Abstract
Purpose – For the developed economies in Europe, to which refugees move, and as refugees’ enterprising expectations evolve, emerging cognitive factors have become closely intertwined with their post-arrival encounters. However, the link between refugees’ social cognition and entrepreneurship commitment tends to be overlooked. This paper aims to join the international debates regarding cognitions of refugee entrepreneurship and explain the bewildering effects of refugees’ social cognitive dissonance on refugee business support.

Design/methodology/approach – This paper reviews the extant knowledge of refugee entrepreneurship and refugee business support. It synthesizes the literature on cognitive dissonance, multiple embeddedness and hospitality to inform a conceptual model and explain the ramifications of refugees’ entrepreneurial cognition on refugee business support and how public attitudes in the destination transform accordingly.

Findings – This paper illustrates the prevalent imbalance between the provision of support and refugees’ anticipations in developed economies. A conceptual toolkit is framed to disclose the succeeding influence of cognitive dissonance on the performances of refugee business support. This framework indicates that the cognitive dissonance could elicit heterogeneous aftermath of refugee business support service, resulting in a deteriorated/ameliorated hospitality context.

Originality/value – This conceptual toolkit unfolds cognitive ingredients in the refugee entrepreneurship journey, providing a framework for understanding refugee business support and the formation of hospitality under cognitive dissonance. Practically, it is conducive to policymakers nurturing rational refugee anticipation, enacting inclusive business support and enhancing hospitality in the host country.
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Introduction
As the refugee waves evolve, refugee entrepreneurial activities progressively serve as an essential component of the integration initiatives. What follows is a growing academic concern for refugee entrepreneurship (e.g. individual agency, obstacles, motivations and individual/social capital). Fruitful economic activities warrant refugees’ self-reliance and relate to the compatibility between the regional economy and the cost of supporting refugees (UNHCR, 2017). The existing literature confirms that the inclination towards entrepreneurship of ethnic minorities is more prominent than the locals (Nontenja and Kollamparambil, 2018). Compared with economic migrants, refugees are less likely to return to their homeland (Bizri, 2017). Therefore, supporting refugee entrepreneurship through
tailed institutional intervention is an imperative policy agenda for the host regime (Harima et al., 2019a).

As a discipline derived from migration scholarship, refugee entrepreneurship has received more widespread research attention in the past ten years. As a result, several streams spring up and constitute the scholarship.

Recently, scholars have emphasised the value of entrepreneurship for refugees’ self-reliance in the realm of economic integration (Shneikat and Alrawadieh, 2019; Heilbrunn and Iannone, 2020). As a result, multiple spheres of refugee entrepreneurship have been demarcated. For instance, the contextual barriers of refugee entrepreneurship (Kachkar, 2019; Embiricos, 2020), the opportunity structure and social capital of refugee entrepreneurship (Kloosterman and Rath, 2010; Elliott and Yusuf, 2014; Bizri, 2017), the diversified refugee business and narratives (Harima et al., 2021), policy intervention and social support services (Meister and Mauer, 2019; Boenigk et al., 2021), resilience, aspiration and psychological characteristics of refugee entrepreneurs (Vlasov et al., 2018; Heilbrunn et al., 2019; Shepherd et al., 2020).

Numerous published works have referred to the term “refugee business support” (RBS), which implies exogeneous empowerment for refugee entrepreneurs and businesses and is customarily used to couple refugees’ barriers and entrepreneurial capital (Alrawadieh et al., 2019; Osman, 2020; Boenigk et al., 2021). RBS generally serves as an instrumental concept in academic discourse, bridging resource spheres and refugee entrepreneurs’ plight. Although RBS activities have been discussed in conjunction with contextual capital, the extant knowledge unexpectedly omits the influence of dysfunctional cognitions on the entrepreneurial engagement of refugees, which may lead to highly inconsistent business support outcomes. This confirms the phenomenon mentioned by Heilbrunn et al. (2019) that the research themes of refugee entrepreneurship are highly dependent on context, which is embodied in scarce theoretical interweaving.

Practically, in many popular developed European destinations, business support for ethnic minorities is not a panacea. It does not always lead to prosperous refugee entrepreneurial outputs (Harima et al., 2019a; Desai et al., 2021) or a hospitable environment. Taking the United Kingdom as an example, social actors such as TERN, MENTA, ACH, regional GrowthUPs and local authorities all manage the methodical RBS schemes. However, according to the Overseas Development Institute, Britons’ general attitude towards refugee assistance is the most negative in Europe, while they have a considerably positive attitude towards economic migrants (ODI, 2019).

The current research spheres call for the nascent theoretical contribution to expand scholars and decision-makers’ understanding of RBS, disclosing antecedents of divergent RBS performance from refugees’ cognition perspective. Grounded on cognitive dissonance theory and refugee entrepreneurship scholarship, this article proffers an implicit “enterprising route of refugees” under cognitive dissonance through interdisciplinary theoretical construction, explaining the interconnections between heterogeneous entrepreneurial engagement and individual cognition. The purpose of this paper is to answer the following questions:

Q1. What prevalent mechanisms of cognitive dissonance are formed when potential refugee entrepreneurs migrate to distant developed economies?

Q2. How refugees’ evolutionary cognition affects their engagement when they receive business support provision?
Q3. How is the public attitude towards refugee entrepreneurs/refugee assistance regulated owing to various support outcomes?

Q4. How to investigate this domain further in future academic works?

The theoretical toolkit proposed by this article identifies a novel anchor for highlighting the role of cognitive literature in the refugee entrepreneurship debate, namely RBS. This article contributes to the theoretical exploration of the cognitive interventions of RBS and corresponding contextual consequences. Thus, it further augments the scarce synthesis of refugee entrepreneurship and cognitive science. Concerning the cognitive dimension of refugee entrepreneurship, employing cognitive dissonance in the context of forced migration is a breakthrough, which highlights the cognitive dilemma of refugee entrepreneurs and bridges the support policy research of refugee entrepreneurship and literature on refugees’ cognition. By positioning RBS as the intersection of policy intervention and entrepreneurial needs of refugees, this article also embraces an emerging stance that understands refugees’ entrepreneurial outcomes and dynamic public attitudes from a cognitive lens. In practice, the framework proposed in this article underlines the necessity of nurturing rational refugee entrepreneurial expectations and illustrates the criteria and strategies needed for designing inclusive RBS.

This article first reviews the state of the art in refugee entrepreneurship scholarship and conceptualises business support in the forced migration context. It identifies cognitive dissonance by integrating the refugee literature with the cognitive dissonance theory, encompassing its diametrical influences on refugee entrepreneurs. Multiple embeddedness is critically introduced to supplement the worrying cognitive dissonance phenomenon in RBS provision. Likewise, the public consequences of refugee entrepreneurship support under cognitive dissonance are also brought to the table, solidifying the value of developing inclusive business support on the supply side and applying expectation management on the demand side to effectuate refugee entrepreneurship.

Refugee entrepreneurship
Refugee entrepreneurship research is dedicated to inquiring about refugees’ livelihood and self-reliance (Desai et al., 2021). Although the term refugee entrepreneurship can be traced back to the end of the 20th century, it has still not been subject to adequate interdisciplinary theoretical investigation (Shneikat and Alrawadieh, 2019; Desai et al., 2021). Regarding its state of the art, differentiated barriers faced by refugee entrepreneurs and immigrant entrepreneurs have become the silver bullet for navigating emerging theoretical constructs. Recently, many scholars have reiterated that forced immigrant entrepreneurs should be regarded as an independent object rather than a subcategory of economic immigration (Harima et al., 2019a; Embiricos, 2020; Heilbrunn and Iannone, 2020; Harima et al., 2021).

Appertaining to the above argument, the motivation for refugees to engage in entrepreneurial activities has been studied widely (de la Chaux and Haugh, 2020; Almohammad et al., 2021). Social disadvantage theory is widely employed to explicate the plight in the refugee community and antecedents of self-employment (Alrawadieh et al., 2019; Kazlou and Wennberg, 2021). Structural disadvantages and precarious livelihoods imperil the survival of refugees, making refugees resort to entrepreneurship for a living (Obschonka and Hahn, 2018; Hack-Polay and Igwe, 2019; Heilbrunn et al., 2019; Embiricos, 2020).

The social network and cultural capital theory (Pillai and Ahamat, 2018; Liscio and Farrelly, 2019; Brieger and Gielnik, 2021) is primarily recruited to examine the entrepreneurial capital that refugees could access, thus confirming the existence of precariousness and the necessity of supportive policies. Ethnic network and resources have
been confirmed their superiority in early-stage entrepreneurship (Lugosi and Allis, 2019). Heilbrunn et al. (2019) and Harima et al. (2021) also compiled the most advanced refugee entrepreneurship paradigm. They compared entrepreneurial paradigms between refugee entrepreneurs and immigrants. In addition to the ethnic enclaves and middleman, they identified emerging trends, including refugee social entrepreneurship, refugees’ creative industries and high-skilled entrepreneurship.

With the increasing entrepreneurial attempts of refugees, longitudinal research projects on the dynamic plight of refugee entrepreneurs have also flourished. The research project launched by The Human Safety Net and Impact Hub in early 2020 revealed the disadvantages of refugee entrepreneurs of Europe in entrepreneurial knowledge, financing, social networks, cultural exclusivity and institutional procedures, which call for an inclusive exogenous intervention (THSN, 2021). Likewise, the BFURE research project carried out by Refai et al. (2021) investigated Syrian refugee entrepreneurs in the UK and showcase refugees’ austerity in social networking, legal familiarity, lack of credit background and policy barriers.

The terminology in the aforementioned research projects also symbolises the rise of a novel branch in refugee entrepreneurship. They allude to RBS to demonstrate the significance of the exogenous intervention for refugee entrepreneurs to overcome obstacles. However, the intrinsic theoretical construction of RBS has not been detailed, nor has it been defined in the context of forced migration.

**Refugee business support**

The semantics of business support is commonly used in the small business management literature. However, it is highly contextualised, whose connotation undergoes adjustment as the supporter and receiver change. Mount and Mulk (2007) portrayed it in the entrepreneurial context as a service that the public and private sectors offer necessary information, skills and capital support for the survival and scale-up of local start-ups. For small firms, business support serves as resource-based subsidies, referring to the exogenous benign intervention of enterprises. The drivers for support schema include eliminating obstacles to survival and “pulling” prosperity to catalyse the regional economy (Cravo and Piza, 2019).

In the aforementioned forced displacement contexts, refugees’ obstacles could emanate from regulatory oppression, psychological trauma, personal narrative (George, 2010) and dissonance caused by high expectations of journeys and destinations (De Vos and Singleton, 2020). In the entrepreneurial context of forced migration, business support commits to providing ethnic minority entrepreneurs with improved exogenous contexts and enhanced endogenous capital necessary for successful entrepreneurship (Stephens, 2013; Harima et al., 2019a).

In addition to the public and private sectors, other providers of RBS also include social organisations dedicated to improving the economic activities of disadvantaged groups (Osman, 2020). The themes of RBS mainly involve entrepreneurial knowledge and management upskilling (Meister and Mauer, 2019), entrepreneurial information delivery (Harima et al., 2019a), language and cultural training (Embiricos, 2020; Heilbrunn and Iannone, 2020), social networks (Brizi, 2017), institutional literacy (de Lange et al., 2020; THSN, 2021) and financing support (Osman, 2020; Refai et al., 2021). Based on the practical claims and explanations in the existing literature, RBS is defined in this article as: A series of business assistance services provided by the social actors and the entrepreneurial ecosystem to tackle the obstacles faced by refugee entrepreneurs or refugee-founded start-ups and mitigate the structural disadvantages.
It can be seen that the majority of the refugee entrepreneurship literature has made outstanding contributions in identifying and responding to the plight of refugee entrepreneurs. They attempt to illustrate the influence of exogenous resources on supportive schemas. Nevertheless, these works are rarely used to explain how to position and monitor the corresponding RBS paradigms (Desai et al., 2021). Moreover, although refugee entrepreneurship has gradually been intertwined with cognition literature (Obschonka and Hahn, 2018; Shepherd et al., 2020), the intricate intervention of the cognition dimension on RBS is still highly neglected. Therefore, the state of RBS literature also confirms the necessity of the theoretical construction of this article.

Cognition doctrine in refugee entrepreneurship literature

Although the influence of refugees’ cognition on RBS has not been identified, there are some influential psychological considerations in the refugee entrepreneurship sphere. Shepherd et al. (2020) explored the life of Palestinian refugees in Lebanon. They find that refugee entrepreneurs could generate resilience after tribulation; they have ambitious and anchored goals but received insufficient exogenous support. The discourse of Shepherd et al. (2020) legitimises this article in two dimensions. First, they identified the differential resilience gained by entrepreneurs inside and outside the refugee camp. Refugees outside possess more accessibility to social capital and form resilience, which is not the case for refugees inside the camp. Also, the social structure in which the refugees live intervenes in the formation of cognitive resilience. This also means that it is necessary to unveil how refugees’ cognition works in more complex and unfamiliar advanced economies. Second, Mawson and Kasem (2019) and Shepherd et al. (2020) both highlighted the divergence between refugees’ aspirations for career development and their plight, which may further inform dissonance in the cognitive dimension.

Besides, proper entrepreneurial cognition is viewed as a decent psychological bridge between refugees and self-employment activities, helping them engage in entrepreneurship (Obschonka and Hahn, 2018). However, trauma and bleak prospects intimately relate to refugees’ negative perceptions of the future (Park et al., 2018; van Heemstra et al., 2020). For example, even the label “refugees” may symbolise these newcomers (Adeeko and Treanor, 2021). Therefore, it is dangerous to neglect the role of dysfunctional refugee cognition in their enterprising journey, which more insights are required to uncover the affections of dysfunctional cognition on refugee entrepreneurship.

Therefore, the questions of how refugee entrepreneurs deal with the differences between their life and anticipations, and how their engagement within provided business services varies accordingly, is a promising research direction.

Cognitive dissonance

The theory of social cognitive dissonance was first proposed by Festinger (1957). He pointed out that when humans face a new context or make life decisions, the gap between their perceived reality (behaviour) and expectations (beliefs) could lead to mental tension and psychological discomfort. Cognitive dissonance can induce self-regulation to relieve discomfort, but not everyone has the ability to do so (De Vos and Singleton, 2020). Correspondingly, the inability to control self-dissonance leads to continuous depression and counter attitudinal behaviour (McGrath, 2017).

When cognitive dissonance occurs, it affects regular emotional expression and causes discomfort (Bran and Vaidis, 2020). This negative emotional state destroys progression in personal life and decision-making, so it is critical to discuss the causes and consequences of cognitive dissonance from a theoretical perspective (Kenworthy et al., 2011). To distinguish
the different stages of cognitive consistency further, Hinojosa et al. (2017) proposed a four-step process to depict the unfolding of cognitive dissonance. The four steps are discrepancy formation, dissonance, motivation and discrepancy reduction.

According to the above theoretical insights, cognitive dissonance and cognitive discrepancy are not equivalent. When humans perceive the divergence between two (or more) cognitions, cognitive discrepancy begins to form. Cognitive dissonance describes how humans feel (psychologically and physically) after being affected by the cognitive discrepancy. However, it is worth noting that cognitive dissonance is not a mental state that can be evaded and rejected. It also provides momentum for humans to pursue cognitive coherence continuously (Hinojosa et al., 2017). The impact of cognitive dissonance on the effective work or actions often prompts people to explore mental pivot, thereby trying different strategies to alleviate dissonance (Harmon-Jones et al., 2009). However, it might not be easy to mitigate dissonance appropriately.

Festinger (1957) introduced two typological exemplars of cognitive discrepancies. First, when humans perceive that the value of their actions conflicts with their desired goals (Harmon-Jones et al., 2015). Second, when humans’ speech or behaviour conflicts with their original beliefs, they could feel psychological gaps and discomfort (Metin and Camgoz, 2011).

**Intertwinement with refugee business support**

Van Heelsum (2017) discovered the contradiction between the growing refugee aspirations in The Netherlands recently and the support capabilities the host country can provide. Within the influx, refugees with a professional background and qualification are more common in many popular destinations, many of whom are middle class and senior intellectuals (ibid). Many refugees who look forward to restarting their careers in a new destination often have overly optimistic beliefs for the support and resettlement capability of the developed economies (ibid).

The empirical observations compiled by Van Heelsum (2017), on the one hand, reveal that due to the international image of developed countries and “word of mouth”, many newcomers have biased insights of the placement services available for their post-migration lives. After arrival, refugees’ entrepreneurial journey and their aspirations turn out to be inconsistent. The ontological homogeneity hypothesis for refugees and migrants is the implicit impetus behind the picture (Heilbrunn and Iannone, 2020). Although developed nations can provide decent business support initiatives for local small firms and some migrant entrepreneurs, there is insufficient academic evidence and policy intervention to reflect the refugee’s distinctive entrepreneurial barrier (ibid). For instance, the legal restrictions on refugee self-employment, precarious social identity (De Jager, 2015), the unprepared forced migration (Wauters and Lambrecht, 2008), limited capital and cultural knowledge (Heilbrunn and Iannone, 2020), detached ethnic networks (Lyon et al., 2007), psychological trauma (Volkan, 2018), and even severe xenophobia and discrimination (Getmansky et al., 2018) are all unique plight of refugee entrepreneurs. Therefore, the awareness and existence of business support cannot automatically indicate exceptional inclusive support for refugees.

Thus, over-optimistic beliefs and imagination (e.g. financial independence, food safety, living environment, cultural and social interaction) are formed. When refugee entrepreneurs form over-optimistic expectations of their social influence based on forthcoming support and self-background, cognitive discrepancy and dissonance are easily triggered by the reality that refugees have to keep dealing with unexpected hinderances within the support initiatives. If they cannot handle the cognitive dissonance properly, their entrepreneurial
engagement could easily be adversely affected. The potential dialectical interconnection between dissonance and the status quo of RBS is shown in Figure 1 below.

Due to the elevated risks of transnational cognitive dissonance, this article chiefly engages with the phenomenon of refugee entrepreneurship in the developed regions of Europe. However, the contextual formation logic of cognitive dissonance should not be neglected. As Shepherd et al. (2020) and Adeeko and Treanor (2021) mentioned, the perception of refugee entrepreneurs is highly attached to the context. Concerning the transnational dimension, taking Europe as an example, as the condition gap between homeland and the host country increases, it provides solid antecedents for cognitive dissonance: conflict between the larger institutional dissimilarities/barriers faced by refugee entrepreneurs (Harima et al., 2021) and the overestimated aspirations for their life ahead (Van Heelsum, 2017).

In contrast, for refugee entrepreneurs migrating to neighbouring or emerging economies, the host country’s institutional environment, language and cultural customs are easier to grasp (Harima et al., 2021). With the provision of limited services, it is easier for entrepreneurs to form a rational post-arrival vision. The other prominent factor that may affect the cognitive dissonance of refugee entrepreneurs is camping. Entrepreneurs who are more integrated into local life are more likely to develop cognitive resilience and better manage cognitive dissonance (Shepherd et al., 2020). On the other hand, camping may nurture the cognitive morass of isolation, post-traumatic stress and low social participation (Nasiroglu et al., 2018; van Heemstra et al., 2020).

Therefore, paying attention to the outcomes of cognitive dissonance from the perspective of RBS also means that as the phenomenon of cognitive dissonance changes, so does the demand for policy intervention.

**Cognitive discrepancy reduction**

Another cognitive antecedent for divergent RBS outcomes is the personalised dissonance reduction strategy that refugees adopt. Cognitive dissonance acts as a catalyst to push individuals to pursue change (Harmon-Jones and Mills, 2019). Given McGrath’s (2017) work on humans’ cognitive discrepancy reduction strategy, refugees might derive several nuanced response mechanisms: rationalise their self-belief to accommodate support activities or construct similarities between their expectation and proffered activities, distract themselves by engaging with other daily tasks, refuse to participate in supportive schemes, or enrol in satisfied programmes to avoid dissonance.

The gap between refugee aspiration and actual support capability begins to shrink when refugee beliefs transit rationally or consonant with proffered support, thereby reducing the unpleasant emotions of refugees. However, the remaining methods are all worrying in the short run, destructing refugees’ preoccupation. Advanced inclusive programs call for long-term investment of time, funds and knowledge to develop tailored services. However,
inaction or engaging with alternative activities might hinder refugees’ progress in entrepreneurship, even exacerbate their cognitive dissonance afterwards.

In summary, even if refugee entrepreneurs can employ endogenous instincts to reduce cognitive dissonance, personalised strategies may lead to a varied level of engagement of refugees with RBS. Actively changing attitudes is conducive to maintaining the balance between cognition and reality and committing to provided RBS. In contrast, resistance can alleviate cognitive dissonance in the short-term, but it profoundly hinders the refugee entrepreneurship. Therefore, based on the theory of cognitive dissonance, the cognitive factors that affect outcomes of RBS can be sorted into two categories:

1. Due to inherent psychological trauma and migration experience, refugees may not effectively alleviate cognitive dissonance, resulting in continuous depression, discomfort and inefficiency.
2. Refugees adopt different strategies to alleviate cognitive dissonance. Individualised strategies can improve refugees’ engagement but can also trigger resistance to entrepreneurial support initiatives.

Refugees and migrants: emerging embeddedness perspective

Mixed embeddedness theory (Kloosterman, 2010) portrays the trajectory of migrant entrepreneurship, which digs into the institutional framework (Turkina and Thi Thanh Thai, 2013). However, its dichotomous structure-agency makes it challenging to define the interaction between context and individual agency, and the relations between various spatial structures embedded by entrepreneurs are not measured (Sepulveda et al., 2011). In other words, in the phenomenon of intrinsic refugee entrepreneurship, the intersection between theoretical variables is likely to be ignored.

Many studies are dedicated to expanding the embeddedness perspective and refer to individual backgrounds to respond to super-diversity (Sepulveda et al., 2011; Ram et al., 2013; Barberis and Solano, 2018; Bagwell, 2018; Harima et al., 2021). Scholars have found that, for economic activities and social integration, refugees do not have the same advantages and resistance when compared to migrant communities (Ruiz and Vargas-Silva, 2018). Therefore, ignoring individual agency and refugee journeys are dangerous for positioning contextual variables.

Hence, for avoiding the pitfall of structural deterministic nature, this article further referred to refugee narratives of Heilbrunn et al. (2019), Harima et al’s (2021) refugee multiple embeddedness, and the work of Santamaria-Velasco et al. (2021) about the effect of refugee journeys on their entrepreneurial aspirations. This section follows the timeline of entry, transit and exit to compare the individual agency and structural disadvantages of refugees and migrants in entrepreneurship to highlight the imperative of inclusive business support. (Figure 2)

Entry phase divergence

Refugee entrepreneurs and migrants both look forward to a better life in the host country (Sandberg et al., 2019). However, there are still significant differences between refugee and migrant entrepreneurs’ economic outputs and entrepreneurial opportunities (Heilbrunn and Iannone, 2020). The amalgamation of multiple embeddedness (Harima et al., 2021) and the migration timeline (Boenigk et al., 2021) can reflect on refugees and migrant entrepreneurs’ individual characteristics as well as the divergent institutional barriers they face.
In the model of Boenigk et al. (2021), the entry phase is defined as the occurrence of forced migration. The urgency of evacuation often prevents refugees from having a lucid plan (Santamaria-Velasco et al., 2021). A lack of investigation and research on the destination (Alrawadieh et al., 2019) also contributes to irrational expectations.

Unlike the continuity preparation and career planning of migrants, refugee entrepreneurs hardly transfer their academic qualifications and professional experience into the host society (Bizri, 2017). The precarious status also restricts refugees’ personal credit and accessible business networks (Santamaria-Velasco et al., 2021). Moreover, migrant entrepreneurs are more likely to maintain contact with their homeland (Riddle and Brinkerhoff, 2011), which is a challenge for evacuated refugees (Wauters and Lambrecht, 2008).

Transition divergence
The transit phase is defined as the refugees’ voyage to the host country (Boenigk et al., 2021), which can be excruciating for refugee entrepreneurs. For example, Harima et al. (2019b) summarised the journey of a Syrian refugee entrepreneur to Germany: the war and gunfire around Syria triggered their flee, and the protagonist had to take a rubber dinghy by sea. The language barrier and camping also caused him great mental stress, and the lack of medical resources almost took his life.

Therefore, unlike the planning ahead undertaken by migrant entrepreneurs, most refugees have limited travel methods. Geopolitical factors, affordability and family all regulate their voyage. Benezer and Zetter (2015) argue that the dangerous journey further develops refugees’ emotional vulnerability. Moreover, human trafficking and illegal slavery have posed a danger to their lives (Brekke and Aarset, 2009). For entrepreneurs with trauma, their mental states, such as emotional management and value recognition, should be paid attention to (Uribe-Toril et al., 2019). Mandiberg (2016) also mentioned targeted business support and incubator services need to be adapted to help entrepreneurs with trauma.
Exit divergence (post-arrival)

The exit phase is the post-arrival period for refugees until either their integration or return to their homeland. Compared with migrants, identity and recognition instability leads to a lack of security for refugees (Ayadurai, 2011). While the refugee camps provide a prerequisite for many new arrivals to socialize, locating refugee camps far away from cities restricts refugees’ resource accessibility and the necessary interaction with the host market (Kreichauf, 2018).

The labour market discrimination faced by refugees is widespread (Jabbar and Zaza, 2016). Even in entrepreneurship, refugees’ precarious status makes it more difficult to obtain any form of credit guarantee to obtain financing (Sandberg et al., 2019). Moreover, the lack of capital and capability reduces the possibility for refugees to engage in specific business activities (Alrawadieh et al., 2019). Due to the limited access to information, the structure of social capital and the available opportunities is even more constrained (Heilbrunn and Iannone, 2020). As a result, refugees have to enter low-threshold businesses to strive for livelihood (Kloosterman and Rath, 2010).

Interconnections with cognitive dissonance

The dialectical relationship shown in Figure 3 is put forward to map the context and inform RBS. The literature on tailored business support services for refugees is overlooked. The debate about inclusive minority business support is still far from adequate (Lam et al., 2019). Therefore, with limited theoretical underpinnings, business support actors with migrants and locals as clients can hardly provide the anticipated inclusive services for refugees.

This section indicates that the personal narratives and passive migration journey shape diverse refugee individuals. Hence, it is perilous to treat refugee entrepreneurs simply as a subset of migrants, which might lead to a discordant relationship between supply and demand and worsening dissonance. Meanwhile, cognitive dissonance and possible trauma further inhibit entrepreneurial activities. Once the contradiction of cognition deepens, the refugees’ ability to deal with cognitive dissonance further varies their engagement levels with support initiatives.

Hostility and hospitality building

Hospitality has been integrated into the discourse of migration research. It is the policy rhetoric and also the policy itself (Boano and Astolfo, 2020). This section describes the
dialectical relationship between RBS outcomes and the hospitable context, uncovering the profound impact of the cognitive dissonance on refugee entrepreneurial journeys.

Instead of labelling refugees only as guests, hospitality symbolises that the host society embraces these travellers and facilitate their belonging (Darling, 2014). However, hospitality is not an unshakable regulation. Diven and Immerfall (2018) used the United States as an example to discuss the dynamic transition between hospitality and hostility. They regard the 9/11 incident as a watershed in the transition from refugee assistance to refugee monitoring. Due to public events and information dissemination, the locals develop opposing views towards specific ethnic groups, thus enhancing political hostility. Such measures significantly weaken the host country’s commitment to refugees, both economically and socially (ibid).

Debates in the international community have caused many scholars to enquire about the triggers and consequences of hospitality building. Hospitality does not mean indulgence. On the contrary, hospitality signifies the apparent dualism between host and guest (Derrida and Dufourmantelle, 2000) and informs a welcoming social orientation. It is reflected in the positive attitude of government statements towards refugees with potential contributions (Darling, 2014). Therefore, optimistic and pessimistic public attitudes are sourced differently. The ODI (2019) mentioned that the public forms a collective attitude based on a group narrative. Positive refugee narratives include regional economic contributions, ethnic assets and acculturation. In contrast, negative narratives may remind locals of the threatened security and encroached resources.

The dialectical structure of Figure 4 could divulge the role of RBS in the hospitality building. First of all, business support in the generic sense is a service sector of the host society. Business support organisations for refugees are usually non-profit social enterprises, and their financing methods are often substantiated on regional public and private funds (EMEN 2020a). For example, ACH (project-related regional/national funds) and TERN (25 % public bid, 50% private contribution) in the UK (EMEN, 2020b; ACH, 2021).

Supporters’ financing structure determines the gratuitous nature of their support. Under the preconditions of financing models, if the entrepreneurial activities’ output is massively disproportionate relative to the input of RBS, it may result in a negative public opinion (resource encroachment). Also, entrepreneurial failure might limit refugees’ opportunities to interact with locals/markets in the foreseeable future. Self-reliance, confidence and social enthusiasm may be impacted further.

Many cases show successful nascent refugee entrepreneurs are often better at establishing a solid social network with locals (Şimşek, 2020). Therefore, positive public opinion and transparent cultural exchanges could root in favourable RBS. The successful
nascent enterprises also help their founders become self-reliant and create value for the local economy, influencing the local employment structure and well-being (Jones et al., 2019).

Media often acts as a bridge for cross-cultural information exchange between refugees and locals (Kaufmann, 2018). The media spotlights successful refugee entrepreneurship practices and further disseminates, which could be developed into a positive refugee narrative. According to Darling (2014) and Wike et al. (2016), the relativity between the two narrative styles regulates the public’s attitude. The positive public attitude is more beneficial for establishing a lasting hospitality context at the micro-level, such as a more friendly neighbourhood, smooth acculturation and a sense of belonging (Elliott and Yusuf, 2014).

Towards a dynamic model of economic integration route
Supporting refugee entrepreneurship is not only a call on the policy agenda. It cannot be separated from hospitality provided by the local public (Boenigk et al., 2021). Although the RBS provision could be treated as a manifestation of hospitality, the influences caused by entrepreneurial output could also trigger an enhanced or diminished hospitable context. Cognitive dissonance theory serves as an emerging theoretical underpinning of the heterogeneous outcomes in RBS. The dialectical interweaving between cognitive dissonance, refugee-focused embeddedness, and hospitality building informs and supports a dynamic model that revolves around RBS, as shown in Figure 5.

This model attempts to provide emerging insights into business support initiatives in the refugee entrepreneurial journey through an interdisciplinary lens. In the three phases of the model, social cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957; McGrath, 2017), embeddedness theory (Kloosterman, 2010; Boenigk et al., 2021; Harima et al., 2021; Santamaria-Velasco et al., 2021) and the hospitable context (Darling, 2014) are linked. As one of the crucial ways of promoting refugees’ entrepreneurship, RBS concatenates the three topics and weaves them into the refugees’ entrepreneurial journey.

Specifically, the quality and content of business support are the core of the model throughout. The hasty departure prevented refugees from developing a deep understanding of the host country’s refugee resettlement policies and context, which paved the way for cognitive dissonance in terms of individual demands. Due to the divergent obstacles between refugees and migrants, the quantity of existing migrant business support activities and academic output cannot perfectly meet refugee entrepreneurs’ expectations. Therefore, variable supportive schemes trigger cognitive dissonance and further lead to the inhibitory effect of negative emotions on refugees’ well-being. Although it is the individual’s instinct to reduce disharmony, the several reduction methods disclosed in the existing literature also

![Figure 5. Positionality model of refugee business support and public attitude under cognitive dissonance theory](image-url)
further facilitate/exacerbate refugees’ engagement within support schemes, resulting in positive/negative entrepreneurial outputs.

Regarding entrepreneurship outcome examination, cognitive dissonance interferes with the economic activities of refugees. Decent economic activities provide refugees with a positive narrative in the host communities, media neighbourhood. On the contrary, stagnant economic activities trigger the discussion about resource encroachment. Grounded on the conceptualized hospitality, two-fold refugees’ narratives could shape public attitudes, thereby constituting hospitable or hostile conditions.

Therefore, it can be seen that the entrepreneurial divergence between refugees and migrants under the multiple embeddedness theory consolidates the rationality of this model. This model echoes the empirical evidence of group differences and refugees’ high expectations. As an anchor, the underdeveloped inclusive RBS triggers and exposes the effects of the cognitive dissonance on entrepreneurship, resulting in different refugee narratives in developed countries. The connections between the refugee narratives and the public attitude of the host society have also further enlarged the profound influence of cognitive dissonance on refugees’ entrepreneurial journey.

This model deepens the role of cognitive theory in affecting the outcomes of refugee entrepreneurship and builds a dynamic route for the antecedents and consequences of cognitive dimension in refugee entrepreneurship. It innovatively applies cognitive theory to how refugee entrepreneurs perceive supportive interventions in unfamiliar advanced economies, which expands Mawson and Kasem (2019) and Sherpherd et al. (2020)’s research into the resilience and demand of refugee entrepreneurs. Also, the model resonates with emerging refugee entrepreneurship literature, evidences the existence of cognitive dissonance in the RBS process and characterises the profound social impact of this dissonance emanated from RBS. Therefore, the raised enterprising route model contributes massively to the cognitive dimension of the academic evaluation of entrepreneurial support policies for refugees, which also stimulates understanding of diversified refugee entrepreneurship and plight by combining individual agency and social context.

Conclusion and future research
This article is keenly aware of the conflicts between the changing refugee backgrounds, improvement of refugee expectations and actual RBS activities in developed destinations. Furthermore, inconsistencies between the RBS dissemination and the public attitude towards refugee support have also become increasingly prominent.

The interdisciplinary approach in this article locates the model at the crossroads of multiple theoretical debates. The interweaving of multiple embeddedness and refugee journeys reveals divergent characteristics between refugees and migrants (Ruiz and Vargas-Silva, 2018; Harima et al., 2021). Studies on social cognition have focused on mental health and recovery after refugee migration, but its connection with RBS services and refugee entrepreneurial activities is still absent. Therefore, when these theories are synthesized with business support initiatives, the emerging entrepreneurial journey regulated by cognitive theory is revealed.

For theoretical construction, this article responds to the call for distinguishing refugees and migrants in venture creation and unveils influences of the cognitive dissonance on refugee entrepreneurship. The combination of social cognition and RBS also provides a nascent anchor for applying social cognitive theory in enquiries into refugee entrepreneurship.

It also provides an opportunity for policymakers and practitioners to filter inclusive RBS provision systematically and emphasise quality rather than quantity. For example, while continuing to optimise inclusive refugee support services, decision-makers shall guide refugees to establish rational awareness and aspiration through legitimate information
dissemination and policy intervention, thereby pursuing the relative balance between supply and demand after their arrival.

For future research, the proposed model could trigger empirical investigations of cognitive dissonance in refugee entrepreneurship. The three phases of the positionality model could navigate multiple interdisciplinary empirical designs. Concerning the formation of dissonance, future research can identify the antecedent, severity of the cognitive dissonance of refugee entrepreneurs with various backgrounds and their response measures. For example, investigating what differences there are between the host society and homeland (geopolitical factors, culture, individual agency, economy) significantly contributes to the cognitive dissonance of refugee entrepreneurs, or collecting narrative data to examine how diversified refugee entrepreneurs deal with cognitive dissonance. The empirical evidence of such enquiries can provide insights for the host country to rationalise refugee expectations and deploy psychological support services on the ground.

In the second phase, researchers can adopt a longitudinal methodology to examine, in a specific context, which personal/context attributes of refugee entrepreneurs (professional experience, education, family, social identity, media opinion, compatriot network) mediate the impact of the cognitive dissonance on their engagement in RBS. Alternatively, researchers could employ ethnographic methods to verify how the cognitive engagement of refugee entrepreneurs changes with the inclusiveness of RBS. Such research questions can evidence the inclusive RBS policy of the host country and enact intervention widely.

In the third phase, strategies such as netnography can be applied to compare public attitudes in assessing refugee entrepreneurial output within divergent contexts, namely advanced economies and emerging economies. Quantitative methods can also be used to verify dialectical relationships between nascent businesses, public attitudes and RBS investments. Exploring the factors affecting refugee narratives and catalyse the conversion between hospitality and hosting is conducive to developing solid RBS services and ameliorating the structural disadvantages of refugee entrepreneurs.
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