Urban Scale and Residents' Entrepreneurship: An Empirical Analysis Based on CGSS2018

Kai Gao[1,*], Xinyu Cheng[2]

[1]Dalian Education College Institute of Educational Sciences, Dalian Education University, Dalian, 116021, Liaoning, China
[2]School of Economics and Management (School of Tourism), Dalian University, Dalian, 116622, Liaoning, China
*kaosa@126.com

Abstract: *Workers with varying skills across urban-rural divides. Key findings include: (1) Urban scale significantly enhances entrepreneurship probability by 1.8% per 1% increase. (2) It promotes both necessity-driven and opportunity-driven entrepreneurship, with a more pronounced effect on the former. (3) Urban scale disproportionately benefits urban residents and migrant workers, while exerting an overall inhibitory effect on rural entrepreneurship. (4) Its impact is most pronounced on necessity-driven entrepreneurship among migrant workers, particularly low-skilled groups. Reducing mobility barriers for migrant workers fosters inclusive entrepreneurship. Based on China's urbanization experience, this research reveals the intrinsic link between urban scale and entrepreneurship, offering actionable insights for rapidly urbanizing regions on leveraging agglomeration effects to promote entrepreneurial activities and inclusive socioeconomic development.*

Keywords: *Urban Scale; Economic Agglomeration; Population Mobility; Entrepreneurship*

1. Introduction

With the rapid development of China's economy, urbanization has led to a significant concentration of resources, population, and economic activities in large cities. This agglomeration effect, driven by factors such as geographic advantages and economic foundations, has not only exacerbated regional development imbalances [1,2] but also created a dynamic environment for entrepreneurial activities. Existing studies have explored the determinants of entrepreneurship from two main perspectives: individual characteristics and external environmental factors. On the individual level, research has highlighted that education level [3], years of residence in host regions [4], risk tolerance [5], and social networks [6] significantly influence an individual's propensity to start a business. For example, males, unemployed individuals, and those with strong social connections are more likely to engage in entrepreneurial behavior [5]. Additionally, religious beliefs have been found to shape entrepreneurial preferences, with religious individuals demonstrating a higher inclination toward entrepreneurship than their secular counterparts [7].

In terms of external factors, studies have shown that policy support for ethnic minorities, experiences of discrimination, and unemployment rates play crucial roles in shaping residents' entrepreneurial decisions [8]. Similarly, rural financial development and government policies have been found to be positively correlated with the likelihood of migrant workers starting businesses [9]. These findings collectively suggest that the urban environment, characterized by economic agglomeration, may serve as a key driver for entrepreneurship through mechanisms such as improved credit accessibility, human capital spillover, and strengthened property rights protection [10-12].

2. Model Construction and Indicator Selection

2.1 Model Construction

To assess the effect of urban scale on the likelihood of entrepreneurship, a regression model is constructed as follows:

$$Entrepre_{ij} = \Phi(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Scale_j + \alpha_2 priv_{ij} + \alpha_3 ctiy_j + \varepsilon_{ij}) \tag{1}$$

In this model, $Entrepre_{ij}$ represents the probability of entrepreneurship for the i-th respondent in province j; $Scle_j$ denotes the urban scale of province j; $priv_{ij}$ represents the private characteristics of the i-th respondent in province j; and $city_j$ represents the macro-level factors in province j that influence residents' entrepreneurship.

2.2 Indicator Selection

(1) Entrepreneurship Probability ($Entrepre_{ij}$) and Urban Scale ($Scle_j$). The entrepreneurship probability is indicated by a binary variable based on the respondent's answer to their current occupation. Specifically, if the respondent is engaged in entrepreneurial activities, the variable is assigned a value of 1; otherwise, it is assigned a value of 0. Additionally, in accordance with the classification criteria of the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor, entrepreneurship is divided into opportunity-driven (being one's own boss) and necessity-driven (individual business operator) types in this study. Urban scale is measured by the urban population of the region.

(2) Macroeconomic Factors ($city_j$). Firstly, the primary reason people choose to engage in entrepreneurship is that their expected income from entrepreneurship is greater than the remuneration they currently receive from their job. Therefore, current wage levels have a significant impact on whether individuals will choose to start a business. Secondly, the advancement of China's industrialization process has led to changes in the industrial structure, which in turn affects employment opportunities. Moreover, different industries have varying demands for labor, and these employment opportunities can also influence entrepreneurial activities. Thirdly, existing research has shown that public investment can have a significant impact on private investment. Thus, regional government expenditures may either induce or crowd out entrepreneurial activities in a given area. Finally, with the increasing globalization of the world economy, more and more foreign-funded enterprises are focusing on China, offering jobs with higher wages than those available domestically. This trend has, to some extent, suppressed entrepreneurial activities among the local population. In summary, this paper selects control variables from four aspects: wage levels, government finance, changes in industrial structure, and the status of foreign investment. The specific variables are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Measurement and Description of Variables

Variable	Measurement Standard	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min	Max	Sample Size
Entrepreneurship Status	"Individual business owner or self-employed" = 1, others = 0	0.165	0.371	0	1	5388
Necessity-Driven Entrepreneurship	"Individual business owner" = 1, others = 0	0.128	0.334	0	1	5388
Opportunity-Driven Entrepreneurship	"Self-employed" = 1, others = 0	0.038	0.190	0	1	5388
Urban Scale	Total population of urban districts (in millions)	3.136	1.643	0.290	7.292	5388
Wage Level	Log of average wage of urban employees	10.924	0.246	10.650	11.535	5388
Fiscal Expenditure	Local fiscal expenditure as a proportion of GDP	0.202	0.074	0.121	0.585	5388
Industrial Structure	Tertiary industry output value as a proportion of secondary industry output value	1.121	0.726	0.666	3.659	5388
Foreign Investment	Foreign investment as a proportion of GDP	0.426	0.370	0.077	1.756	5388
Household Registration	"Agricultural household registration" = 1, others = 0	0.466	0.499	0	1	5388
Gender	"Male" = 1, "Female" = 0	0.504	0.500	0	1	5388
Age	Age in years	40.315	11.516	17	60	5388
Education Years	Years required to obtain the highest educational degree	10.504	3.756	0	19	5388
Marital Status	"Married" = 1, others = 0	0.801	0.399	0	1	5388
Ethnic Group	"Han" = 1, others = 0	0.934	0.249	0	1	5388
Relative Income	Based on the self-assessment of current socio-economic status in the questionnaire	4.407	1.605	1	10	5388
Social Trust	Scored from 1 to 5 based on questionnaire responses, with "strongly agree" = 5	3.372	0.986	1	5	5388
Sense of Fairness	Scored from 1 to 5 based on questionnaire responses, with "fair" = 5	3.063	1.008	1	5	5388

(3) Private Characteristics ($priv_{ij}$). Private characteristics ($priv_{ij}$) reflect personal traits that can

influence residents' entrepreneurship. The data are sourced from the Chinese General Social Survey (CGSS) conducted in 2018. The ($city_j$) data are obtained from the China Statistical Yearbook. Building on the selection of private characteristics and economic factors by Wu Lei et al., Liu Weili and Yang Jingyuan, and Wang Zhuo and Su Beibei[10-12], we assign values to private characteristics based on the options set in the survey questionnaire. Specific details are shown in Table 1.

2.3 Data Preprocessing

This paper utilizes data from the Chinese General Social Survey (CGSS2018), the China Statistical Yearbook 2019, and the China Urban Statistical Yearbook 2019. Responses marked as "Don't know," "Refused to answer," or "Not applicable" were excluded. To prevent the interference of outliers, following the method proposed by Yang Jidong, the top 1% and bottom 1% of samples in terms of income were also removed. After these procedures, a total of 5,388 samples were obtained. A comparison of the distribution of entrepreneurial status before and after the data processing revealed minimal changes, indicating that the distribution characteristics remained consistent.

3. Empirical Analysis

3.1 Analysis of Regression Results for the Full Sample

Table 2 reports results from Probit and IV Probit models analyzing urban scale's impact on entrepreneurship. Model (1) shows urban scale is significant at 10% with a positive coefficient, increasing entrepreneurship probability by 1.8% per 1% scale increase (Probit coefficients serve as marginal effects due to nonlinearity). Key private characteristics: agricultural hukou raises probability by 0.22%, males by 16.4%; age has an inverted U-shape with peak at 38. Education years (-4.03% per year) and marital status (+21.4%) show opposite effects. Relative income promotes, while social trust inhibits entrepreneurship.

Table 2 The Impact of Urban Scale on Entrepreneurship

Variable	Probit		IV probit	
	Model (1)	Model (2)	Model (3)	Model (4)
Urban Scale	0.018**	0.0518***	0.293***	0.5570***
	(2.37)	(2.95)	(5.75)	(3.19)
Wage Level		-0.314		-0.274
		(-1.13)		(-0.94)
Fiscal Expenditure		0.828**		0.901**
		(2.12)		(2.27)
Industrial Structure		-0.217***		-0.203***
		(-3.89)		(-3.83)
Industrial Structure Squared		0.0695**		0.0641***
		(2.25)		(4.15)
Foreign Investment		-0.467***		-0.455***
		(-3.09)		(-2.94)
Household Registration	0.220***	0.184***	0.0458***	0.183***
	(4.43)	(3.66)	(7.12)	(3.77)
Gender	0.164***	0.160***	-0.00765	0.160***
	(3.86)	(3.74)	(-1.36)	(3.71)
Age	0.126***	0.126***	-0.00384**	0.126***
	(7.92)	(7.91)	(-2.03)	(8.03)
Age Squared	-0.00166***	-0.00166***	0.0000383*	-0.00166***
	(-8.52)	(-8.47)	(1.65)	(-8.59)
Education Years	-0.0403***	-0.0352***	-0.00243***	-0.0352***
	(-6.17)	(-5.29)	(-2.71)	(-5.10)
Marital Status	0.214***	0.198***	0.0205***	0.197***
	(3.23)	(2.97)	(2.58)	(3.01)
Ethnic Group	0.0215	0.0775	0.015	0.0762
	(0.25)	(0.88)	(1.33)	(0.89)
Relative Income	0.0769***	0.0812***	0.00882***	0.0809***
	(5.55)	(5.75)	(4.92)	(5.82)
Social Trust	-0.0399*	-0.0424*	-0.0422*	-0.0398*
	(-1.76)	(-1.86)	(-1.87)	(-1.77)
Sense of Fairness	0.024	0.0224	0.0228	0.0244
	(1.06)	(0.98)	(1.03)	(1.11)
Constant	-3.414***	-7.146**	-1.293***	-6.741**
	(-10.08)	(-2.41)	(-577.7)	(-2.17)
Sample Size	5388	5388	5388	5388

Model (2) adds urban characteristics to Model (4), maintaining urban scale's significance. Wage levels have weak inhibitory effects; fiscal expenditure (+82.6% per 1%) and foreign investment (-46.7% per 1%) show significant opposite impacts. Industrial structure has a U-shaped relationship, with minimum entrepreneurship at a tertiary-to-secondary ratio of ~1.56. Comparing models, urban characteristics preserve the age inflection point but amplify urban scale effects and reduce hukou, gender, and education impacts.

Estimates from Models (1) and (2) may suffer from bias due to bidirectional causality: rising resident entrepreneurship influences local economic conditions, which in turn affect urban scale. To address this endogeneity, historical urban scale data (2005) are employed as an instrumental variable. The Wald test confirms endogeneity (p=0), while the IV demonstrates strong significance and explanatory power for urban scale.

IV Probit results are presented in Models (3) and (4). Model (3) shows urban scale remains a significant positive predictor of entrepreneurship. Adding urban characteristics in Model (4), the urban scale coefficient increases substantially compared to Model (2), indicating that resident entrepreneurship impacts urban scale—creating a negative correlation between urban scale and the error term that leads to underestimation in Probit regression. Other variables maintain consistency with earlier model specifications.

3.2 Robustness Test

To examine the robustness of the effect of urban scale on individuals' decisions to engage in entrepreneurship, we follow existing studies and replace urban scale with total urban population and the number of employed individuals. We also employ multiple estimation models (OLS and Logit models) for analysis, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Robustness Test Results under Multiple Models

Variable	OLS	Logit	Probit	Probit	IV probit	IV probit
Urban Scale	0.0112***	0.0938***				
	(2.64)	(2.91)				
Year-End Employment			0.0201***		0.0619***	
			(3.34)		(3.29)	
Total Urban Population				0.00211**		0.0387**
				(2.04)		(2.09)
Wage Level	0.0865	0.614	0.282	0.368	0.325	0.319
	(1.42)	(1.23)	(1.02)	(1.34)	(1.12)	(1.1)
Fiscal Expenditure	0.219**	1.455**	0.836**	0.558	0.934**	0.581
	(2.13)	(2.1)	(2.23)	(1.46)	(2.33)	(1.42)
Industrial Structure	-0.0653	-0.412***	-0.223***	-0.284***	-0.181***	-0.221***
	(-1.09)	(-2.94)	(-4.91)	(-3.17)	(-5.73)	(-2.91)
Industrial Structure Squared	0.0191**	0.132***	0.0728***	0.0873***	0.0605***	0.0709**
	(2.46)	(3.32)	(5.31)	(4.59)	(3.07)	(2.37)
Foreign Investment	-0.0990***	-0.864***	-0.505***	-0.453***	-0.481***	-0.501***
	(-3.11)	(-3.13)	(-3.33)	(-3.02)	(-3.09)	(-3.21)
Household Registration	0.0461***	0.334***	0.185***	0.183***	0.183***	0.185***
	(3.72)	(3.61)	(3.68)	(3.62)	(3.77)	(3.81)
Gender	0.0337***	0.271***	0.159***	0.159***	0.159***	0.159***
	(3.37)	(3.51)	(3.72)	(3.72)	(3.7)	(3.69)
Age	0.0265***	0.232***	0.127***	0.126***	0.126***	0.126***
	(8.54)	(7.76)	(7.95)	(7.96)	(8.07)	(8.07)
Age Squared	-0.00035***	-0.0031***	-0.0017***	-0.0017***	-0.0017***	-0.0017***
	(-9.28)	(-8.29)	(-8.50)	(-8.52)	(-8.63)	(-8.64)
Education Years	-0.00796***	-0.0590***	-0.0351***	-0.0353***	-0.0351***	-0.0353***
	(-5.04)	(-4.98)	(-5.28)	(-5.29)	(-5.09)	(-5.12)
Marital Status	0.0391***	0.386***	0.197***	0.200***	0.197***	0.196***
	(3.02)	(3.04)	(2.96)	(3.01)	(3.01)	(2.99)
Ethnic Group	0.0234	0.159	0.0803	0.0841	0.0788	0.0835
	(1.11)	(1.00)	(0.91)	(0.96)	(0.92)	(0.97)
Relative Income	0.0186***	0.143***	0.0796***	0.0794***	0.0794***	0.0802***
	(5.68)	(5.51)	(5.56)	(5.53)	(5.66)	(5.71)
Social Trust	-0.00995*	-0.0751*	-0.0423*	-0.0421*	-0.0425*	-0.0415*
	(-1.83)	(-1.82)	(-1.86)	(-1.84)	(-1.89)	(-1.84)
Sense of Fairness	0.0052	0.0393	0.0232	0.0197	0.0232	0.0209
	(0.95)	(0.94)	(1.02)	(0.86)	(1.05)	(0.95)
Constant	-1.384**	-13.53**	-6.844**	-7.733***	-7.346**	-7.159**
	(-2.11)	(-2.53)	(-2.31)	(-2.61)	(-2.37)	(-2.32)

First, columns 1 and 2 of Table 3 present the regression results using the OLS and Logit models, respectively. It is evident that urban scale has a significant positive effect on residents' entrepreneurship.

Columns 3 to 6 of Table 3 show the results using the Probit and IV Probit models, where the number of employees at year-end and the total urban population are used as proxies for urban scale. Both alternative variables exhibit a significant positive effect on residents' entrepreneurship in both the Probit and IV Probit models. Additionally, the significance and direction of the regression coefficients of the other control variables remain consistent with those in Table 2. In summary, urban scale significantly promotes residents' entrepreneurship. Therefore, the results obtained using the Probit model in this study are robust.

4. Further Discussion

4.1 Urban Scale and Different Types of Entrepreneurship under Urban-Rural Stratification

Table 4 examines urban scale effects on entrepreneurship types across urban-rural groups. Urban scale significantly boosts both opportunity-driven and necessity-driven entrepreneurship for the full sample and urban residents. For rural residents, it inhibits necessity-driven but promotes opportunity-driven entrepreneurship, with an overall inhibitory effect on rural entrepreneurship.

Table 4 Regression Results of Urban Scale on Different Types of Entrepreneurship for the Full Sample and Under Urban-Rural Stratification

Group Category	Variable	probit			IV probit		
		Entrepreneurship Status	Necessity-Driven Entrepreneurship	Opportunity-Driven Entrepreneurship	Entrepreneurship Status	Necessity-Driven Entrepreneurship	Opportunity-Driven Entrepreneurship
Full Sample	Urban Scale	0.0518*** (2.95)	0.023*** (4.2)	0.0197*** (3.43)	0.5570*** (3.19)	0.0308*** (3.58)	0.0267*** (3.24)
	Household Registration	0.184*** (3.66)	0.209*** (3.85)	0.0182 (0.23)	0.183*** (3.77)	0.207*** (3.99)	0.0186** (2.24)
	Education Years	-0.0352*** (-5.29)	-0.0365*** (-5.21)	-0.0172*** (-3.64)	-0.0352*** (-5.10)	-0.0366*** (-4.96)	-0.0175 (-1.62)
Urban	Urban Scale	0.0593*** (3.13)	0.0335* (1.65)	0.0811*** (2.92)	0.0579*** (3.00)	0.0344 (1.63)	0.0755*** (2.63)
	Household Registration	0.396*** (6.82)	0.389*** (6.28)	0.185** (2.1)	0.397*** (7.00)	0.389*** (6.47)	0.186** (2.12)
	Education Years	-0.0545*** (-6.98)	-0.0558*** (-6.80)	-0.0254** (-2.15)	-0.0546*** (-6.78)	-0.0558*** (-6.48)	-0.0267** (-2.16)
Rural	Urban Scale	-0.076 (-1.44)	-0.144*** (-2.59)	0.134** (2.46)	-0.0513 (-0.97)	-0.124** (-2.17)	0.143* (1.65)
	Household Registration	-0.0994 (-0.72)	0.0441 (0.29)	-0.384* (-1.94)	-0.102 (-0.73)	0.0417 (0.27)	-0.383* (-1.90)
	Education Years	0.00676 (0.49)	0.00214 (0.15)	0.0156 (0.67)	0.00599 (0.41)	0.00158 (0.10)	0.0148 (0.58)

Household registration analysis shows agricultural hukou in the full sample and urban residents enhances both entrepreneurship types, while rural residents show no significant effects—highlighting large cities' advantage for migrant worker entrepreneurship. Education years negatively impact full sample and urban entrepreneurship significantly, but show a non-significant positive effect for rural residents. Local fiscal expenditure promotes urban but inhibits rural entrepreneurship, likely due to fiscal support favoring developed areas.

4.2 Urban Scale and Different Types of Entrepreneurship among Migrant and Non-Migrant Workers

Table 5 Different Types of Entrepreneurship among Migrant and Non-Migrant Workers in Urban Areas

Group Category	Variable	probit			IV probit		
		Entrepreneurship Status	Necessity-Driven Entrepreneurship	Opportunity-Driven Entrepreneurship	Entrepreneurship Status	Necessity-Driven Entrepreneurship	Opportunity-Driven Entrepreneurship
Migrant Workers	Urban Scale	0.0358** (2.01)	0.0643* (1.75)	-0.0688 (-1.19)	0.0326*** (3.94)	0.0652* (1.80)	-0.0865 (-1.49)
	Wage Level	1.164** (2.07)	1.292** (2.18)	-0.00264 (-0.00)	1.197** (2.02)	1.283** (2.07)	0.204 (0.21)
	Foreign Investment	-0.887*** (-2.96)	-1.015*** (-3.21)	-0.0423 (-0.10)	-0.895*** (-2.91)	-1.013*** (-3.11)	-0.0818 (-0.17)
	Education Years	-0.0787*** (-7.97)	-0.0837*** (-8.00)	-0.0333** (-2.26)	-0.0787*** (-7.71)	-0.0837*** (-7.55)	-0.0341** (-2.18)
Non-Migrant Workers	Urban Scale	0.0845*** (3.62)	0.0262 (3.01)	0.153*** (4.67)	0.0842*** (3.47)	0.0268 (0.97)	0.151*** (4.44)
	Wage Level	-0.273 (-0.69)	-0.634 (-1.47)	0.781 (1.32)	-0.27 (-0.64)	-0.637 (-1.41)	0.865 (1.22)
	Foreign Investment	-0.137 (-0.64)	-0.00447 (-0.02)	-0.399 (-1.27)	-0.137 (-0.63)	-0.00373 (-0.02)	-0.434 (-1.21)
	Education Years	-0.011 (-0.84)	-0.00529 (-0.39)	-0.021 (-1.04)	-0.0111 (-0.82)	-0.00527 (-0.37)	-0.0221 (-1.05)

Urban residents' entrepreneurship is significantly influenced by hukou and education. As urban populations include both local residents and migrant workers, the data were reclassified by hukou into migrant and non-migrant groups. Table 5 shows urban scale positively impacts necessity-driven entrepreneurship among migrants but not opportunity-driven entrepreneurship, whereas the opposite

holds for non-migrants—indicating survival as the primary entrepreneurial motivation for migrants. Education years significantly differ in impact: increasing education inhibits entrepreneurship among migrants.

4.3 Urban Scale and Entrepreneurship among Migrant Workers with Different Skill Levels

Table 5 shows increased education years inhibit migrant workers' entrepreneurship. Given varying technical skills, this study differentiates high/low-skill migrant workers by education (low-skill: junior high school or below). Table 6 results show urban scale significantly impacts migrant workers' entrepreneurship, with a stronger effect on low-skill groups, indicating large cities better promote their self-employment. Improving migrant workers' entrepreneurial environment and welfare expenditures can reduce economic imbalances. Wage levels affect high-skill migrant workers' entrepreneurship more significantly—particularly opportunity-driven ventures—whereas they impact low-skill workers' necessity-driven entrepreneurship.

Table 6 Urban Scale and Entrepreneurship among Migrant Workers with Different Skill Levels

Group Category	Variable	probit			IV probit		
		Entrepreneurship Status	Necessity-Driven Entrepreneurship	Opportunity-Driven Entrepreneurship	Entrepreneurship Status	Necessity-Driven Entrepreneurship	Opportunity-Driven Entrepreneurship
High-Skill Group	Urban Scale	0.112** (2.27)	0.115* (1.73)	0.0453 (0.31)	0.12*** (3.54)	0.134* (1.69)	0.111*** (3.67)
	Wage Level	-2.398* (-1.87)	-1.046 (-0.83)	-6.052*** (-2.63)	-2.488* (-1.69)	-1.216 (-0.81)	-5.031 (-1.61)
	Sense of Fairness	-0.151* (-1.73)	-0.0898 (-0.99)	-0.224* (-1.65)	-0.152* (-1.76)	-0.091 (-1.02)	-0.217 (-1.40)
Low-Skill Group	Urban Scale	0.47** (2.3)	0.359*** (2.84)	0.104* (1.67)	0.181 (0.20)	0.344* (1.82)	0.114* (1.74)
	Wage Level	-2.099*** (-3.21)	-1.976*** (-2.89)	-0.876 (-1.11)	-2.134*** (-3.16)	-1.994*** (-2.84)	-0.956 (-0.91)
	Sense of Fairness	0.0799* (1.7)	0.0554 (1.12)	0.0983 (1.43)	0.0800* (1.7)	0.0554 (1.14)	0.103 (1.37)

5. Conclusion

This study utilizes CGSS2018 data to examine the impact of urban scale on residents' entrepreneurship, yielding key findings: (1) Urban scale significantly enhances entrepreneurship probability, with a 1% increase in scale elevating it by 1.8% (average marginal effect). (2) It promotes both necessity-driven and opportunity-driven entrepreneurship, with a more pronounced effect on the former. (3) Urban-rural stratification shows urban scale boosts entrepreneurship among urban residents, while inhibiting rural entrepreneurship overall—though it promotes opportunity-driven ventures in rural areas. (4) Large cities disproportionately facilitate entrepreneurship among migrant workers, particularly those with agricultural hukou. (5) Migrant workers primarily engage in necessity-driven entrepreneurship, with urban scale showing no significant effect on their opportunity-driven ventures. (6) Urban scale impacts migrant workers' entrepreneurship differently by skill level, with a stronger effect on low-skilled groups.

These findings carry critical policy implications. Expanding urban scale fosters resident entrepreneurship—especially among migrant workers in large cities—aligning with China's "Mass Entrepreneurship" initiative. Reducing barriers to migrant mobility is vital to leverage urban agglomeration effects, as current restrictions hinder economic agglomeration, migrant entrepreneurship, and regional equity. Internationally, China's experience highlights how urban scale can promote inclusive development by stimulating entrepreneurship and creating opportunities for vulnerable groups, offering actionable insights for rapidly urbanizing regions worldwide to integrate economic and social progress through urbanization.

References

[1] Jin Y,,Chen Z, Lu M. Industry Agglomeration in China: Economic Geography,New Economic Geography and Policy[J]. Economic Research Journal, 2006(04): 79-89.
[2] Tong Y, Wang Y. The Choice of Floating Migrants in China:Why Megacities are Always Preferred? A Cost-Benefit Analysis[J]. Population Research, 2015, 39(04): 49-56.
[3] Zhong W, Zhang W. The Effect of Enterpreneurs' Education Level and School Performance on Entrepreneurial Performance——An Empirical Research Based on Micro and Small Enterprises[J]. Educational Research, 2014, 35(06): 58-66.
[4] Peroni C, Riillo C A F, Sarracino F. Entrepreneurship and immigration: evidence from GEM

Luxembourg[J]. Small Business Economics, 2016, 46(4): 639-656.

[5] Chen B. An Empirical Study on the Impact of Risk Attitude on Return Entrepreneurship Behavior[J]. Journal of Management World, 2009(03): 84-91.

[6] Turkina E, Thi Thanh Thai M. Social capital, networks, trust and immigrant entrepreneurship: A cross-country analysis[J]. Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy, 2013, 7(2): 108-124.

[7] Ruan R, Zheng F, Liu L. The Power of Faith: Does Religion Facilitate Entrepreneurship?[J]. Economic Research Journal, 2014, 49(03): 171-184.

[8] Constant A, Zimmermann K F. The making of entrepreneurs in Germany: Are native men and immigrants alike?[J]. Small business economics, 2006, 26(3): 279-300.

[9] Lin Y, Lin L, Gao Q, et al. Development of Digital Inclusive Finance and Business Startups of Migrant Population:Evidences from the China Migrants Dynamic Survey[J]. Contemporary Finance & Economics, 2022(04): 65-75.

[10] Wu L, Liu J, Wen H. Does rural female entrepreneurship have a "digital dividend"?——Survey and analysis based on CGSS2015[J]. World Agriculture, 2021(08): 53-68+119-120.

[11] Liu W, Yang J. The Impact of Sense of Income Inequality on Individual Entrepreneurship ——Empirical Analysis Based on CGSS 2015 Data[J]. Research on Economics and Management, 2021, 42(03): 97-110.

[12] Wang Z, Su B. A Study on the Current Situation and Influencing Factors of Youth Employment: Based on Empirical Analysis of Chinese General Social Survey[J]. Northwest Population Journal, 2022, 43(04): 42-53.