-being is of significant value for entrepreneurial ecosystems. These findings are not surprising given the

crucial role of well-being in shaping entrepreneurs' decision making, motivation, and action (Stephan, 2018). Overall, entrepreneurship is often associated with several stressors that may influence the very psychological well-being of entrepreneurs (Lerman et al., 2020). In the case of refugee entrepreneurs, the hospitality and tourism industry may be an ideal context to explore the influence of entrepreneurship on integration and well-being. Not only is this industry largely appealing to immigrant entrepreneurs in general (Rivera, 2019) and refugee entrepreneurs in particular (Alrawadieh et al. 2019) but also it has some other distinctive characteristics (e.g., a strong familial component, labor intensiveness) that make entrepreneurship in this industry lucrative (Memili et al., 2020). Despite a coherent body of research highlighting the economic benefits of tourism as a facilitator of the entrepreneurship action (e.g., Zhou et al., 2017), so far, little nuanced attention has been given to the role of hospitality and tourism entrepreneurship in generating positive social outcomes for entrepreneurs, their families and the wider society (e.g., Peters et al., 2019). For instance, existing theoretical assessments are generally biased toward lifestyle entrepreneurship driven by quality of life choices (Ateljevic & Doorne, 2000), but ignore the social outcomes of necessity-driven entrepreneurship. Moreover, the hospitality industry is frequently criticized for its promotion of unhealthy eating, drinking and for its part in contributing to public disorder, but its role in addressing social concerns is yet to be investigated (Altinay et al., 2019). Through examining the interface between hospitality entrepreneurship and well-being, this study offers insights into how small hospitality and tourism organizations can facilitate the well-being of refugee entrepreneurs and their families. This study also demonstrates that the refugee crisis, as a social issue, can not only be tackled by political intervention, but also with the help of commercial activities oriented towards the well-being of hospitality and tourism entrepreneurs.

2. Literature review

2.1. Hospitality and tourism entrepreneurship

Approximately two decades ago, Koh and Hatten (2002) lamented that little research had been done to explore entrepreneurship within hospitality and tourism. Despite a growing academic interest, hospitality and tourism entrepreneurship literature is still at an embryonic stage. A recent review paper by Fu et al. (2019) acknowledges this research gap and provides a comprehensive review of entrepreneurship research in hospitality and tourism in order to map out the evolution of the entrepreneurship domain, and propose a framework that may guide the future research agenda. This framework identifies ‘person aspect’ and ‘destination environment’ as the two main categories of entrepreneurial antecedents that trigger and stimulate entrepreneurial activities.

Current tourism and hospitality literature evaluates the role of personality factors, motivations, education, and industry experience as the key factors influencing entrepreneurial intentions to start-up businesses in the hospitality industry. For example, Gurel et al. (2010) found that personality traits, such as innovation, propensity to take risks, and the entrepreneurial family, all influence entrepreneurial intentions. In other studies, Jaafar et al. (2011) and Shepherd et al. (2009) identified “independence” and the “ability to learn from failure” as the key antecedents of hospitality and tourism entrepreneurship. Scholars such as Lerner and Haber (2001) defined hospitality and tourism entrepreneurs as hardworking, independently driven characters, who strive to achieve success through difficulties. In terms of the educational background of the hospitality entrepreneurs and its impact on entrepreneurial activities, existing literature seems to be inconsistent. For example, Tajeddini et al. (2017) allude that the hospitality and tourism entrepreneurs have limited education whereas Szivas (2001)’s sample was dominated by relatively high levels of education. Glancey and Pettigrew (1997), however, identified equal numbers of respondents with a

college-level education and a secondary education engaging in entrepreneurial activities. One, however, needs to note that hospitality and tourism enterprises do not operate in a vacuum. Entrepreneurial activities are highly dependent upon the environment in which they operate as it may stimulate or hinder them.

Economic, socio-cultural, and political environments affect entrepreneurial activities in hospitality and tourism (Kaaristo, 2014; Kallmuenzer et al., 2019; Honggang & Shaoyin, 2014). The economic environment of different countries in which new business ideas are nurtured affects venture creation. For example, hospitality and tourism entrepreneurs may not be able to pursue their entrepreneurial endeavors due to limited access to financing and/or incentives (Zhao et al., 2011). In particular, in developed countries, prospective entrepreneurs have easier access to financing and incentives and such a favorable economic environment supports the development of entrepreneurial activities (Russell & Faulkner, 2004).

Hospitality and tourism entrepreneurship is also bound to the dynamics of the socio-cultural environment that involves sociological and institutional aspects of society (Fu et al., 2019). People who grow up in a society with ‘entrepreneurial traditions’ are more likely to engage in entrepreneurial activities (Elo & Dana, 2019). In addition, residents’ attitudes also shape how entrepreneurship is received and supported in a community (Kline et al., 2020). What is even more important though, is how government and government policies shape the entrepreneurial climate in a country (Qin et al., 2011; Strobl & Peters, 2013). Policies and programs should be geared towards nurturing creativity and entrepreneurial activities, development of skills and capabilities needed to start up and grow businesses (Kwaramba et al., 2012). Indeed, growth and performance of entrepreneurial activities measured as sales growth, market share, productivity and innovation are crucial entrepreneurial outcomes that offer benefits to the entrepreneurs and their immediate families, help with the economic and social development of the community, enhance tourist experience and help with the

sustainable development of destinations (Ateljevic & Doorne, 2000; Bosworth and Farrell, 2011; Naipaul & Wang, 2009; Roxas & Chadee, 2013).

Existing hospitality and tourism entrepreneurship literature highlights the importance of the economic motivations of hospitality and tourism entrepreneurs. Few studies explain how entrepreneurial activities enhance the tourist experience through innovation. Some studies also identified entrepreneurship as important for community and destination development. However, these studies tend to focus on economic initiatives and outcomes of entrepreneurship rather than focusing on the social networks, motivations and outcomes. More specifically, there appears to be no research investigating how hospitality and tourism entrepreneurial activities aid social inclusion and the integration of refugee entrepreneurs and their families into the host society, and more importantly how entrepreneurial activities contribute to the well-being of refugees, their immediate families and communities. In order to provide an initial step in rectifying this deficiency, this paper scrutinizes the entrepreneurial activities of refugee and examines existing integration and well-being literature.

2.2. Refugee entrepreneurship in hospitality and tourism

Over the years, the topic of immigrant entrepreneurship has attracted increasing academic attention both in mainstream entrepreneurship research (See Dabić et al., 2020) and hospitality and tourism scholarship (Calero-Lemes & García-Almeida, 2020). Notably, less academic attention has been paid to refugee entrepreneurs (Mawson & Kasem, 2019; Refai et al, 2018); a surprising omission considering the increasing numbers in refugee flows (Farmaki & Christou, 2019). Refugee entrepreneurs have specific needs and characteristics and should be regarded as a distinct cohort of immigrant entrepreneurs (Wauters & Lambrecht, 2008). Within this context, it has been noted that forced immigrants (i.e. refugees) are three times more likely to become entrepreneurs rather than economic immigrants (Kallick et al, 2016). Through entrepreneurship, the integration of refugees as well as their well-being can be

improved (Wiklund et al, 2019). Indeed, entrepreneurship may bring a sense of control, autonomy, empowerment and freedom that helps individuals realize their potential and engage in a more meaningful life (Wood et al, 2016). Moreover, refugee entrepreneurship was argued to alleviate the financial burden imposed on the host countries' social welfare systems (Berns, 2017) and contribute to their long-term economic sustainability (Bizri, 2017). The economic contribution of refugee entrepreneurship might also improve the host societies' perception of refugees and further strengthen the social integration of refugee.

Past research addressing the interface between the refugee crisis and tourism seems to focus on the dark side of the issue including the negative effects of the refugees' inflows on tourism (Tsartas et al., 2020; Ivanov & Stavrinoudis, 2018; Zenker et al., 2019) neglecting the potential of the industry in encouraging refugees' entrepreneurial inspirations. Recently, there has been a growing interest within the realm of hospitality and tourism to uncover the potential role of the industry in addressing the refugee crisis through refugee entrepreneurship. For instance, Shneikat and Alrawadieh (2019) argued that venturing into the hospitality industry helped refugees integrate into the socioeconomic fabric of the host societies. However, as noted by Desai et al (2020), research into refugee entrepreneurship remains embryonic, making it difficult to draw reliable conclusions that can direct policy decisions. Hence, this study echoes the need for more academic engagement with the global refugee crisis (Paraskevas et al., 2019; Nasr and Fisk, 2019.) and joins recent limited research endeavors, shifting towards the role of the hospitality and tourism industry in facilitating integration of refugees and enhancing their well-being (Shneikat & Alrawadieh, 2019; Alrawadieh et al., 2019).

2.3. Integration and well-being

Integration, particularly refugee integration, is defined as a process that is configured by the various experiences of refugees. It is measured by access to rights, intentions and

aspirations of refugees, and social bridges between refugees and the host society (Ager & Strang, 2008; Simsek, 2018). Over the years, several attempts to identify indicators of refugee integration were made by researchers and intergovernmental organizations (e.g., Crisp, 2004; Kuhlman, 1991). In their totality, these indicators revolve around economic, socio-cultural, spatial and legal dimensions of integration. For example, to be integrated into the host society, refugees need to have employment and access to education or vocational training, healthcare and housing as well as enjoy equal rights and interaction with others. In this regard, Valtonen (2004) argued that participation and citizenship are inherently linked to refugee integration as refugees need to become part of the social, institutional and economic fabric of the host society. Within this context, Ager and Strang's (2008) framework emerged as the most widely adopted lens in examining refugee integration. Contrary to previous models, the framework conceptualizes integration more from a behavioral stance than as a psychological construct (Rudmin, 2003). Specifically, Ager and Strang (2008) suggested that integration can be explored under four key domains: (i) *markers and means* including employment, housing, education and health; (ii) *social connections* encompassing social bridges, bonds and links; (iii) *facilitators* including language and cultural knowledge as well as refugees' feelings of safety and security; and (iv) *foundation* referring to citizenship and rights.

Ager and Strang's (2008) framework captures the multi-dimensionality of integration and is helpful in examining the antecedents and outcomes of the four domains, which are interlinked (Platts-Fowler & Robinson, 2015). For example, employment may not only promote economic means but also offers opportunities for increased interaction with the host society, resulting in improved language skills and self-esteem (Ager & Strang, 2008). Indeed, as Simsek (2018) argued, through entrepreneurial activities refugees may build stronger social connections and aspire to integrate into the host society. Whilst the framework recognizes integration as a non-linear process, it also acknowledges that integration may differ in various

contexts (Ager & Strang, 2010). For instance, *facilitators* and *markers and means* are strongly related to the local context into which refugees are to be integrated. Thus, refugees' economic and social integration may be impaired by contextual factors such as limited availability of language training, verbal and/or physical abuse, and employment discrimination emanating from perceived insecurity within the host society (e.g., Campbell, 2006; Eastmont, 2013; Hainmueller et al, 2016; Montgomery & Foldspang, 2007; McIntosh & Cockburn-Wooten, 2019).

The well-being of refugees was recognized as an important outcome of effective integration (Ager & Strang, 2008) that, nonetheless, may not always be achieved through the refugee integration processes. Refugees represent a societal group that carries traumatic experiences as a result of war and displacement (Jorden et al, 2009) whilst often facing discrimination within the host society. Hence, the process of their integration in the host society is likely to influence their perceived well-being (Sampson and Gifford, 2010). Although much has been written about the negative impact that displacement has had on refugees, less attention was paid to how refugees' perceived well-being may actually be enhanced through the process of their economic and social integration in host societies (Kale, 2019).

Well-being is difficult to define and subsequently to measure, as it is a multi-dimensional, complex construct (Dodge et al, 2012) that is predominantly subjective. Although objective measures have been related to well-being (e.g., health, income, education, expenditure), its subjective connotations led to the majority of studies investigating 'subjective well-being' encompassing several indicators including self-acceptance, pleasure, self-realization, happiness and social satisfaction, among others (Diener et al., 2010; Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Generally speaking, two forms of subjective well-being are recognized in extant literature: a) *cognitive well-being* that refers to satisfaction with life over a long time-

span and b) *hedonic well-being* which refers to shorter and more recent affective states of well-being including happiness (Bhuiyan & Ivlevs 2019). The successful integration of refugees into host societies should ensure that both forms of subjective well-being are achieved through a series of short-term and long-term integration initiatives. For instance, establishing a sense of belonging in the host society was identified as a significant prerequisite of well-being (Correa-Velez et al, 2010). Likewise, policies that promote social inclusion and cultural diversity were found to underpin the well-being of resettled refugee youth (Correa-Velez et al, 2015). In this context, entrepreneurship was identified as a potential route to the improvement of refugees' economic, social and legal integration in host societies (Shneikat & Alrawadieh, 2019) that may enhance the subjective well-being of refugees and their families.

Through entrepreneurship, the integration of refugees, as well as their well-being, can be improved (Wiklund et al, 2019). Improved well-being, in turn, improves the motivation of refugees and their self-esteem creating a feedback loop which reinforces entrepreneurship. Likewise, the economic benefits derived from entrepreneurship as well as the social relations that entrepreneurial activities may foster, can lead to higher perceived well-being among individuals as a result of improved standards of living and health and an optimistic outlook on life among others (Abreu et al, 2019; Hmieleski & Baron, 2009). These studies suggest that refugees need to engage in different entrepreneurial activities in order to succeed with their entrepreneurial endeavors and enjoy the associated benefits. However, it is not known which hospitality and tourism entrepreneurial activities refugees need to engage in at different phases of the entrepreneurship process. In addition, there is little understanding of how hospitality and tourism entrepreneurial activities may contribute to the integration of refugees in the host society and, more importantly, how different entrepreneurial activities contribute

to the improvement of the subjective well-being of refugees and their families (Shneikat & Alrawadieh, 2019). Therefore, this study aims to answer the following research questions:

- What are the ‘social antecedents’ of refugee entrepreneurship within hospitality and tourism and how do they affect integration (economic and social)?
- How does refugee entrepreneurship within hospitality and tourism contribute to integration and well-being?

3. Methodology

3.1. Study context

This qualitative exploratory study was conducted in Turkey (TR) and the United Kingdom (UK). On the one hand, as a developing country and a gateway to the West, Turkey has been receiving an increased flow of refugees from Syria particularly after the agreement with the European Union (EU) in March 2016 (Andritzky et al., 2016). On the other hand, as a developed economy, the UK has historically hosted immigrants and has always been an attractive destination for refugees. However, both case-study countries have been struggling in terms of helping refugees integrate into the wider society (Aras & Duman, 2019; Ostrand, 2015). The number of refugees living in Turkey peaked with the Syrian conflict as the neighboring country became the top refugee-hosting country (Baban et al., 2017). According to the figures released by the General Directorate for Migration Management (GDMM, 2019), for example, after ten years of migration, more than half of the Syrian refugees (around 3.6 million) have settled in Turkey. Comprising over 4 percent of the population, the number of refugees has subsequently exceeded the capacity of refugee camps. Syrian refugees who took shelter in camps imposed a huge burden (estimated US\$30 billion) on the Turkish National Budget while others, living outside of the camps in severe poverty, brought various social, cultural and economic problems.

The UK has long been an attractive destination for refugees fleeing from war, and religious and political oppression. The UK differs from most EU countries as it has traditionally approached the integration of refugees in a pluralistic manner, treating them as “Full and Equal Citizens” while preserving their cultural and religious identity rather than trying to assimilate and naturalize them into the society. This not only leads to economic benefits derived from the successful ventures of these refugees (e.g., Marks and Spencer, Burton Retail) but also results in cultural development (e.g., Sigmund Freud, Victor Hugo) (Shiferaw & Hagos, 2002). Although the UK has become cautious in welcoming refugees, currently hosting around only 12 thousand of the 5.6 million Syrian refugees (Refugee Council, 2018), it has more experience and has more established structures in place to successfully settle and integrate refugees compared to many other countries.

Despite being substantially different in terms of the volume of refugees they host, as well as their refugee management policies, choosing these two countries as case studies stems from the fact that refugee integration, as well as their well-being, are emerging as important themes in public debate both in the UK (Charsley & Spencer, 2019) and Turkey (Erdoğan, 2019). Drawing on the cases of Turkey and the UK not only allows a nuanced understanding of refugee entrepreneurship in two distinct contexts, but it also allows greater generalizability therefore facilitating more accurate implications. It is also useful in entrepreneurship research since it provides support to theory development while also helping to generate new research questions (Getz & Petersen, 2005).

3.2. Research design

This study utilizes an exploratory qualitative approach which has been largely used in recent research endeavors addressing refugee entrepreneurship (Alrawadieh et al, 2019; Bizri, 2017) and is also recommended for research involving integration (e.g., Stuart & Ward, 2011). Our decision to draw on a qualitative research approach stems from the assumption

that academic discussion on refugee entrepreneurship is emerging and notably fragmented. Ahearn (2000) noted that qualitative research is particularly effective in collecting and analyzing data and generating new theories and insights into the feeling and emotions of refugees and vulnerable groups. Therefore, a qualitative approach provides a deeper understanding of the interface between refugee entrepreneurship, integration, and well-being.

3.3. Sampling and data collection

The study draws on data collected from Syrian refugee entrepreneurs venturing into the hospitality and tourism industry in London and Istanbul. In the absence of any complete and reliable listings of Syrian refugee entrepreneurs in these two cities, we relied on different resources to estimate the population size and reach out to participants in both cities. The Turkish sample was drawn from a database of 3504 Syrian refugee entrepreneurs who own businesses in different districts of Istanbul. This unpublished database was obtained from the Istanbul Chamber of Commerce. Estimating the population size in the UK was more challenging. Yet, based on local press, community interest networks (e.g., The Entrepreneurial Refugee Network), social media pages (e.g., Syrian Community in the UK on Facebook), and informal discussions with Syrian refugee shopkeepers, we estimate that currently there are at least 1000 Syrian refugee business owners in different boroughs of London.

After defining the population size, we selected a random sample, stratifying participants to cover various sectors of the hospitality and tourism industry, including food and beverage facilities (e.g., restaurants, cafes), lodging businesses (e.g., boutique hotels, dormitories), travel agencies, and ancillary tourism businesses (e.g., gift shops). The hospitality and tourism industry might be considered an ideal context to explore refugee entrepreneurship due to low entry barriers (e.g., less capital and know-how) and its human intensive-nature, and given that tourism is a popular sector for refugees to venture into

(Alrawadieh et al., 2019). For instance, human capital is an important input in ethnic restaurants and refugees are likely to have large families and access to a large low-cost refugee workforce market. In addition, the hospitality and tourism industry offers intense multi-cultural interaction opportunities thus facilitating refugees' integration whilst enhancing their well-being.

The interview protocol was developed after a thorough review of the hospitality and tourism entrepreneurship literature (Ateljevic & Doorne, 2000; Honggang & Shaoyin, 2014; Lerner and Haber, 2001; Swanson & DeVereaux, 2017; Zhao et al., 2011) as well as existing theoretical assessments on refugee entrepreneurship (Bizri, 2017; Shneikat & Alrawadieh, 2019 Alrawadieh et al., 2019 Wauters & Lambrecht, 2006), refugee integration (Ager & Strangs, 2008; Simsek, 2018) and well-being (Stephan, 2018; Sampson and Gifford, 2010). To obtain a general understanding of refugee entrepreneurial activities, multiple visits were made to Syrian refugee communities and networks both In London and Istanbul. This in-field observation process helped inform the main structure of the interview and identified various Syrian hospitality and tourism businesses. During this phase, the interviews were also piloted on two Turkey-based refugee entrepreneurs to ensure that the potential participants fully understood the final version of the interview questions. Recruiting entrepreneurs is generally challenging (Rutherford et al, 2017), and convincing vulnerable informants such as refugees to take part in an interview is usually uneasy (Hugman et al., 2011). Therefore, we also employed a snowball technique and informants were requested to nominate other potential Syrian refugee entrepreneurs operating in hospitality and tourism. This recruitment strategy was more effective given the absence of complete and up-to-date listings. Moreover, refugees were more willing to participate in the study when they heard others had referred them.

Two inclusion criteria were set to qualify participants in the present study. First, participants should be of Syrian origin who left Syria due to the civil war. Second,

participants should be over the age of 18 and own a registered business in tourism and hospitality based in London or Istanbul. These screening criteria resulted in excluding some entrepreneurs who left Syria before 2011 and several who operate in the informal economy. Interviews lasted for an average of one hour with the shortest lasting 30 minutes and the longest lasting two hours. Among participating refugee entrepreneurs, the vast majority (33) were micro-businesses (one–nine employees), 21 were recent start-ups (less than five years), and 17 had been in operation for five to eight years. Following the discussion of an information sheet and obtaining the consent of each informant, each interview was conducted in either English or Arabic depending on the participant’s preference. Interviews conducted in Arabic were translated into English by one of authors who is bilingual in Arabic and English. All interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed in full immediately after the interview. Each interview covered a wide range of issues including refugee and resettlement experience, entrepreneurship process, challenges faced during this process, and how entrepreneurship impacted upon the informant’s integration and well-being. Some demographics (e.g., family life cycle, education) and business-related information (e.g., capital, state of business, customer profile) were also collected. The interviews were conducted over a period of around four months in Istanbul (from 14 April until 2 June, 2018) and in London (from 28 June until 12 September, 2018). After conducting a total of 38 interviews, the authors agreed that a satisfactory level of saturation was achieved (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) and thus further interviews would have reinforced the emerging insights rather than yielding new ones.

3.4. Data analysis

A deductive coding scheme was used based on Ager and Strangs’ (2008) typology of antecedents of integration and refugee entrepreneurship and well-being literature. First, the authors open-coded the data individually into the stages that define integration (markers and means, social connections, facilitators and foundation) and entrepreneurial activities

(including start-up, growth and break out) as well as indicators of well-being (objective and subjective well-being). This stage involved identifying emerging concepts and grouping them into initial themes to generate the first-order concepts. Participants' own language was used to create in vivo codes. The data analysis continued with axial coding where we looked into the interface between refugee entrepreneurship, integration and their impact on well-being. In this stage, we introduced our interpretations, categorizing first-order concepts into broader second-order themes. Finally, the second-order themes were gathered into aggregate dimensions re-referring to the original data to check our interpretations. Given the large volume of the qualitative raw data combined with the word constraints for this paper, we present an indicative example, with authentic quotations, of how key concepts in the present paper emerged (See table 1).

>>>Insert Table 1 here<<<

This process of discussion and re-categorization informed the identification of relationships between entrepreneurship and integration on each of the predetermined conceptual categories and their aggregate impact on objective and subjective well-being. The themes were then reorganized and integrated in the final model (See Figure 1) displaying the interface between entrepreneurship and integration and how this affects refugees' well-being.

>>>Insert Figure 1 here<<<

4. Findings

4.1. Comparative profile of refugee entrepreneurs across the UK and Turkey

Our findings imply that refugee hospitality and tourism entrepreneurs have some common characteristics. For example, refugee entrepreneurs were comparatively young with

an average age of 39 and they had prior experience of working in the industry back in their home country. They either had a similar business back in Syria or acquired necessary know-how before establishing their own businesses. Some also worked in similar jobs in hosting countries, acquired industry-specific business skills, and developed the human capital to become successful entrepreneurs in the same industry (See Table 2). Pursuing better life conditions, independent and flexible work, and providing for family members were frequent motivations for self-employment. There are also some distinctions among refugee entrepreneurs' profile in the UK and Turkey. Average age is around 43 for Turkey-based refugee entrepreneurs while it is 36 among UK entrepreneurs. Overall, establishing a business took longer in the UK (around 2 years) as opposed to Turkey (less than a year). Notably, all women entrepreneurs in this sample were in the UK. Interestingly, while jobs created by entrepreneurs in Turkey are over four times larger than jobs created by their counterparts in the UK, entrepreneurs in Turkey are apparently more inclined to hire employees on an off-the-books basis and inherently with lower wages.

>>>Insert Table 2 here<<<

4.2. Factors influencing the contribution of entrepreneurship to integration

4.2.1. Language skills of entrepreneurs

When refugees were asked how life could be better in terms of integration within the host society, language is perceived as a key agent not only for integration but also for business success. This was well captured by TR10: *“Being able to communicate in Turkish is essential for my business. It is important to communicate with the customers, suppliers and also with the community”*. Confirming this, UK1 stated *“How can I make a living here and succeed with my business without communicating in English? Customers, community, all communicate in English”*. Being able to communicate in English also helps with the

acceptance of the refugees by the host society. UK3 stated: *"When you speak English and communicate with the customers, you can feel they are more welcoming and tolerant"*. TR14 also confirmed: *"When you speak to Turkish people in their own language, you can feel the mood changes, it gets even better"*. In addition, it was found that 'ability to use the host country's language' helps to cope with the legislation of the host country and understand regulations.

4.2.2. Family and co-ethnic network

Findings revealed that family and co-ethnic networks are crucial both for business start-up and integration. For example, TR10 stated that *"We would not know what to do on a foreign land without our family members and other Syrians"*. UK17 added: *"Imagine living in a foreign country with no relatives, no fellow country people. It would be almost impossible to settle down"*. When we investigated further to establish the levels of support received from the family members and other Syrians, we found that this support was not only for business start-up but also emotional. For example, family members provide their savings as start-up capital and share experience. TR6 opened a restaurant with his three brothers. *"We worked in a Turkish restaurant for almost three years. During these three years, we saved a good amount of money in order to rent our own place. We also asked our father to lend us some money so we could get our job started. We rented this small venue and started working here. Now we are our own boss."*

4.2.3. Relationship with the host communities

The findings of the study showed that hospitality and tourism entrepreneurship is a tool which enhances the social status of refugee entrepreneurs and facilitates strong social connections with the hosts (See Figure 1). For example, UK6 mentioned; *"My English customers are becoming my friends which is good."* TR6 said: *"I have plenty of Turkish customers, this gives me a daily chance to interact with Turks; it helps me understand their*

customs and the way they treat each other so I can avoid mistakes whenever I deal with them.” The multi-cultural structure of both societies, hosts familiarity and interest with different cultures and customer groups were also mentioned as an advantage; UK10 summarized: *“British society is very multicultural. The hospitality and tourism industries act as a platform for social interactions. There is a wide range of ethnicity, religions...multiculturalism in the UK is a big facilitator ... and London is a very lucrative tourism destination”*.

Social bridges that are constructed between entrepreneurs and the members of the host society not only make refugees feel welcomed but also have a positive effect on the economic aspects of integration. UK16 emphasized this: *“If your customers are Syrians, you actually do not need to integrate whatsoever. However, when you have a mixture of customers like my business, integration has many advantages in communicating with and understanding the British customers”*. Findings revealed that entrepreneurs become part of the socio-economic, cultural and political environments of the host societies particularly when they serve the mainstream market. This is not only crucial for long-term survival but also helps with integration. More importantly, if they operate as a family in the running of their businesses, this could help with the integration of the entire family as well. The entire family’s perceptions could change, thus improving understanding between cultures.

4.3. Well-being as an entrepreneurial outcome

Entrepreneurial activities influence not only the processes of integration but also the well-being of entrepreneurs. Both objective (economic) well-being and subjective (psychological) well-being are affected by entrepreneurship. Findings of this study demonstrate that income generated through hospitality and tourism entrepreneurship contributes to the objective well-being of refugees. For instance, refugee entrepreneurs live in better houses in wealthy neighborhoods, send their children to private schools, and receive

private health-care. As TR15 stated: *“I am completely able to fulfill my family’s needs in all aspects. ...both my sons are studying in a private university [...] we have two cars[...].”* It was also found that entrepreneurs feel proud that they are improving the well-being of their fellow co-ethnic community. TR14 for example stated: *“Besides earning money [...], the most important thing that makes me happy is the opportunity to employ Syrians. [...] satisfying the needs of one refugee family.”* TR3 also explained: *“I am careful to treat my employees like my children. These employees look for a better future. The vast majority of them live without their families. It is really hard for them to make a living”.*

Besides access to basic needs such as income, housing, education, food and healthcare, entrepreneurial activities also influence psycho-social factors of entrepreneurs, their immediate families and co-ethnic communities. In particular, interactions and connections with others through their entrepreneurial endeavors help them to recover from the psychological effects of the war. There was also a consensus among the refugees that their venture is a way out of trauma and diversion experienced during war. For example, TR4 stated: *“This business has helped to open a new page in my and my family’s life. It is very much like waking up from a nightmare”.* Supporting this, UK9 indicated: *“Life has started again for us. We feel we are re-born. [...] living in the UK and establishing our business have transformed our lives”.*

5. Discussion

Drawing on the experiences of refugee entrepreneurs, this study explores the interface between hospitality and tourism entrepreneurship, integration, and well-being. The findings identify that the language skills of entrepreneurs, family and co-ethnic networks, and relationships with the host communities as key factors influencing the contribution of entrepreneurship to integration. The findings also show how entrepreneurial activities in the hospitality and tourism industry can significantly contribute to the subjective well-being of

refugee entrepreneurs, and their immediate families and communities. By addressing entrepreneurship, integration, and well-being and delving into their imbrications, this study shifts attention towards the social outcomes of the hospitality and tourism industry and highlights its role in addressing global issues such as that of the refugee crisis.

The findings show how the language skills of entrepreneurs contribute to their integration. Previous hospitality and tourism entrepreneurship literature has identified personality (risk-taking and innovativeness) (Gurel et al., 2010) and demographic (education and experience) (Alrawadieh and Alrawadieh, 2018) characteristics as the key antecedents of entrepreneurial activities. Surprisingly, they have not considered how certain skills and ‘human capital’ such as language influence the entrepreneurial outcome in a multicultural environment with stakeholders from diverse backgrounds within the hospitality industry. This study has shown that the ‘ability to communicate in host country language’ plays an instrumental role in achieving entrepreneurial outcomes such as sales and growth. In terms of the social outcomes though, Ager and Stang (2008) believe that language skills and cultural knowledge are two of the main facilitators of refugee integration. Cortes (2004) also argues that integration results in better language skills and cultural knowledge among the refugee entrepreneurs, which translates into more earnings. This was indeed the case for Syrian refugees who reported they would like to break out of the ‘ethnic enclave’ and target the mainstream market both in Turkey and in the UK. Therefore, many refugee entrepreneurs not only improved their ability to speak the local language but also expected some assistance with their language skills from their co-ethnic employees. Some of them even eliminated this barrier by employing hosts which also improved their understanding of the host culture.

Our findings highlight the role of family and co-ethnic networks in both business startup and integration. These findings go further than the existing hospitality and tourism entrepreneurship literature and demonstrate the importance of informal networks for

entrepreneurial outcomes. Business capital, advice and labor provided by the informal networks help with both the start-up and growth of hospitality and tourism businesses. Bloch and McKay (2015) and Spicer (2008) also found that social capital and networks are crucial to the development and running of businesses as these networks provide business capital, advice and labor. As well as helping entrepreneurs to integrate into the wider business environment and facilitating economic integration, emotional support offered by informal networks helps with the social integration and the motivation of entrepreneurs. TR9 expressed: *“I am still in touch with the Syrian community, they are also part of my customers. I am connected to them because sometimes you need reminders of your homeland. I find this only in my fellow Syrians”*. UK3 stated: *“I can see that there are many Syrians in the same boat as I am. We share the same destiny. We try to make a living. This keeps me going and looking into the future with hope”*.

The emotional value of providing a ready-made sense of belonging and the personal confidence that fellow country people offer is also acknowledged (Losi and Strang, 2008). Family members and fellow country people are a source of hope, familiarity, identity and genuine communication. Social bonds also serve as a familiar environment where refugees share and maintain their cultural habits. Such a connection plays an important role in refugees feeling ‘settled’, particularly during the early stages of integration.

Ager and Strang (2008) claim that expecting refugees to immediately become indistinguishable members of the host society is flawed. They also stated that enclaves improve a sense of belonging and minimize the risk of depression for refugees. Our study went further than previous research and our findings demonstrate that support from family members and other co-ethnic is crucial for both entrepreneurial activities and integration. In fact, our findings show that entrepreneurial activities and integration are interrelated and family and co-ethnic community support act as a foundation for both.

The findings highlight the role of hospitality and tourism entrepreneurship as a tool that has the potential to enhance the social status of refugee entrepreneurs and facilitate their social connections in the hosting communities. In line with the previous hospitality and tourism entrepreneurship literature (Fu et al., 2019), the findings also show that the socio-cultural environment influences entrepreneurial activities. More specifically, as stated by Kline et al. (2020), the findings of this study demonstrate that local community attitudes shape how entrepreneurship is received and supported within that society. This study went further than the existing hospitality and tourism entrepreneurship literature and demonstrates that in a multicultural society hospitality and tourism entrepreneurs need to consider both the economic and social realms of life simultaneously. Economic and social integration is a two-way process and requires the actual participation of entrepreneurs in all aspects of life. Entrepreneurship is a platform for social exchange not only with customers but also with employees, suppliers, competitors and host institutions. The ‘hospitality and tourism’ business space allows them to connect more with the hosts and their subsequent status within the host community separates them from the rest of co-ethnics in the eyes of many local people. Entrepreneurship resulting in enhanced interactions with other communities and organizations also improves social connections through informal networks, local community, customers, suppliers, and government services. Cultural exchange and mutual understanding between entrepreneurs and hosts are also promoted through such interactions.

Our findings are also in line with Berry (1997) who defined integration as preserving ones’ own culture while adapting to the host culture. The findings also provide support to Buchanan et al (2017) who argue that a successful integration only happens when refugees embrace both cultures – *origin* culture and *host* culture. What is surprising in our findings is that refugees need to consider the ‘economic rationale of integration’ as well. Corroborating

this, entrepreneurs serving the mainstream market believe their business success is directly related to integration and serving hosts, in turn resulting in a more efficient integration.

Korac (2003) raised the need to examine the various processes of receiving societies, the level of economic and social participation and their interrelations as we evaluate the extent of integration. Entrepreneurship with all its facets – having a business, running a business, recruiting people, and contributing to the economic and social fabric of the community – demonstrates the extent of engagement and integration. In particular, entrepreneurs who define themselves as successful and who are paying their taxes feel confident, proud, secure and that they belong within the host society. This was well captured by TR19: *“Turkish people welcomed us when no one else did, so I think it is fair to invest and contribute here than move to another country. We work hard and feel proud to contribute to the Turkish economy”*. UK8 also claimed that working hard and contributing to the existing economic system in the UK is something he feels proud of on behalf of his family: *“I do not see myself and my family as a burden anymore to this country. I can feel this in the eyes of the British people. They appreciate that I work hard and I contribute to the economy”*. Entrepreneurial activities act as a platform for both social and economic exchange, and help with mutual learning and understanding, acceptance, reciprocity and tolerance among refugee entrepreneurs and host societies.

The findings of this study also support Strang and Ager’s (2010) arguments that in order to build bridges between bonded groups there needs to be opportunities for people to meet and exchange resources in ways which are mutually beneficial. It is indeed the case that refugee businesses create platforms for both economic and social exchange, thereby helping to build mutual understanding, trust and reciprocity. Entrepreneurial activities constitute a platform for refugees to maintain and strengthen their identity through selling their culture-bound goods and engaging in cultural exchange with tourists, other ethnics or host societies.

Cultural exchange through entrepreneurial activities strengthens social bridges between refugees and the members of the host society.

Finally, this study showcases how the entrepreneurial activities of refugees influence not only their integration but also enhances their objective and subjective well-being. Previous hospitality and tourism entrepreneurship literature identified sales growth, market share and productivity as entrepreneurial outcomes that support income generation (Ateljevic and Doorne, 2000; Naipaul & Wang, 2009; Roxas & Chadee, 2013). This is indeed the case and income generation contributes to the objective well-being of entrepreneurs, their immediate families and co-ethnic employees. This study went further than the existing hospitality and tourism entrepreneurship literature and demonstrated that subjective well-being is an important outcome of entrepreneurial activities.

Entrepreneurial activities not only help with economic integration but also benefit mental health and help with regaining self-esteem and personal dignity. This was captured in the statement of TR14 who stated that: *“Having a job and being able to earn money is a very good feeling. You know that you are productive and able to provide for your family. Moreover, it boosts the sense of confidence through dealing with people especially using a foreign language. Staying at home and doing nothing is slow death to me, I feel energetic when I open my shop every morning.”* More importantly, it was found that entrepreneurs see entrepreneurial activities as a way forward to self-efficiency and gaining self-respect. For example, UK6 noted *“I do feel respected not all the time but I do feel like an equal member of the society, I am working, I am not sitting at home doing nothing, I am working and contributing to this society too.”* Confirming this, a restaurant owner, TR10, said: *‘People respect me because I have a business. I feel proud of myself and my family. People in the community respect us for the hard work and hardship that we have gone through’.*

These findings are in line with studies by Nikolova (2019) and Abreu et al (2019) who found that entrepreneurial activities enhance the subjective well-being of entrepreneurs. What is surprising in this study's findings is that the entrepreneurial activities of hospitality and tourism entrepreneurs influence their perception of themselves, the host society and life in general. These positive feelings, however, come at the expense of them making sacrifices for others. As UK11 put it: *"I feel that my hard work pays off when I see my wife and children happy, when I see that the bread earner makes households happy, this is a great achievement for me"*. UK19 claimed that besides supporting their immediate families, it is the responsibility of Syrians to support each other: *"I am trying to create a home for Syrians away from home through employing them and supporting them financially and emotionally with my business. This makes me feel very happy."* In addition, it was found that entrepreneurial activities help in constructing social bridges with the host society which is one of the main social aspects of economic and social integration as well as improving the well-being of entrepreneurs. This was captured in the statement of UK1: *"We live together with the society here. Besides giving me a sense of belonging to a new society, it gives me the comfort of living and sharing with others. We share the economic and social benefits as well as the burdens of life"*.

These findings demonstrate that while 'intense entrepreneurial activities' may lead to a stressful lifestyle for refugee entrepreneurs venturing into the hospitality and tourism industry, helping others contributes to their subjective well-being. This shows that even challenge stressors that are often experienced by entrepreneurs may have limited negative impact on their well-being (Lerman et al., 2020). Entrepreneurial activities and the resulting sense of achievement not only help with the individual's well-being but also benefit family, the co-ethnic community, and employees. In addition, entrepreneurial activities in hospitality and

tourism create stronger bonds with the host community and improve the social status of refugee entrepreneurs.

6. Implications and conclusions

This paper conceptualizes and qualitatively explores the relationships between entrepreneurship, integration and well-being by looking into the entrepreneurial activities of refugees in the hospitality and tourism industry. By scrutinizing the imbrications between these concepts, this study makes several distinct contributions to hospitality and tourism entrepreneurship literature as well as recent theoretical assessments on refugee entrepreneurship .

6.1.Theoretical implications

First, this study shows that the entrepreneurial activities of hospitality and tourism entrepreneurs contribute to their economic and social integration into the host society. In particular, language ability, family and co-ethnic network, and relationships with host communities contribute to both the entrepreneurial success and the integration of the entrepreneurs. It became apparent that ability to communicate in the host country's language helps with business transactions but also helps with the acceptance of entrepreneurs by the host societies. Family and co-ethnic networks provide financial support, information and human capital to entrepreneurial endeavors and also constitute a source of hope, familiarity, identity and genuine communication, thus helping refugees feel settled during the early stages of the integration process. Relationships and social bridges constructed with host communities make entrepreneurs feel welcomed but also help them break out to the mainstream market.

Second, this study shows that entrepreneurial activities influence both the objective and subjective well-being of the entrepreneurs, their families, and broader society. This study provides empirical evidence demonstrating the spillover effect of entrepreneurship in society. It has become apparent that entrepreneurial activities affect both the objective and subjective

well-being of the entrepreneurs. Hospitality and tourism entrepreneurship gives entrepreneurs a sense of achievement and improves their perceptions of themselves and the host society. In particular, entrepreneurial activities help refugees to recover from the trauma of war, protect their mental health, and regain self-esteem and personal dignity. They, however, work under tremendous stress in order to help with the well-being of their families and fellow country people. Entrepreneurial achievements and helping others, including fellow country people, creates a strong sense of pride and improves their social status.

This study makes two specific contributions to the existing literature. First, by identifying the factors which influence the contribution of refugee entrepreneurship to integration, the study captures the social antecedents of entrepreneurship and showcases their role in the social and economic integration of refugee entrepreneurs. Consequently, the study extends our understanding of how contextual and environmental conditions shape entrepreneurs' experiences and activities (Kaaristo, 2014; Honggang & Shaoyin, 2014). In doing so, the study responds to a recent call for research into forced immigrant entrepreneurs as a distinct type of entrepreneurs worth of nuanced understanding (Dabić et al., 2020).

Second, this study examines how entrepreneurship within hospitality and tourism contributes to the integration and well-being of refugees. In doing so, the study not only contributes to an emerging stream of research delving into the role of the hospitality and tourism entrepreneurship in facilitating integration (Shneikat & Alrawadieh, 2019; Alrawadieh et al., 2019), but it also responds to recent calls for further research into entrepreneurs' well-being (Bhuiyan & Ivlevs 2019; Wiklund et al., 2019). While existing scant literature addressing the interface between entrepreneurship and well-being tends to focus on non-economic lifestyle hospitality and entrepreneurs (Peters & Schuckert, 2014; Peters et al., 2019), our study shows how necessity-driven entrepreneurship also contributes to the well-being of refugees and their immediate families. Overall, the present study contributes

to an emerging stream of research addressing entrepreneurship as an antecedent of subjective well-being (Nikolaev et al., 2020; Stephan, 2018) and adds to the ongoing discussion addressing the imbrication between entrepreneurial activity and entrepreneurs' well-being (Lerman et al., 2020; Bichler et al., 2020; Carree & Verheul, 2012).

6.2. Practical implications

This study suggests some practical implications for policy. Overall, this study concludes that entrepreneurship, integration and well-being are mutually inclusive. They co-evolve within the social and economic fabric of the host communities, as refugee entrepreneurs face economic, social and cultural challenges in their entrepreneurial endeavors. Therefore, policy-makers need to consider both the social and economic antecedents and the outcomes of entrepreneurial activities in the hospitality and tourism industry. This will help with the development of appropriate incentives, support and infrastructure mechanisms to nurture and grow entrepreneurial activities geared towards the transformation of refugee entrepreneurs, their immediate families as well as the wider community. To facilitate the integration of refugee entrepreneurs, policy-makers should direct efforts toward improving the language skills of these entrepreneurs, enhancing family and co-ethnic networking, and improving their relationship with the host communities. To achieve this, governmental bodies (e.g., municipalities) and other stakeholders (e.g., NGOs) may provide training opportunities and language courses that target refugee entrepreneurs, their employees, and their immediate families. These programs should be designed and implemented in such a way as to ensure maximum participation and greater involvement given that entrepreneurs are likely to be extremely busy in their businesses. These programs may not only contribute to the improvement of the entrepreneurs' language skills but may also serve as a social platform for refugee entrepreneurs to meet and build relationships with their co-ethnics. Finally, stronger social connections with host communities through entrepreneurship should be viewed as a

crucial opportunity to achieve integration. Policy makers should therefore encourage refugee entrepreneurs who aspire to break out of the ‘ethnic enclave’ and target the mainstream market. This may be achieved through supporting entrepreneurs who are venturing into mainstream market through the allocation of more incentives directed toward this segment as compared to enclave entrepreneurship.

Results from this study indicate that refugees’ entrepreneurial activities can potentially have positive spillover effects on their subjective well-being. Therefore, encouraging entrepreneurship not only helps to generate economic benefits for entrepreneurs and their family, but it also enhances their quality of life. An obvious implication is that policy-makers should view entrepreneurship as an instrument to enhance the well-being of refugees thus reducing dependency on local welfare systems including healthcare services. For instance, governmental bodies and other funders providing financial support for refugee rehabilitation and healthcare centers may consider assigning part of their financial resources to promote entrepreneurial endeavors of refugees even in their very naïve forms (e.g., handcraft). Building stronger relationships with both nascent and established refugee entrepreneurs and using these networks to help vulnerable segments within refugees may also be incorporated into these rehabilitation and healthcare centers’ internal policies.

6.3.Limitations and areas of future research

This study has some limitations which may encourage and direct future research endeavors. The study adopts an exploratory qualitative approach drawing on a relatively small sample of Syrian refugees in Turkey and in the UK. Therefore, generalizing the findings to refugee entrepreneurs in other countries and sectors of the economy should be approached with caution. Relatedly, findings from this study may be refined and re-validated using quantitative, mixed-methods, or innovative research designs. Furthermore, participants recruited in the current investigation had businesses in different sub-sectors within the

hospitality and tourism industry (e.g., restaurants, hotels, gift shops). Assuming homogeneity among these sub-sectors may be misleading. Therefore, future research may provide a more nuanced understanding of the imbrication between entrepreneurship, integration, and well-being by focusing on specific sub-sector(s) within the industry. Finally, there seems to be an opportunity to examine the entrepreneurial activities of refugees and their outcomes from the perspective of the entrepreneurs' immediate families, employees and community.

References

- Abreu, M., Oner, O., Brouwer, A., & van Leeuwen, E. (2019). Well-being effects of self-employment: A spatial inquiry. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34(4), 589-607.
- Ager, A., & Strang, A. (2008). Understanding integration: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 21(2), 166-191.
- Ahearn, F. L. (2000). *Psychosocial wellness of refugees: Issues in qualitative and quantitative research* (Vol. 7). Berghahn Books.
- Alrawadieh, Z., & Alrawadieh, Z. (2018). Exploring entrepreneurship in the sharing accommodation sector: Empirical evidence from a developing country. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 28, 179-188.
- Alrawadieh, Z., Karayilan, E., & Cetin, G. (2019). Understanding the challenges of refugee entrepreneurship in tourism and hospitality. *The Service Industries Journal*, 39(9-10), 717-740.
- Altinay, L. (2010). Market orientation of small ethnic minority-owned hospitality firms. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(1), 148-156.
- Altinay, L., & Altinay, E. (2006). Determinants of ethnic minority entrepreneurial growth in the catering sector. *The Service Industries Journal*, 26(2), 203-221.
- Altinay, L., Madanoglu, M., Daniele, R., & Lashley, C. (2012). The influence of family tradition and psychological traits on entrepreneurial intention. *International Journal of hospitality management*, 31(2), 489-499.
- Altinay, L., Song, H., Madanoglu, M., & Wang, X. L. (2019). The influence of customer-to-customer interactions on elderly consumers' satisfaction and social well-being. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 78, 223-233.
- Andritzky, J., Aretz, B., Christofzik, D. I., & Schmidt, C. M. (2016). *Influx of refugees: Integration as a key challenge* (No. 09/2016). Arbeitspapier.
- Aras, B., & Duman, Y. (2019). I/NGOs' assistance to Syrian refugees in Turkey: Opportunities and challenges. *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, 21(4), 478-491.
- Ateljevic, I., & Doorne, S. (2000). 'Staying within the fence': Lifestyle entrepreneurship in tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 8(5), 378-392.
- Baban, F., Ilcan, S., & Rygiel, K. (2017). Syrian refugees in Turkey: Pathways to precarity, differential inclusion, and negotiated citizenship rights. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 43(1), 41-57.
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology*, 46(1), 5-34.

- Bhuiyan, M. F., and Ivlevs, A. (2019). Micro-entrepreneurship and subjective well-being: Evidence from rural Bangladesh. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34(4), 625-645.
- Bichler, B. F., Kallmuenzer, A., & Peters, M. (2020). Entrepreneurial ecosystems in hospitality: The relevance of entrepreneurs' quality of life. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 44, 152-161.
- Bizri, R. M. (2017). Refugee-entrepreneurship: a social capital perspective. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 29(9-10), 847-868.
- Bloch, A., & McKay, S. (2015). Employment, social networks and undocumented migrants: The employer perspective. *Sociology*, 49(1), 38-55.
- Bosworth, G., & Farrell, H. (2011). Tourism entrepreneurs in Northumberland. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(4), 1474-1494.
- Buchanan, Z. E., Abu-Rayya, H. M., Kashima, E., & Paxton, S. J. (2017). The interconnection between acculturation and subjective and social wellbeing among refugee youth in Australia. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 30(4), 511-529.
- Calero-Lemes, P., & García-Almeida, D. J. (2020). Immigrant entrepreneur knowledge in the tourism industry of island destinations. *Tourism Geographies*, 1-25.
- Carree, M. A., & Verheul, I. (2012). What makes entrepreneurs happy? Determinants of satisfaction among founders. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 13(2), 371-387.
- Charsley, K., & Spencer, S. (2019). Understanding integration processes: informing policy and practice, *Policy Report 44*. Available online: <https://www.bristol.ac.uk/media-library/sites/policybristol/PolicyBristol-PolicyReport-44-Jan19-integration.pdf> (Accessed 10 February 2020).
- Cortes, K. E. (2004). Are refugees different from economic immigrants? Some empirical evidence on the heterogeneity of immigrant groups in the United States. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86(2), 465-480.
- Dabić, M., Vlačić, B., Paul, J., Dana, L. P., Sahasranamam, S., & Glinka, B. (2020). Immigrant entrepreneurship: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 113, 25-38.
- Desai, S., Naudé, W., & Stel, N. (2020). Refugee entrepreneurship: context and directions for future research. *Small Business Economics*, 1-13.
- Diener, E., Wirtz, D., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi, D. W., Oishi, S., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2010). New well-being measures: Short scales to assess flourishing and positive and negative feelings. *Social Indicators Research*, 97(2), 143-156.

- Dodge, R., Daly, A. P., Huyton, J., & Sanders, L. D. (2012). The challenge of defining wellbeing. *International journal of wellbeing*, 2(3), 222-235.
- Elo, M., & Dana, L. P. (2019). Embeddedness and entrepreneurial traditions. *Journal of Family Business Management*. 2043-6238.
- Erdoğan, M. M. (2019). Türkiye'deki Suriyeli mülteciler, Konrad Adenauer Stiftung, Available online:
<https://www.kas.de/documents/283907/7339115/T%C3%BCrkiye%27deki+Suriyeliler.pdf/acf9d37-7035-f37c-4982-c4b18f9b9c8e?version=1.0&t=1571303334464> (Accessed 10 February 2020).
- Farmaki, A., & Christou, P. (2019). Refugee migration and service industries: advancing the research agenda. *The Service Industries Journal*, 39(9-10), 668-683.
- Fu, H., Okumus, F., Wu, K., & Köseoglu, M. A. (2019). The entrepreneurship research in hospitality and tourism. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 78, 1-12.
- GDMM, (2019). Gecici koruma (Temporary Protection). Accessed at http://www.goc.gov.tr/icerik3/gecici-koruma_363_378_4713 on 02.01.2019.
- Getz, D., & Petersen, T. (2005). Growth and profit-oriented entrepreneurship among family business owners in the tourism and hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 24(2), 219-242.
- Glancey, K., & Pettigrew, M. (1997). Entrepreneurship in the small hotel sector. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 9 (1), 21-24.
- Glaser, B.G. and Strauss, A.L. (1967), *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*, Aldine Publishing Company, New York, NY.
- Gurel, E., Altınay, L., & Daniele, R. (2010). Tourism students' entrepreneurial intentions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(3), 646-669.
- Hallak, R., & Assaker, G. (2013). Family vs. non-family business owners' commitment to their town: A multigroup invariance analysis. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 18(6), 618-636.
- Hmieleski, K. M., & Baron, R. A. (2009). Entrepreneurs' optimism and new venture performance: A social cognitive perspective. *Academy of management Journal*, 52(3), 473-488.
- Honggang, X., & Shaoyin, M. (2014). Regional environment of destination and the entrepreneurship of small tourism businesses: A case study of Dali and Lijiang of Yunnan province. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 19(2), 144-161.

<https://cdn.americanprogress.org/content/uploads/2016/12/12102316/SyrianImmigrants-brief.pdf> (Accessed 13 February 2020).

Hugman, R., Pittaway, E., & Bartolomei, L. (2011). When 'do no harm' is not enough: The ethics of research with refugees and other vulnerable groups. *The British Journal of Social Work, 41*(7), 1271-1287.

Ivanov, S., & Stavrinoudis, T. A. (2018). Impacts of the refugee crisis on the hotel industry: Evidence from four Greek islands. *Tourism Management, 67*, 214-223.

Jaafar, M., Abdul-Aziz, A. R., Maideen, S. A., & Mohd, S. Z. (2011). Entrepreneurship in the tourism industry: Issues in developing countries. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 30*(4), 827-835.

Jorden, S., Matheson, K., & Anisman, H. (2009). Supportive and unsupportive social interactions in relation to cultural adaptation and psychological distress among Somali refugees exposed to collective or personal traumas. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 40*(5), 853-874.

Kaaristo, M. (2014). Value of silence: mediating aural environments in Estonian rural tourism. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change, 12*(3), 267-279.

Kale, A. (2019). Building attachments to places of settlement: A holistic approach to refugee wellbeing in Nelson, Aotearoa New Zealand. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 65*, 101315.

Kallick, D. D., Roldan, C., & Mathema, S. (2016). Syrian Immigrants in the United States. Available online:

Kallmuenzer, A., Kraus, S., Peters, M., Steiner, J., & Cheng, C.-F. (2019). Entrepreneurship in tourism firms: A mixed-methods analysis of performance driver configurations. *Tourism Management, 74*, 319-330.

Kline, C., Duffy, L., & Clark, D. (2020). Fostering tourism and entrepreneurship in fringe communities: Unpacking stakeholder perceptions towards entrepreneurial climate. *Tourism and Hospitality Research, 20*(1), 3-17.

Koh, K. Y., & Hatten, T. S. (2002). The Tourism Entrepreneur: The overlooked player in tourism development studies. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration, 3*(1), 21-48.

Korac, M. (2003). Integration and how we facilitate it: A comparative study of the settlement experiences of refugees in Italy and the Netherlands. *Sociology, 37*(1), 51-68.

- Koutsou, S., Notta, O., Samathrakakis, V., & Partalidou, M. (2009). Women's entrepreneurship and rural tourism in Greece: Private enterprises and cooperatives. *South European Society and Politics*, 14(2), 191-209.
- Kwaramba, H. M., Lovett, J. C., Louw, L., & Chipumuro, J. (2012). Emotional confidence levels and success of tourism development for poverty reduction: The South African Kwam eMakana home-stay project. *Tourism Management*, 33(4), 885-894.
- Lerman, M. P., Munyon, T. P., & Williams, D. W. (2020). The (not so) dark side of entrepreneurship: A meta-analysis of the well-being and performance consequences of entrepreneurial stress. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*. <http://doi.org/10.1002/sej.1370>.
- Lerner, M., & Haber, S. (2001). Performance factors of small tourism ventures: The interface of tourism, entrepreneurship and the environment. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(1), 77-100.
- Losi, N and Strang, Alison (2008) IntagraRef: Local communities and refugees, fostering social integration. Project Report. Institute for International Health and Development. Available online: https://eresearch.qmu.ac.uk/bitstream/handle/20.500.12289/1240/eResearch_1240.pdf?sequence=1 (Accessed 4 February 2020).
- Mawson, S., & Kasem, L. (2019). Exploring the entrepreneurial intentions of Syrian refugees in the UK. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 25(5), 1128-1146.
- McCabe, S., & Johnson, S. (2013). The happiness factor in tourism: Subjective well-being and social tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 41, 42-65.
- McCabe, S., Joldersma, T., & Li, C. (2010). Understanding the benefits of social tourism: Linking participation to subjective well-being and quality of life. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 12(6), 761-773.
- McIntosh, A., & Cockburn-Wootten, C. (2019). Refugee-focused service providers: improving the welcome in New Zealand. *The Service Industries Journal*, 39(9-10), 701-716.
- Memili, E., Patel, P. C., Koç, B., & Yazıcıoğlu, İ. (2020). The interplay between socioemotional wealth and family firm psychological capital in influencing firm performance in hospitality and tourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 34, 100651.
- Naipaul, S., & Wang, Y. (2009). Entrepreneurship and leadership in hospitality. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 21(6), 639-658.
- Nasr, L., & Fisk, R. P. (2019). The global refugee crisis: how can transformative service researchers help?. *The Service Industries Journal*, 39(9-10), 684-700.

- Nikolaev, B., Boudreaux, C. J., & Wood, M. (2020). Entrepreneurship and subjective well-being: The mediating role of psychological functioning. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 44(3), 557-586.
- Ostrand, N. (2015). The Syrian refugee crisis: A comparison of responses by Germany, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States. *Journal on Migration and Human Security*, 3(3), 255-279.
- Paraskevas, A., Brookes, M., & Altinay, L. (2019). Global refugee crisis and the service industries. *The Service Industries Journal*, 39(9-10), 663-667.
- Pesonen, J., & Komppula, R. (2010). Rural wellbeing tourism: Motivations and expectations. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 17(1), 150-157.
- Peters, M., & Schuckert, M. (2014). Tourism entrepreneurs' perception of quality of life: an explorative study. *Tourism Analysis*, 19(6), 731-740.
- Peters, M., Kallmuenzer, A., & Buhalis, D. (2019). Hospitality entrepreneurs managing quality of life and business growth. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 22(16), 2014-2033.
- Qin, Q., Wall, G., & Liu, X. (2011). Government roles in stimulating tourism development: A case from Guangxi, China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 16(5), 471-487.
- Refai, D., Haloub, R., & Lever, J. (2018). Contextualizing entrepreneurial identity among Syrian refugees in Jordan: the emergence of a destabilized habitus?. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 19(4), 250-260.
- Refugee Council. (2018). *Top 20 Facts about Refugees and Asylum Seekers*. Accessed August 17, 2018. <https://www.refugeecouncil.org.uk/20facts>
- Rivera, M. A. (2019). Anti-immigrant sentiments in the hospitality industry: A research agenda in flux? *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 82, A1-A2.
- Roxas, B., & Chadee, D. (2013). Effects of formal institutions on the performance of the tourism sector in the Philippines: The mediating role of entrepreneurial orientation. *Tourism Management*, 37, 1-12.
- Russell, R., & Faulkner, B. (2004). Entrepreneurship, chaos and the tourism area lifecycle. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 556-579.
- Rutherford, M. W., O'Boyle, J. R., H, E., Miao, C., Goering, D., & Coombs, J. E. (2017). Do response rates matter in entrepreneurship research? *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 8, 93-98.
- Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(4), 719-727.

- Sampson, R., & Gifford, S. M. (2010). Place-making, settlement and well-being: The therapeutic landscapes of recently arrived youth with refugee backgrounds. *Health & place*, *16*(1), 116-131.
- Shepherd, D. A., Covin, J. G., & Kuratko, D. F. (2009). Project failure from corporate entrepreneurship: Managing the grief process. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *24*(6), 588-600.
- Shiferaw, D., & Hagos, H. (2002). *Refugees and progression routes to employment*. London: Refugee Council.
- Spicer, N. (2008). Places of exclusion and inclusion: Asylum-seeker and refugee experiences of neighbourhoods in the UK. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *34*(3), 491-510.
- Stephan, U. (2018). Entrepreneurs' mental health and well-being: A review and research agenda. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *32*(3), 290-322.
- Strobl, A., & Peters, M. (2013). Entrepreneurial reputation in destination networks. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *40*, 59-82.
- Stuart, J., & Ward, C. (2011). A question of balance: Exploring the acculturation, integration and adaptation of Muslim immigrant youth. *Psychosocial Intervention*, *20*(3), 255-267.
- Swanson, K. K., & DeVereaux, C. (2017). A theoretical framework for sustaining culture: Culturally sustainable entrepreneurship. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *62*, 78-88.
- Szivas, E. (2001). Entrance into tourism entrepreneurship: a UK case study. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, *3*(2), 163-172.
- Tajeddini, K., Ratten, V., & Denisa, M. (2017). Female tourism entrepreneurs in Bali, Indonesia. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, *31*, 52-58.
- Tsartas, P., Kyriakaki, A., Stavrinoudis, T., Despotaki, G., Doumi, M., Sarantakou, E., & Tsilimpokos, K. (2020). Refugees and tourism: a case study from the islands of Chios and Lesbos, Greece. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *23*(11), 1311-1327.
- Uysal, M., Sirgy, M. J., Woo, E., & Kim, H. L. (2016). Quality of life (QOL) and well-being research in tourism. *Tourism Management*, *53*, 244-261.
- Wauters, B., & Lambrecht, J. (2006). Refugee entrepreneurship in Belgium: Potential and practice. *The International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *2*(4), 509-525.
- Wauters, B., & Lambrecht, J. (2008). Barriers to refugee entrepreneurship in Belgium: Towards an explanatory model. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *34*(6), 895-915.
- Wiklund, J., Nikolaev, B., Shir, N., Foo, M. D., & Bradley, S. (2019). Entrepreneurship and well-being: Past, present, and future. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *34*(4), 579-588.
- Wong, P. K., Ho, Y. P., & Autio, E. (2005). Entrepreneurship, innovation and economic growth: Evidence from GEM data. *Small business economics*, *24*(3), 335-350.

- Wood, M. S., Bylund, P., & Bradley, S. (2016). The influence of tax and regulatory policies on entrepreneurs' opportunity evaluation decisions. *Management Decision*, 54(5), 1160-1182.
- Zenker, S., von Wallpach, S., Braun, E., & Vallaster, C. (2019). How the refugee crisis impacts the decision structure of tourists: A cross-country scenario study. *Tourism Management*, 71, 197-212.
- Zhao, W., & Ritchie, J. B. (2007). Tourism and poverty alleviation: An integrative research framework. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10(2-3), 119-143.
- Zhao, W., Ritchie, J. B., & Echtner, C. M. (2011). Social capital and tourism entrepreneurship. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(4), 1570-1593.
- Zhou, L., Chan, E., & Song, H. (2017). Social capital and entrepreneurial mobility in early-stage tourism development: A case from rural China. *Tourism Management*, 63, 338-350.

Table 1: Indicative example of the data analysis process

Excerpt	Initial coding	Themes	Concept
“He [my father] is the one who raised me and taught me values and ethics especially in the business field. A person like him who started from ground zero is a perfect example for inspiration” [TR10]	Emotional value from family members	Belongingness	Family and co-ethnic network
“When you see your plans are being achieved exactly like you have thought, you feel proud of yourself. I do feel positive toward my business” [TR4].	Feeling positive about one’s achievements	Self-actualization	Subjective well-being
“My English customers are becoming my friends which is good” [UK6]	Local customers as friends	Improved relationships	Social Integration

Table 2. Descriptive profile of the refugee entrepreneurs in hospitality and tourism

Code	Age	Education	Gender	Arrival Date	Entry Date	Type of business	Number of Employees	Previous experience
TR1	38	BA	Male	2013	2013	Dessert Shop	3	Yes
TR2	26	BA	Male	2014	2014	Travel agency	2	No
TR3	54	HS	Male	2012	2012	Restaurant	8	Yes
TR4	50	BA	Male	2012	2012	Cafe shop	4	Yes
TR5	49	HS	Male	2013	2013	Cafe shop	4	Yes
TR6	27	HS	Male	2014	2014	Restaurant	5	Yes
TR7	52	HS	Male	2011	2013	Cafe shop	16	Yes
TR8	32	HS	Male	2014	2016	Restaurant	7	Yes
TR9	56	BA	Male	2013	2013	Cafe shop	1	Yes
TR10	37	BA	Male	2014	2014	Restaurant	6	Yes
TR11	51	HS	Male	2014	2014	Cafe shop	3	Yes
TR12	53	BA	Male	2015	2016	Restaurant	9	Yes
TR13	46	BA	Male	2013	2013	Cafe shop	4	Yes
TR14	29	BA	Male	2011	2014	Travel agency	25	Yes
TR15	55	HS	Male	2014	2015	Catering	30	Yes
TR16	40	BA	Male	2011	2011	Pastry shop	5	No
TR17	35	BA	Male	2015	2016	Travel Agency	7	No
TR18	43	HS	Male	2015	2016	Cafe shop	2	Yes
TR19	57	HS	Male	2012	2014	Hotel	9	Yes
UK1	43	BA	Female	2014	2015	Restaurant	2	No
UK2	20	HS	Female	2016	2017	Gift shop	2	No
UK3	39	BA	Female	2015	2016	Event planning	1	Yes
UK4	20	HS	Female	2015	2018	Food cart	0	No
UK5	21	HS	Male	2015	2016	Food cart	0	No
UK6	25	HS	Male	2015	2017	Gift shop	2	No
UK7	48	HS	Male	2017	2017	Pastry shop	0	Yes
UK8	59	BA	Male	2013	2013	Hotel	9	Yes
UK9	54	HS	Male	2014	2017	Gift shop	0	Yes
UK10	57	BA	Male	2013	2015	Cafe shop	4	Yes
UK11	33	BA	Male	2014	2016	Hotel	15	Yes
UK12	27	BA	Male	2014	2016	Travel agency	3	Yes
UK13	38	BA	Male	2011	2012	Restaurant	15	Yes
UK14	40	BA	Male	2013	2018	Cafe shop	4	Yes
UK15	30	BA	Male	2012	2017	Catering	0	Yes
UK16	32	BA	Male	2011	2017	Restaurant	3	No
UK17	42	HS	Male	2012	2014	Souvenir shop	2	No
UK18	25	BA	Male	2011	2018	Souvenir shop	2	No
UK19	31	MS	Male	2012	2016	Cafe shop	6	No

Figure 1. Interface between Hospitality and Tourism Entrepreneurship of Refugees, Integration and Well-being

