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In 1999, AnnaLee Saxenian published the first study to provide a quantitative analysis of the economic contributions of high-skilled immigrants in Silicon Valley. In “Silicon Valley’s New Immigrant Entrepreneurs,” she examined the transnational circulation of capital and labor of Silicon Valley’s economy during the 1980s and 1990s. She found that immigrants comprised one-third of the region’s scientific and engineering workforce. Moreover, in 1998, Chinese and Indian engineers were responsible for operating one-quarter of technology businesses in the region, accounting for more than $16.8 billion in sales and 58,282 jobs. At the time of its release, the report succeeded in validating the prevailing belief that immigrants were major contributors to the U.S. economy and the high-tech industry.

Finding that the period from the 1980s and 1990s had experienced such a vast upswing in the number of immigrant-founded companies, Saxenian surmised that the growth rate of immigrant entrepreneurship would continue to accelerate in subsequent decades. Her initial forecasts were ultimately proven right. In 2007, a study conducted by researchers at Duke University and the Berkeley School of Information, drawing on Saxenian’s earlier work, concluded that high-skilled immigrants were playing an even more expanded role than before as the driving forces of technological innovation and capital growth. The study found that, between 1995 and 2005, 52 percent of high-tech companies started in Silicon Valley.

The 2007 study also examined companies founded between 1995 and 2005 nationwide. Researchers found that 25.3 percent of these engineering and technology companies had at least one key founder who was foreign-born. In 2005, these immigrant-founded companies collectively generated roughly $52 billion in sales and employed 450,000 workers. These findings were documented in a paper titled, “America’s New Immigrant Entrepreneurs.”

A subsequent research project analyzed the backlog of immigrants in the United States waiting for legal permanent residence visas, or green cards, as these commonly are called, was about a decade. The researchers saw reason for concern and forecast that this wait increasingly would lead to these workers getting frustrated and returning home or moving to other countries. The prediction of a “reverse brain drain” was published in a Kauffman Foundation paper titled, “Immigrants, Intellectual Property, and the Reverse Brain-Drain—America’s New Immigrant Entrepreneurs, Part III.”

To test this hypothesis and to learn whether the trend of increasing immigrant entrepreneurship in the technology sector had continued, researchers at Duke University, the Berkeley School of Information, and Stanford University conducted a follow-up study to the 2007 report to determine what has happened to the rate of immigrant entrepreneurship from 2006 to 2012. Here we present our findings.

This study examined the complex relationships between immigration and economic development in an increasingly globalized economy. It sought to update the findings of the 2007 report by analyzing whether changes in the pace of immigrant entrepreneurship have occurred. Out of a total of 107,819 engineering and technology companies founded in the last six years, it examined a random sample of 1,882 companies to identify whether a key founder was foreign-born.

The study found that, for the first time in decades, the growth rate of immigrant-founded companies has stagnated, if not declined. In comparison with previous decades of increasing immigrant-led entrepreneurism, the last seven years has witnessed a flattening out of this trend. The proportion of immigrant-founded companies nationwide has dropped from 25.3 percent to 24.3 percent since 2005. While the margins of error of these numbers overlap, they nonetheless indicate that immigrant-founded companies’ dynamic period of expansion has come to an end.

We also performed a special analysis of Silicon Valley, which is widely known as the international hub for technological development and innovation. The findings indicate that 43.9 percent of Silicon Valley startups founded in the last seven years had at least one key founder who was an immigrant. This represents a notable drop in immigrant-founded companies since 2005, when 52.4 percent of Silicon Valley startups were immigrant-founded.
Below is a summary of the key findings about engineering and technology companies founded in the United States between 2006 and 2012:

- 24.3 percent of these companies had at least one key founder who was foreign-born. In Silicon Valley, this number was 43.9 percent.
- Nationwide, these companies employed roughly 560,000 workers and generated $63 billion in sales in 2012.
- Of the total of immigrant-founded companies, 33.2 percent had Indian founders, up about 7 percent from 2005. Indians have founded more such companies than immigrants born in the next top seven immigrant-founder-sending countries combined.
- The top ten sending countries of immigrant entrepreneurs in descending order were India (33.2 percent), China (8.1 percent), the United Kingdom (6.3 percent), Canada (4.2 percent), Germany (3.9 percent), Israel (3.5 percent), Russia (2.4 percent), Korea (2.2 percent), Australia (2.0 percent), and the Netherlands (2.0 percent).
- The 458 immigrant-founded companies sampled collectively created a total of 9,682 jobs. They employed an average of 21.37 workers.
- While the mix of immigrants varies by state, Indians tend to dominate the immigrant-founding groups of the top six states with the greatest representation of immigrant founders.
- The states with the highest concentration of immigrant-founded companies were California (31 percent), Massachusetts (9 percent), Texas (6 percent), Florida (6 percent), New York (5 percent), New Jersey (5 percent).
- Some immigrant groups showed a greater tendency to start companies in particular states. Of Indian-founded companies, 26 percent were founded in California and 8 percent in Massachusetts. Of Chinese-founded companies, 40 percent were founded in California and 16 percent in Maryland. While immigrant groups tended to concentrate the most in California, German immigrants demonstrated a preference for starting businesses in Ohio (22 percent), followed by California (17 percent).
- Across engineering and technology fields, immigrant entrepreneurs displayed the greatest concentration in the innovation/manufacturing-related services (45 percent) and software (22 percent) fields.

This study demonstrates that the rate of immigrant entrepreneurship nationwide has plateaued. Silicon Valley remains the rubric against which national trends in the technology sectors are measured. That the proportion of immigrant founders in the Silicon Valley has declined since 2005 should raise questions about the United States’ future ability to remain economically competitive in the international market.
Background on U.S. Immigration

The 2010 American Community Survey from the U.S. Census Bureau shows that 12.9 percent of the U.S. population was foreign-born.¹ This equates to nearly 40 million foreign-born living in the United States. Immigrants from Latin America make up the largest portion of this group at 53.1 percent, followed by those from Asia (28.2 percent) and Europe (12.1 percent). Figure 1 displays the countries of birth for foreign-born individuals living in the United States in 2000 and 2010.

Immigrant populations vary considerably by state. California has the highest percentage, with 25.4 percent of the state’s 2010 population being foreign-born, followed by New York, with 10.8 percent; Texas, with 10.4 percent; and Florida, with 9.2 percent. The lowest foreign-born state populations are in the west/Midwest and southern states. A full state breakdown of this Census data is presented in Figures 2 and 3.

According to the Census bureau, more than one in four California residents and more than one in five residents of New York and New Jersey were foreign-born. Additionally, about 74 percent of all foreign-born residents lived in ten states, with the remaining forty states (and the District of Columbia) sharing 2 percent or less of the remaining foreign-born population.

Figure 1
Countries of Birth of the U.S. Foreign-Born Population in 2000 and 2012 (Includes Data from Groups with 500,000 or More Individuals Living in the U.S. in 2000)

1. http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tablesservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS_10_1YR_DP02&prodType=table
Figure 2
Foreign-Born Population for Individual States: 2010
Data based on sample. For information on confidentiality, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www.census.gov/acs/www/.

![Map showing foreign-born population distribution by state in 2010.]


Figure 3
Foreign-Born Population for Individual States: 2010
Percent distribution. Data based on sample. For information on confidentiality, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www.census.gov/acs/www/.

- California 25.4
- New York 10.8
- Texas 10.4
- Florida 9.2
- New Jersey 4.6
- Massachusetts 2.5
- Georgia 2.4
- Virginia 2.3
- Washington 2.2
- All other states 26

Note: Percentages do not sum to 100.0 due to rounding. Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2010.
For our study, we received the highest number of responses from the following states: California, Massachusetts, Texas, Florida, New York, and New Jersey. Across the six states, Indian entrepreneurs dominated all other immigrant entrepreneur groups.

The table below shows the Indian populations for each of these states. Although these data refer to the number of Indians as a race and not the number of Indian immigrants specifically, it underscores the outsized role of Indian entrepreneurs in these states.

### Methodology—Immigrant Key Founder Data

To determine the proportion of immigrant entrepreneurs in the high-technology industry, we sought to locate data compiled about engineering and technology companies founded in the United States for the last seven years (2006–2012).

We obtained a list of all such companies from Dun & Bradstreet’s (D&B) Million Dollar Database. This database contains U.S. companies with more than $1 million in sales and twenty or more employees, and company branches with fifty or more employees. It is commonly used by researchers and is considered a source of reliable data.

The D&B database listed 107,819 engineering and technology companies founded in the United States between 2006 and 2012. A portion of these were older companies with recent changes in control or corporate restructurings/mergers. We also omitted a small number of companies that did not meet the definition of a high-tech company by the study’s definition. Included below is a list of key data that D&B provides:

- Company name
- Type of company
- City, state, zip code
- Phone number
- Company website
- Sales
- Total number of employees
- Select executive officer information
- Primary standard industrial classification

For the purposes of our study, the words technology and engineering indicate that the main work of the company was the deployment of technology or engineering to design or manufacture products or services. Our definition of engineering and technology firms thus includes the following industry groups, defined with 3- and 4-digit U.S. Government Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes: semiconductors, computers/communications, biosciences, defense/aerospace, environmental, software, and innovation/manufacturing-related services. A full listing of the SIC codes associated with each industry group is present in appendix A. These are the same engineering and technology SIC codes used in the previous 2007 study, as well as in Saxenian’s original research. We excluded some professional services SIC codes that were included in Saxenian’s 1999 study, but were outside the purview of the engineering and technology disciplines.

Company entries within each SIC code were randomized using a Microsoft Excel random-number assignment. Researchers then were assigned random listings of 500 companies, with representative entries from each of the main engineering and technology industry groups.

Researchers made unsolicited phone calls and sent unsolicited emails, searched company websites, and utilized social media tools to determine whether a company’s key founders were immigrants and, if so, what their nationalities were. This became the source of data presented in the report.

### Definition of Key Founder

In most engineering or technology companies, the key founders are the President/Chief Executive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total State Population</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Massachusetts</th>
<th>Texas</th>
<th>Florida</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>New Jersey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Indian Population by State</td>
<td>37,691,912</td>
<td>6,587,536</td>
<td>25,674,681</td>
<td>19,057,542</td>
<td>19,465,197</td>
<td>8,821,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Indians by State</td>
<td>1.53%</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
<td>1.67%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Officer or the head of development/Chief Technology Officer. An individual can perform both of these roles simultaneously. Other roles, such as finance, marketing, HR, and legal, can be very important in startups. For the purposes of our research, however, we chose to use a narrow definition of key founder and exclude the latter roles. Since these findings include only companies with immigrant Presidents/Chief Executive Officers or heads of development/Chief Technology Officers, they potentially understate the role of immigrants in founding new firms.

Definition of an Immigrant and Immigrant-Founded Company

An immigrant is a person who was born in another country and subsequently moved to the United States at some point in his or her lifetime. Immigrant-founded companies are those having one or more immigrants as key founders.

Some companies had more than one key immigrant founder. For the purpose of our research, we counted this as one response from the company. However, we did count all countries that were represented in each company when analyzing countries of origin.

Data Collection

Researchers conducted a Web search using company websites, LinkedIn, and other social media tools, and made phone calls to companies to determine whether a company’s key founders were immigrants and, if so, what their nationalities were.

A team of ten graduate students and research assistants collected company information by calling and emailing, conducting Web searches, and utilizing LinkedIn and other social media tools.

When contacting CEOs, HR managers, and other knowledgeable company employees, student researchers gave a two-sentence introduction of themselves and the research project. The company representatives then were asked:

1. Were any of your company’s key founders immigrants to the United States? If “yes,” they were asked:
2. In what country was he or she born?

They followed the first question with the definition of “key founder” and “immigrant-founded company.”

Quality Assurance and Data Analysis

After all of the data had been collected, we performed quality assurance on our records. Two criteria in particular were chosen to ensure the veracity of the collected data. First, companies listed in the D&B database with zero employees at their U.S. headquarters were omitted from consideration. Second, companies with 2012 sales greater than $100 million were double-checked to make certain that they had been founded after 2005.

Data Analysis—Immigrant Key Founder Data

From our dataset, we obtained responses from 1,882 engineering and technology companies founded in the United States between 2006 and 2012. Our results found that 24.3 percent of these companies had at least one key founder who was an immigrant. Extrapolations from the sample allowed us to estimate

---

| Table 2 |
| Founder Survey Statistics and Response Rates |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total “Yes” Responses</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total “No” Responses</td>
<td>1,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Declined Responses:” Hang Ups, Unwilling to Participate</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Missing Data:” No Knowledge, Answering Machines, Requests to Call Back</td>
<td>1,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Companies Approached</td>
<td>3,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate R1 (The proportion of survey responses obtained out of total survey delivery attempts) ( \frac{[a+b]}{e} )</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate R2 (The proportion of survey responses obtained out of total surveys actually delivered) ( \frac{[a+b]}{[a+b+c]} )</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that companies founded by immigrants between 2006 and 2012 generated $63 billion in revenue and employed 560,000 workers in 2012. Table 2 shows the results of our survey, broken down by the response statistics.

**Revenue and Employment Data**

To make statistically sound conclusions about the 107,819 engineering and technology companies established in the last seven years, we ran a sampling distribution of a proportion and performed finite population correction. We can say with 95 percent confidence that 24.3 percent ± 1.90 percent of the 107,819 engineering and technology companies founded between 2006 and 2012 had an immigrant key founder. This equates to 26,243 ± 2,054 companies. These 26,243 companies generated more than $63 billion in 2012 sales and employed an estimated 560,816 workers.

**Immigrant-Founder Origin Data**

Our study found that, while certain nationalities tended to account for a significantly greater number of immigrant-founded companies, immigrant founders come from diverse backgrounds, hailing from more than sixty countries. Figure 4 provides a list of the top ten countries with the greatest number of immigrant founders represented.

Figure 4 shows that Indians account for 33.2 percent of immigrant-founded engineering and technology companies started between 2006 and 2012. Significantly, Indians have founded more such companies than immigrants from the next top seven immigrant-founder-sending countries combined. Immigrant founders from China, ranking second in this list, account for 8.1 percent; those from the United Kingdom, 6.3 percent; those from Canada 4.2 percent; and those from Germany, 3.9 percent.

**State-wise Distribution of Immigrant Founder Data**

We analyzed the responses based on the location of each company’s headquarters as listed in the D&B database. This allowed us to group responses by state and determine whether immigrant engineering and technology founders had a propensity to gravitate toward certain U.S. states when starting new companies. We were only able to report results from twelve states where we had a high enough sampling density to be confident of our findings. Figure 5 indicates the percentage of companies founded by immigrants in each of these states. The study’s average immigrant founding rate also is presented to illustrate the extent of a state’s deviation from the national average.

Whereas in the 2007 study California led the states in holding the highest rate of immigrant entrepreneurs, New Jersey (45.1 percent) and Massachusetts (41.7 percent) now lead ahead of California (39.6 percent). Washington also has
undergone a jump in its percentage of immigrant key founders from 11.3 percent to 28.6 percent since the last study.

We conducted difference-in-proportions tests to determine any statistically significant changes in the percentages of immigrant founders state-wise between the two periods. From the states we analyzed, only Washington showed a statistically significant change in its percentage of immigrant founders.

Figure 6 details where immigrant-founded engineering and technology companies were located. Here, California dominates the group with 31 percent. The next-highest-ranked state is Massachusetts, with only 9 percent. We tested for statistically significant differences between studies and, again, only Washington had a statistically significant difference, increasing from 1 percent to 5 percent.
Using the 2012 state breakdown of immigrant founder data, it is possible to determine the states where immigrant entrepreneurs from specific ethnic groups are concentrated. Figures 7a to 7e detail these statistics for the five largest immigrant groups: those from India, China, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Germany. In 2005, the four largest immigrant groups were from India, the United Kingdom, China, and Taiwan. Since 2005, Canada has risen from ninth to fourth for countries sending the greatest number of immigrant founders to the United States. Taiwan has dropped from fourth to twenty-second.

**Chart 7a**
Where are Immigrants from India Founding Engineering and Technology Companies?

- California: 26%
- Massachusetts: 8%
- New Jersey: 9%
- New York: 5%
- North Carolina: 4%
- Ohio: 3%
- South Carolina: 1%
- Texas: 5%
- Arizona: 2%
- Virginia: 7%
- Other: 6%
- Michigan: 1%
- Illinois: 7%
- Maryland: 3%

**Chart 7b**
Where are Immigrants from China Founding Engineering and Technology Companies?

- California: 40%
- Maryland: 16%
- Florida: 3%
- Georgia: 3%
- Kentucky: 3%
- Washington: 8%
- Virginia: 3%
- Texas: 5%
- North Carolina: 3%
- New York: 3%
- New Jersey: 5%
- Massachusetts: 5%
Figure 7c
Where are Immigrants from the United Kingdom Founding Engineering and Technology Companies?

California 34%
Massachusetts 14%
New York 7%
Pennsylvania 5%
New Jersey 5%
Mississippi 5%
Florida 5%
Colorado 3%
Washington 11%
Wisconsin 5%
North Carolina 3%
Ohio 3%
Texas 3%
Virginia 3%
Indiana 3%
Georgia 3%
Florida 3%
Colorado 3%
Delaware 3%
Missouri 3%
Minnesota 3%
New York 7%
These results demonstrate a high degree of ethnic clustering of immigrant-founded engineering and technology companies, particularly in California.

Indian founders continued to favor California and New Jersey as locations to start businesses, founding 35 percent of their companies in these two states alone. Chinese founders (mainland only) also continued to heavily favor California, with 40 percent establishing companies in the state; founders from the United Kingdom and Canada had higher founding rates in California, as well, with rates of 34 percent and 32 percent, respectively. Germans displayed a high level of dispersion in their preferences, showing no centralized founding locations, with the exception of slightly higher rates in Ohio and California.

Grouping the data by state reveals both the distinct spatial clustering of immigrant founders and the diversity of immigrant founders in the same states. Figures 8a to 8f display the immigrant groups founding engineering and technology companies in the states with the highest response profiles: California, Massachusetts, Texas, Florida, New York, and New Jersey. In our previous study, these same six states also had the highest response profiles.

Figure 8a demonstrates the continuing prevalence of Asian immigrant founders of engineering and technology companies established in California since 2006, particularly those from India (26 percent) and China (10 percent). In 2005, the top three immigrant founder groups were India (20 percent), Taiwan (13 percent), and China (10 percent). The percentage of Indian founders in California has increased from 20 percent to 26 percent since 2005. Figure 8b shows that Massachusetts continues to demonstrate high percentages of Israeli immigrant founders at 16 percent, compared with 17 percent in 2005.
**Figure 8a**

Immigrant Groups Founding Engineering and Technology Companies in California since 2006

- **India**: 26%
- **Other**: 21%
- **China**: 10%
- **UK**: 7%
- **Russia**: 5%
- **Canada**: 4%
- **New Zealand**: 3%
- **Australia**: 3%
- **Israel**: 3%
- **Japan**: 3%
- **Korea**: 3%
- **Belgium**: 2%
- **Egypt**: 2%
- **Hungary**: 2%
- **Germany**: 2%
- **Netherlands**: 2%
- **Taiwan**: 2%
- **Turkey**: 2%

*The large “Other” category includes countries that have only one or two immigrant founders in Massachusetts. Those countries are: the Bahamas, Brazil, Canada, Croatia, France, Hungary, Iran, Ireland, Lebanon, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden, and Switzerland.*
Texas holds a high percentage of Indian immigrant founders (28 percent), as illustrated in Figure 8c. Not surprisingly, immigrants from Mexico (10 percent) account for the second-greatest number of immigrant founders in Texas. In Figure 8d, Florida shows comparatively greater diversity of immigrant founders from South American and Latin American countries, with those from Brazil at 10 percent, Cuba at 7 percent, and Mexico at 7 percent.
Figure 8e demonstrates that the greatest proportion of immigrant founders in New York is from India (27 percent). Canadians are the next-largest group (11 percent). Figure 8f shows that Indian founders are dominant in New Jersey at 57 percent; China and Germany, both at 9 percent, are the next-largest groups.
Industry-Specific Immigrant Founder Data

Our definition of "engineering and technology companies" extends to companies practicing in the fields of bioscience, computers/communications, defense/aerospace, environmental, innovation/manufacturing-related services, semiconductors, and software as defined by a company’s primary SIC code (see Appendix A for a more indepth description of the included SIC codes). This section explores the concentrations of immigrant entrepreneurs in the engineering and technology industries. Immigrant founders displayed a greater tendency to establish businesses in the innovation/manufacturing-related (45 percent) and software (22 percent) fields. These two fields account for 67 percent of immigrant-founded companies. Figure 9 shows a breakdown of immigrant founding activity across the seven business fields.

This breakdown of immigrant-founded companies by industry is consistent with the 2005 data. Some notable changes between the two studies include an increased representation in the bioscience and environmental industries and a decrease in the software industry. We can say with 95 percent confidence that the changes within the bioscience, environmental, and software industries are statistically significant. Figure 10 shows the comparison between the two time periods.

The seven technology fields exhibited slight levels of variation in the representation of immigrant-founded companies. Nationwide, the proportion of engineering and technology companies with at least one key immigrant founder was 24.3 percent. Immigrant founders were slightly more concentrated in the semiconductor and computers/communications industries, with rates of 31.58 percent and 28.26 percent, respectively.
Industry-Specific Immigrant Founder Data

Figure 10

Figure 11
Percentages of Immigrant-Founded Companies by Industry

Kauffman Foundation
From 2005 to 2012, some fields have demonstrated an increase in the representation of immigrant-founded companies, particularly in the environmental industry. Other fields, including the software industry, experienced a decline in the number of immigrant-founded companies. At a 95 percent confidence level, the changes in representation within both the environmental and software industries had a statistically significant difference. Figure 12 above illustrates the changes in immigrant founding rates by industry between the two periods.

By cross-referencing our industry-field and immigrant-founder-nationality data, we can determine specific immigrant ethnic groups’ likelihood of founding new companies in distinct industry fields. Figures 13a to 13e display the industries in which immigrants from India, China, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Germany founded companies from 2006 to 2012.
Industry-Specific Immigrant Founder Data

**Figure 13a**
Industries in which Immigrants from India are Founding Companies

- Innovation / Manufacturing-Related Services: 41%
- Software: 23%
- Computers / Communications: 12%
- Bioscience: 12%
- Semiconductors: 5%
- Environmental: 4%
- Defense / Aerospace: 3%

**Figure 13b**
Industries in which Immigrants from China are Founding Companies

- Innovation / Manufacturing-Related Services: 57%
- Software: 16%
- Computers / Communications: 13%
- Bioscience: 8%
- Semiconductors: 5%
- Environmental: 3%
- Defense / Aerospace: 3%
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**Figure 13c**
Industries in which Immigrants from the United Kingdom are Founding Companies

- Innovation / Manufacturing-Related Services: 45%
- Software: 28%
- Computers / Communications: 14%
- Bioscience: 4%
- Semiconductors: 3%
- Environmental: 3%
- Defense / Aerospace: 3%

**Figure 13d**
Industries in which Immigrants from Canada are Founding Companies

- Innovation / Manufacturing-Related Services: 53%
- Software: 21%
- Computers / Communications: 11%
- Bioscience: 5%
- Semiconductors: 5%
- Environmental: 5%
These data show that founders from the top five sending countries are more likely to establish innovation/manufacturing-related service businesses. This industry accounts for 41 percent to 57 percent of all engineering and technology companies founded by each immigrant group. Following the innovation/manufacturing-related services industry, each of the top five immigrant groups also are inclined to found companies in the software industry, which accounted for 16 percent to 28 percent of all companies they founded. Across the semiconductor, environmental, and defense/aerospace industries, immigrant founders show lackluster representation.

The inclination for founders from India, China, and the United Kingdom to start companies mostly in the innovation/manufacturing-related services and software sectors is consistent with trends from our previous study. Due to lack of sufficient data, in-depth industry data for Canada and Germany were not examined in the previous study, nor that of Taiwan for this current study.

In a final analysis of this industry-specific data, we present in Figures 14a to 14g a breakdown of the immigrant groups founding companies in distinct industry fields in the last six years.
Industry-Specific Immigrant Founder Data

Figure 14a
Immigrant-Founder Origins in Bioscience Field in the Last Six Years

- India 34%
- US 28%
- Anonymous 4%
- China 6%
- Germany 4%
- Hungary 4%
- Brazil 4%
- Bangladesh 4%
- Other 23%
- UK 8%
- Italy 6%
- Anonymous 2%

Figure 14b
Immigrant-Founder Origins in the Computers/Communications Field in the Last Six Years

- India 28%
- US 27%
- Germany 3%
- China 3%
- Hong Kong 3%
- Canada 7%
- Bahamas 3%
- Australia 3%
- Anonymous 7%
- UK 3%
- Turkey 3%
- Serbia 3%
- Russia 3%
- Romania 7%
- Pakistan 3%
- New Zealand 3%
- Iraq 3%
- Iran 3%
- Israel 7%
- Anonymous 3%
Industry-Specific Immigrant Founder Data

Figure 14c
Immigrant-Founder Origins in the Innovation/Manufacturing-Related Field in the Last Six Years

- India 29%
- China 10%
- Others 25%
- Egypt 2%
- France 2%
- Germany 4%
- Hungary 1%
- Anonymous 2%
- Canada 5%
- Australia 2%
- Anonymous 2%
- UK 4%
- South Africa 2%
- Mexico 2%
- Russia 3%
- Japan 3%
- Korea 2%
- Egypt 2%
- France 2%
- Germany 4%
- Hungary 1%
- Anonymous 2%
- Canada 5%
- Australia 2%
- Anonymous 2%
- UK 4%
- South Africa 2%
- Mexico 2%
- Russia 3%
- Japan 3%
- Korea 2%
- Egypt 2%
- France 2%
- Germany 4%
- Hungary 1%
- Anonymous 2%
- Canada 5%
- Australia 2%
- Anonymous 2%
- UK 4%
- South Africa 2%
- Mexico 2%
- Russia 3%
- Japan 3%
- Korea 2%
- Egypt 2%
- France 2%
- Germany 4%
- Hungary 1%
- Anonymous 2%
- Canada 5%
- Australia 2%
- Anonymous 2%
- UK 4%
- South Africa 2%
- Mexico 2%
- Russia 3%
- Japan 3%
- Korea 2%
- Egypt 2%
- France 2%
- Germany 4%
- Hungary 1%
- Anonymous 2%
- Canada 5%
- Australia 2%
- Anonymous 2%
- UK 4%
- South Africa 2%
- Mexico 2%
- Russia 3%
- Japan 3%
- Korea 2%
- Egypt 2%
- France 2%
- Germany 4%
- Hungary 1%
- Anonymous 2%
- Canada 5%
- Australia 2%
- Anonymous 2%
- UK 4%
- South Africa 2%
- Mexico 2%
- Russia 3%
- Japan 3%
- Korea 2%
- Egypt 2%
- France 2%
- Germany 4%
- Hungary 1%
- Anonymous 2%
- Canada 5%
- Australia 2%
- Anonymous 2%
- UK 4%
- South Africa 2%
- Mexico 2%
- Russia 3%
- Japan 3%
- Korea 2%
- Egypt 2%
- France 2%
- Germany 4%
- Hungary 1%
- Anonymous 2%
- Canada 5%
- Australia 2%
- Anonymous 2%
- UK 4%
- South Africa 2%
- Mexico 2%
- Russia 3%
- Japan 3%
- Korea 2%
- Egypt 2%
- France 2%
- Germany 4%
- Hungary 1%
- Anonymous 2%
- Canada 5%
- Australia 2%
- Anonymous 2%
- UK 4%
- South Africa 2%
- Mexico 2%
- Russia 3%
- Japan 3%
- Korea 2%
- Egypt 2%
- France 2%
- Germany 4%
- Hungary 1%
- Anonymous 2%
- Canada 5%
- Australia 2%
- Anonymous 2%
- UK 4%
- South Africa 2%
- Mexico 2%
- Russia 3%
- Japan 3%
- Korea 2%
- Egypt 2%
- France 2%
- Germany 4%
- Hungary 1%
- Anonymous 2%
- Canada 5%
- Australia 2%
- Anonymous 2%
- UK 4%
- South Africa 2%
- Mexico 2%
- Russia 3%
- Japan 3%
- Korea 2%
- Egypt 2%
- France 2%
- Germany 4%
- Hungary 1%
- Anonymous 2%
- Canada 5%
- Australia 2%
- Anonymous 2%
- UK 4%
- South Africa 2%
- Mexico 2%
- Russia 3%
- Japan 3%
- Korea 2%
- Egypt 2%
- France 2%
- Germany 4%
- Hungary 1%
- Anonymous 2%
- Canada 5%
- Australia 2%
- Anonymous 2%
- UK 4%
- South Africa 2%
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Figure 14e
Immigrant-Founder Origins in the Software Field in the Last Six Years

- India 33%
- China 6%
- Canada 4%
- Brazil 3%
- Anonymous 5%
- Others 13%
- Vietnam 2%
- UK 12%
- Turkey 3%
- Spain 2%
- Pakistan 2%
- Egypt 2%
- France 2%
- Germany 3%
- Other 13%

Figure 14f
Immigrant-Founder Origins in the Environmental Field in the Last Six Years
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Indians are the dominant founders of immigrant companies in all seven industries: biosciences (35 percent), computers/communications (28 percent), innovation/manufacturing-related services (29 percent), semiconductors (32 percent), software (33 percent), environmental (39 percent), and defense/aerospace (23 percent). In the biosciences and innovation/manufacturing-related services industries, China follows next by a considerable distance at 10 percent in both industries. In semiconductors, Israel contributes 11 percent of the companies founded by immigrants, while the United Kingdom accounts for 12 percent of immigrant-founded companies in software. In the defense/aerospace industry, immigrants from the Netherlands made up the second-greatest number of immigrant founders.

Indian founders accounted for a significant proportion of immigrant-founded companies in all industries in 2005; at the time, though, they were dominant only in the innovation/manufacturing-related services sector. Since then, Indians have become the primary leaders in all industries. It is interesting to note that, although China (mainland) remains a notable contributor across all industries, Taiwanese immigrants have become a very small minority.

Special Analysis—Silicon Valley, Calif.

Our data showed that more immigrant founders started companies in California than in any other state, and we wanted to analyze founding rates in Silicon Valley because of the area’s economic strength in the engineering and technology industries. Our random sample from the primary survey provided sufficient data for analysis of Silicon Valley, but we wanted to expand our sample size to increase precision. We created an additional dataset from the D&B database and conducted a new survey of this area.

We analyzed Silicon Valley data by selecting zip codes in the following counties: Alameda, Contra Costa, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, San Francisco, and San Mateo. We received responses from 335 companies that fit these criteria. Of these, 43.9 percent reported that at least one of their key founders were immigrants, which was significantly higher than the national average of 24.3 percent. A breakdown of our survey statistics and response rates can be found in Table 3. Figure 15 on the following page displays the breakdown of nationalities in Silicon Valley.
The 2007 study on immigrant entrepreneurship found that Indians accounted for 25.8 percent of immigrant-founded companies started in Silicon Valley from 1995 to 2005. This suggested the acceleration of growth of Indian-led entrepreneurship in light of estimates provided by Saxenian’s 1999 paper, which attributed 7 percent of Silicon Valley high-tech companies started between 1980 and 1998 to Indian immigrants. Our study shows the continuation of this trend of accelerated growth of Indian entrepreneurship from 2006 to 2012. In this period, Indians accounted for 32.0 percent of immigrant-founded companies in Silicon Valley.

Indians continue to dominate other immigrant groups in rates of entrepreneurship. Trailing behind Indian founders in the creation of Silicon Valley startups are immigrants from China (5.4 percent), the United Kingdom (5.4 percent), Japan (4.8 percent), and Canada (4.1 percent). Since 2005, the percentage of businesses founded by Chinese immigrants has declined from 12.8 percent to 5.4 percent, and those founded by Japanese immigrants from 13.6 percent to 4.8 percent.

The proportion of immigrant-founded companies in Silicon Valley has dropped 8.5 percentage points, from...
Summary of Results and Conclusions

52.4 percent to 43.9 percent since 2005. This signifies a potential reversal in previous trends of expansion of immigrant-led entrepreneurship. From the 1980s to 1990s, Silicon Valley attracted more foreign-born scientists and engineers than any other technological center in the nation. In 2000, 53 percent of Silicon Valley’s science and engineering (S&E) workforce was foreign-born. In other technology regions, including Austin, Texas, and Boston, Massachusetts, less than a quarter of the S&E workforce was foreign-born.

High-skilled immigrants have played an important role in driving entrepreneurship and making Silicon Valley unrivaled throughout the world as the premier center for technological innovation. Their companies have produced substantial capital and employed thousands. Taking advantage of their ability to move across cultural and economic grooves, they have fostered important linkages with international economies, particularly those of China and India. High-skilled immigrants will remain key to the United States’ ability to stay economically competitive in the international markets.

Summary of Results and Conclusion

The period of unprecedented expansion of immigrant-led entrepreneurship that characterized the 1980s and 1990s has come to a close. Today, the growth rate of immigrant-founded companies nationwide, at 24.3 percent, has plateaued. In the high-tech hub of Silicon Valley, the proportion of immigrant-founded companies has dropped from 52.4 percent during 1995–2005 to 43.9 percent during 2006–2012.

More than sixty countries were represented in the study, demonstrating that immigrant founders come from a diverse range of backgrounds. Nonetheless, certain immigrant groups tended to dominate the pool of immigrant-founded companies, particularly those from India (33.2 percent), China (8.1 percent), the United Kingdom (6.3 percent), Canada (4.2 percent), and Germany (3.9 percent).

Indians continue to be at the forefront of immigrant-led entrepreneurship. Whereas in 2005 they accounted for 26.0 percent of immigrant-founded companies, they now account for 33.2 percent. While less dramatic than the case of Indians, the proportion of Chinese founders has increased from 6.9 percent to 8.1 percent. Interestingly, Taiwanese founders, who had previously accounted for 5.8 percent of immigrant-founded companies and had comprised the fourth-largest immigrant-founder group, now only account for 1.1 percent and rank twenty-second. This may be correlated to the decreasing numbers of Taiwanese coming to the United States for higher education and then staying, and complex other factors.

Immigrant founders also continue to exhibit a high pattern of clustering in certain states. The greatest number of immigrant-founded companies were located in states that generally are regarded as immigration gateways: California (31 percent), Massachusetts (9 percent), Florida (6 percent), Texas (6 percent), New Jersey (5 percent), and New York (5 percent).

Some specific immigrant groups demonstrated a strong preference for establishing companies in particular states. Indians displayed a greater tendency to establish businesses in California (26 percent), New Jersey (9 percent), and Massachusetts (8 percent). Chinese founders tended to establish businesses in California (40 percent) and Maryland (16 percent). Whereas most immigrant groups showed a greater preference for establishing businesses in California, Germans displayed a greater preference for Ohio (22 percent), followed by California (17 percent).

The study also found that immigrant-founded companies are concentrated in certain business fields. Immigrants were more likely to start companies in the innovation/manufacturing-related services (45 percent) and software (22 percent) fields.

Immigrant founders of engineering and technology companies have employed roughly 560,000 workers and generated an estimated $63 billion dollars in sales from 2006 to 2012. While the rate of growth of immigrant entrepreneurship has stagnated, these numbers nonetheless underscore the continuing importance of high-skilled immigrants to the maintenance and expansion of the national economy. These findings are interestingly complex, since the two major skilled-immigrant groups—Indian and Chinese—are starting companies at higher rates than they did previously. Historically and today, the United States continues to benefit directly from the contributions of such immigrants. Far from expendable, high-skilled immigrants will remain a critical asset for maintaining U.S. competitiveness in the global economy.
Appendix: High-Technology Industry Definition

U.S. Government-defined Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>SIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semiconductors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special industry machinery</td>
<td>3559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiconductors and related devices</td>
<td>3674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruments for measuring and testing electricity and electric signals</td>
<td>3825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computers/Communications</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic computers</td>
<td>3571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer storage devices</td>
<td>3572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer peripheral equipment, n.e.c.</td>
<td>3577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed circuit boards</td>
<td>3672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic components, n.e.c.</td>
<td>3679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnetic and optical recording media</td>
<td>3695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone and telegraph apparatus</td>
<td>3661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio and television broadcasting and communications equipment</td>
<td>3663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications equipment, n.e.c.</td>
<td>3669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bioscience</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgical medical and dental instruments and supplies</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical laboratories</td>
<td>8071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory apparatus and analytical, optical,</td>
<td>382 (except</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measuring, and controlling instruments</td>
<td>3822, 3825 and 3826)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defense/Aerospace</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small arms ammunition</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electron tubes</td>
<td>3671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft and parts</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided missiles and space vehicles</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanks and tank components</td>
<td>3795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search, detection, navigation, guidance,</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aeronautical and nautical systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruments and equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial and commercial fans and blowers and air purification equipment</td>
<td>3564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service industry machinery, n.e.c.</td>
<td>3589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary services</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrap and waste materials</td>
<td>5093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix

Software
Computer programming services 7371
Prepackaged software 7372
Computer integrated systems design 7373
Computer processing and data preparation and processing services 7374
Information retrieval services 7375

Innovation/Manufacturing-Related Services
Computers and computer peripheral equipment and software (wholesale trade) 5045
Electronics parts and equipment, n.e.c. (wholesale trade) 5065
Computer facilities management services 7376
Computer rental and leasing 7377
Computer maintenance and repair 7378
Computer-related services, n.e.c. 7389
Engineering services 8711
Research and testing services 873