

Raphaela Hettlage

Working Paper Nr. 0803
**From Ethnic Business To
Hybrid Entrepreneurs**

35 years of research on self-employed immigrants



Content

1	Introduction	2
2	Part 1: From Then To Now	2
2.1	The cultural approach	2
2.2	Opportunity structures.....	2
2.3	Introducing social networks	2
2.4	Transnationalism and globalization	2
3	Part 2: From androcentric to gendered.....	2
4	Part 3: From the US to Europe	2
4.1	The Biographical Perspective	2
5	Conclusion	2
6	References.....	2

1 Introduction

In 1972 Ivan Light set out to find out why the foreign born evidenced higher rates of self-employment than did the native born. His research led to a huge body of literature on ethnic entrepreneurs, immigrant self-employment and minority businesses¹, mainly concerned with the question: "Why are some groups more successful in their entrepreneurship than others?" From then on, researchers have shown an increasing interest in the development of business activity as a pattern of adjustment of immigrant groups to the host society. The research has focused on how culture contributes to the development of enterprises (Light, 1972); the trajectory of certain ethnic groups who move into entrepreneurship (ethnic enclave theory: Wilson and Portes, 1980; middleman minorities theory: Bonacich and Modell, 1980); how the structure of the host society influences the entrepreneurship of ethnic groups or immigrants (interactive model: Waldinger, Aldrich and Ward, 1990); how institutions come into play in comparative research (mixed embeddedness: Kloosterman and Rath, 2001); the importance of an ethnic or family network for entrepreneurial activities (e.g. Light, 1993; Portes and Bach, 1985); the importance of gender (e.g. Dallalgar, 1994; Hillmann, 1999; Morokvasic, 1988; Strüder, 2003) and biographical experience (e.g. Apitzsch, 2003; Kupferberg, 2003).

There has been increasing confusion regarding terminology within the different theoretical approaches and frameworks. I do not aim within this paper to define the concepts of self-employment, small business ownership, and entrepreneurship. However, it should be noted that the empirical research reviewed does not often make a theoretical distinction between these terms. Whether someone is actually an entrepreneur in Schumpeter's sense and therefore shows aptitudes that are present in only a small fraction of the population, or whether someone is the owner of his/her own business but does not focus on new, innovative business ideas is not dealt with in most of the literature on ethnic entrepreneurship. Some of the immigrants who open up their own business might be innovation champions (Rogers, 1995), focused on innovation and willing to break through society's constraints. Others (early and late adaptors) might simply imitate the business idea of other successful business owners and still be successful in their business-ownership (Rogers, 1995). The emphasis in the literature is therefore not on the notion of innovation and entrepreneurship. Instead, all who are self-employed and not working for wages, and who are not part of the majority population, are included in the term 'ethnic entrepreneurs'. This would include both individuals who are sole proprietors with no employees, and small business owners with less than 500 employees. However, it should be noted that immigrants are mostly active in so-called micro-enterprises, small businesses with five or fewer employees requiring less than \$35,000 in start-up costs.

Furthermore, it is often unclear what kinds of groups are being observed: In many studies, immigrant, ethnic or minority entrepreneurs are treated as being the same, and no further differentiation is made between the underlying categories of these groups, although the following distinction could be made: immigrant entrepreneurs are individuals who have a migration background, whereas ethnic entrepreneurs typically share a "common national background or migration experiences" (Waldinger, Aldrich and Ward, 1990:3) and minority entrepreneurs are individuals who are not of the majority population. However, the boundaries between these categories are not fixed but overlap, as many self-employed immigrants can also

¹ I will discuss the different terminologies involved in the research on self-employed immigrants later.

belong to a certain ethnic group and are members of a minority, whereas some scholars see women entrepreneurs as minority entrepreneurs even when they are neither immigrants nor ethnic. It is, therefore, not surprising that many researchers do not differentiate between these groups. From my perspective, the notion of ethnic entrepreneurs is rather confusing, because ethnicity in entrepreneurship research is often used to indicate the geographic origin of the migrants. Yet, ethnicity is usually not defined by geographical boundaries but as the cultural traits of particular groups who share common customs, behavior and a common world view in the sense of Humboldt's Weltanschauung, and so the notion of ethnic entrepreneurs is misplaced in certain contexts (nDoen et al. 1998). However, it can be observed that European studies rely less on the term 'ethnic entrepreneurs', preferring the term 'immigrant entrepreneurs', thereby stressing the fact of a migration background and the shared experience of migration (Kontos, 2003). I also prefer the term 'entrepreneurial migrants' or 'migrant entrepreneurs' to 'ethnic entrepreneurs', since ethnic entrepreneurs are generally migrants who become self-employed in the process of their immigration. But for this paper both terms, 'entrepreneurial migrants' and 'ethnic entrepreneurs', are used with respect to the different theoretical takes on self-employed immigrants. Thus, the terminology already reflects the different theoretical approaches towards migrants in various entrepreneurial sectors.

In this review, I offer a history of theoretical developments, outlining the different ways in which scholars have defined and approached the entrepreneurship of migrants. I show how the focus on cultural and group resources has been replaced by a broader perspective including opportunity structures and emphasizing the importance of institutions. In the second part I demonstrate how the call for a gendered approach to migration research has influenced scholarship on self-employed immigrants. To conclude, I present promising new scholarship and highlight future research directions focusing on the micro-level of analysis and promoting an approach that finds a balance between individualism and biography.

2 Part 1: From Then To Now

2.1 The cultural approach

Cultural factors have been considered by many as the cause of the over-representation of certain ethnic groups in self-employment. The cultural argument represents an attempt to attribute entrepreneurship to non-economic factors such as a cultural predisposition to self-employment or social networks. This approach is often linked to a Weberian approach to entrepreneurship, where capital accumulation is dependent on specific traditional values such as those inspired by Max Weber's Protestant ethic thesis (1930), in which certain value systems and religions breed entrepreneurial spirit. According to Weber, the institutions and ethics of Protestantism determined the entrepreneurial success of the Puritans and contributed to the rise of capitalism.

The pioneering work of Ivan Light (1972) illustrates the significance of ethnicity based on tight social networks, in which ethnic business owners sell goods that are mainly consumed by co-ethnic customers. Light adopts a comparative perspective and asks why there should have been such varying entrepreneurial responses to severe discrimination and deprivation among Chinese and Japanese immigrants to the USA, on the one hand, and Black Americans, on the other. Substantial and prosperous business groups emerged amongst the former, but not among the latter. Light sought his answer in the contrasting patterns of community structure and co-operation evident in each group. One of his explanations was the importance of mutual reliance within the ethnic community and the fact that these businesses tend to employ fellow ethnics, and often depend on ethnic structures such as credit associations and values such as ethnic honor (Light, 1972). He showed that in some ethnic groups members share access to capital through rotating credit associations. In some ways, the book "anticipated the major theoretical ideas that came later" (Light and Gold, 2000:9) by emphasizing trust and solidarity within ethnic groups – a feature which would later be understood as social capital.

In 1979 Ivan Light further developed his idea by introducing the disadvantage theory and distinguishing disadvantage explanations from cultural ones. Like cultural theory, disadvantage theory is rooted in Weber's (1930) work, in which Weber suggested that those who are excluded from the mainstream economy because of discrimination will often turn to business ownership as an alternative to the labor market – in effect, choosing self-employment over unemployment. In Light's seminal article on disadvantaged minorities, in which the disadvantage thesis was originally advanced, Light (1979) argued that disadvantages in the labor market push all minority members and immigrants to turn to self-employment, but that only those minority members with a predisposition toward risk taking, hard work, and delayed gratification can successfully enter small business. Therefore, his perspective on cultural factors also remains in his revised approach. According to his article minority members as a whole group might experience disadvantages on the labor market, but it is their special cultural resources that account for the differences in the entrepreneurship rates of minority groups. Although Light's hypothesis on the disadvantaged status of certain groups as a motive for entrepreneurial action is more convincing than the idea of some ethnic groups possessing "special endowments" (Cobas, 1988). It is important to note that neither Light nor other contemporary scholars took into account that minority groups are not (class) homogeneous, that all individuals do not pursue self-

employment, and that, among those who seek self-employment, members of different classes, educational background, migration history, age, gender and so on take different routes (Cobas, 1988).

Another early explanation centered on the idea of the "middleman minority." This construct, which had proponents in various fields, grew out of the observation that many of the most active groups in business were historically traders belonging to a minority group. Immigrant groups such as Jews in Europe have adapted to the receiving societies by becoming "middleman minorities". Edna Bonacich showed in her 1973 paper how middleman minority groups are created by using family, regional, dialect, sect and ethnic ties for preferential economic treatment. Bonacich argues that middleman minority groups continue to exist in today's advanced capitalist societies, although the original context and conditions have changed. Middleman minorities are usually small in size and found in specialized occupational niches. The groups are relatively successful in relation to other groups. Building on the concept developed by Blalock (1967), Bonacich argues that in contrast to other ethnic minorities, middleman minorities occupy an intermediate position by performing the delivery of goods and services between producer and consumer, employer and employee, owner and renter, elite and masses (Bonacich, 1973: 583). Their concentration in small business does not necessarily result from cultural business predispositions but more from the fact that they are temporary immigrants (sojourners). In pursuit of income maximization within a limited time for their future investments, sojourners mostly concentrate on narrow occupational niches and aim to save money. Because of the temporary aspect of their emigration, an orientation towards their homeland persists and they resist out-marriage, reside in self-segregation, establish language and cultural schools for their children, maintain cultural distinctiveness from the host society and avoid involvement in local politics except in affairs that directly affect their group (Bonacich, 1973:586). As they remain outsiders in relation to the host society, internal solidarity is an important feature of middleman minorities. They rely heavily on their own ethnic or economic community for mutual support and resources. Resources distributed within the middleman community include capital, credit and easier terms in relation to purchasing, information and training, jobs and labor.

Despite its success at the time (and until the 1990s), the middleman minority theory has its conceptual limitations. As Bonacich admits, we cannot claim that all middleman minorities are in a constant mode of movement between homeland and receiving countries, or that they all aim to return to the homeland (Bonacich, 1973: 592). They may abandon the dream of return to their homeland and hence become socially integrated into the country in which they reside. Therefore the sojourner status which has been emphasized by Bonacich is not applicable to many groups. The same is true for the "go-between" role of middlemen. Many immigrant business-owners do not serve a clientele limited to a minority population but try to address a broader clientele as soon as their resources allow them to do so.

In 1980 Edna Bonacich and John Modell reformulated the idea of the middleman minority by analyzing three generations of Japanese-Americans. Their study focuses on the relationship between the engagement of Japanese Americans in middleman minority economic activities and their retention of a strong ethnic community. Using their theory of middleman minorities, they explain the development of certain forms of businesses, the decline of ethnic cohesion, and the move out of ethnic enterprises and into the general economy in later years. According to Bonacich and Modell these developments are related to the children's and grandchildren's higher cultural capital. In this more recent study, Bonacich has incorporated some of the critique from her 1973 paper; i.e. the focus is no longer on sojourning, but instead the authors have tried to elaborate an ideal type of middleman minority by describing the specific organization of its business activities and its antagonistic relation

onship to the host society. Bonacich and John Modell were also the first ones to introduce the term “ethnic economy” into the debate (1981) and defined the ethnic economy as employment created by ethnic groups or immigrants on their own. Accordingly, the focus of Bonacich and Modell was on ethnicity as a defining factor, yet they also insist that ethnic community life is mainly based on shared economic interests. Once people move out of ethnic businesses the ethnic bonds are weakened. This theoretical approach stimulated a great deal of further research on the one hand, but at the same time also led to criticism. One major weakness of the Bonacich-Modell-theory was seen in their fluidity concerning the question of who comprises a middleman minority and who doesn't: “any and all small business activities undertaken by immigrants are classified as middleman phenomena” (Waldinger, 1986:254); therefore the theory loses the appeal of the initial formulation of 1973, where the definition of middleman minorities was much more precise. Another major critique comes from Donald Horowitz in his book “Ethnic groups in conflict” (1985). He refutes the 'middleman' theories' idea which claims that the source of ethnic conflict lies in economic resentments against minorities that specialize in control of trade, pointing out that often there are no conflicts at all but rather amicable working relations developed out of mutually complementary economic aims. Furthermore when there are conflicts between a middleman minority and their customers, they are more political than economic in nature. Middleman minorities are tolerated as long as their extraterritorial orientation does not pose a political threat to the majority. In the 1980s the publication of Alejandro Portes and colleagues on enclave economies (Wilson and Portes, 1980; Portes and Bach, 1985) marked a turning point in the understanding of how different immigrant groups organize themselves socially and economically to negotiate their new surroundings. Portes and Bach (1985) showed that under certain circumstances, immigrants create an alternative, unavailable to native-born workers, which they called the “ethnic enclave”. The ethnic enclave economy derived from dual or segmented labor market theory and was focused on inequality in employment. In the dual market theory² scholars emphasize the division between the primary market, which is based on human capital and rewards a high level of human capital, and the secondary labor market, which holds mostly undesirable positions for “marked” groups who have no other choice than to participate in this segment of the labor market (Dickens and Lang 1985). Dual market theory claimed that women and minorities were locked into a secondary labor market which offered less desirable jobs than the primary labor market. Portes and Bach argue that there is a third segment to the labor market, namely the ethnic enclave. Compared with this secondary labor market, entry into the enclave sector leads to greater opportunities for upward mobility and yields higher wages for members of the group. In the ethnic enclave, ethnic businesses trade primarily with other co-ethnics and are therefore able to gain competitive advantages over non-ethnic businesses. The enclave model of Portes and Bach (1985), which resulted from a detailed study of the Cuban and Mexican immigrant experience in the US, has several distinctive features: geographical concentration, interdependent networks of social and business relationships, and a relatively sophisticated division of labor. Rather than just being another segment of the labor market, the enclave functions as a substitute environment for the immigrant, cushioning his or her incorporation into the host country by providing both community and employment. The “enclave” refers to specific characteristics of the ethnic economy, such as an identifiable ethnic community and co-ethnic social relations and institutions (Zhou 1994). Later this approach would be expanded to

² Dual market theory has become widely discussed with the book of Doeringer and Piore (1971).

include the question of how social capital influences immigrant entrepreneurship, whereby social capital refers to the ability of entrepreneurs to draw on resources from their social networks (Portes and Zhou, 1992; Portes, 1998).

These two theories can be compared briefly as follows: The middleman minority theory is concerned with the ways that ethnic groups act as middlemen in the movement of goods and services, acting as intermediaries between the elite and the masses, and employers and employees. As such, the middleman minority theory only deals with trading groups with a history of traditional capitalism. In other words, it could not be applied to wage-earner groups who have recently become entrepreneurs (Light, 2000). In the ethnic enclave theory, however, business relations with the economy as a whole are an integral part and there is no idea of acting as an intermediary between the elite and the masses. The significance of the enclave theory is that immigrants can remain part of a self-segregated community and realize a sense of strong economic security without being entirely focused on their own ethnic group. An ethnic enclave economy is clustered around a territorial core and has a quasi-monopolistic economic advantage (Light, 2000:15). In other words, the ethnic community obtains a higher proportion of sales for the firms and extra jobs for co-ethnic workers than would be possible from unclustered ethnic economies (Light, 2000:24). The most important feature of the enclave theory is therefore the strong segregation which enables the immigrants to be economically successful without assimilation into the host society. Nevertheless, the relevance of the ethnic 'niche' or 'enclave' model has been questioned in multiple approaches. Apart from the fact that the very existence of ethnic enclaves has been discussed and has been proven to be true only for some ethnic groups (Waldinger, 1993) it should be stressed that opening a business always demands knowledge of how things work in the host society. In contrast to Portes and Bach's view, data on entrepreneurship shows that becoming self-employed usually requires special skills, such as the ability to speak the language well, and the understanding of all administrative questions. It is indeed true that many ethnic businessmen collaborate intensively with other members of the same ethnic group, but this does not mean that they are completely cut off from the host society.

2.2 Opportunity structures

Both theories, the middleman minority theory and the ethnic enclave theory, have been criticized for overemphasizing ethnic cultural factors and downplaying the structural constraints that push ethnic minorities into self-employment. In 1986, Waldinger came up with a new model focusing on the opportunity structures of the host society and stated that more attention should be given to the economic constraints that narrow the options available to immigrants who seek to develop their own businesses. Waldinger (1986) emphasized that immigrant enterprises are not only influenced by the social organization of the immigrant community, hence by the processes through which family and co-ethnic labor is mobilized and pre-existing knowledge is drawn upon within the community, but also by opportunity structures in the host society³. In 1990, Waldinger and his co-authors extended the idea of the importance of opportunity structures and developed the so-called interaction

³ Although the introduction of opportunity structures in the sense of Waldinger was new to the analysis of ethnic entrepreneurship it should be emphasised here that the idea of ethnic honor as a contribution to the favorable image of the Chinese and Japanese in the US (Light 1973) was one of the reasons why Orientals were successful business owners. We could therefore conclude that "ethnic honor" was one means to culturally influence the opportunity structure of immigrants.

approach. This is perhaps the most widely used work when it comes to questions of immigrant self-employment. Waldinger, Aldrich and Ward focus on opportunity structures, group characteristics and the strategies used by entrepreneurs within a specific set of historical conditions. Opportunity structures are defined as the resources made available to the groups within the host society (Waldinger, Aldrich and Ward, 1990:21). These are market conditions, i.e. the question of where a business niche can be found, and access to ownership. Listed under group characteristics are predisposing factors, resource mobilization, and features specific to the various groups. A predisposing factor can be a sense of blocked mobility. Immigrants often suffer from a variety of impediments on the labor market and these can lead to a predisposition to act on their own and to experience more autonomy from the majority population. The social structure of the immigrant community plays a key role in this. Faced with a multitude of difficulties, from obtaining information about the market to the acquisition of capital and labor, necessary resources are often mobilized from within the immigrant community. According to Waldinger and his co-authors, the existence of ethnic networks may be the most important factor in the decision to become self-employed. The strategies entrepreneurs choose to employ in order to deal with problems related to their businesses are a consequence of the interplay between opportunity structures and group characteristics. It is this interplay which is seen as crucial for explaining the differences in the kinds of entrepreneurship of different immigrant groups.

Criticism of the model of Waldinger and colleagues has focused on the nowadays contested idea that immigrant entrepreneurship is based on ethnicity. Within the interactive model it has never been questioned whether immigrants indeed constitute ethnic groups and pursue mainly ethnic business activities. Nevertheless, the question of “why immigrants are a priori depicted as unchanging ethnic subjects” (Kloosterman and Rath, 2000:667) has only been addressed in much later research.

2.3 Introducing social networks

In the early 1990s migration theorists closed the gap between the macro and micro level of analysis as to why people move by introducing social network theory into the debate and thereby emphasizing the meso level of analysis. Already in 1989 Boyd argued that the recognition of social relationships and their role in international migration added an important theoretical emphasis, highlighting the social forces involved in migration. It didn't take long for scholars in ethnic entrepreneurship to realize that “studying networks, particularly those linked to family and households” (Boyd, 1989:642) not only permitted understanding of migration as a social product but also the ability to see ethnic entrepreneurship as a result of social embeddedness in combination with economic and political parameters and individual decisions. Since then the literature on ethnic entrepreneurship has acknowledged the considerable influence of informal support structures in providing various forms of support to businesses resources through contacts with individuals or experts. Conceptually, social capital refers to the ability of individuals such as entrepreneurs to draw on resources from their social networks (Coleman, 1988; Portes, 1998; Deakins et al., 2007). There are two major approaches to the question of how social capital influences the entrepreneurship of immigrants. Theories which draw upon the notions of solidarity and trust are related to the ethnic enclave theory. They explain the rise of social capital by cultural similarity or similar experiences of exclusion. Alejandro Portes and Min Zhou (1992), for example, emphasized the importance of bounded solidarity among customers, workers, and investors in ethnic business created among immigrants as a result of their foreignness and cultural difference and the consequences of

these features: in other words enforceable trust (Portes and Zhou, 1992:513, see also Portes and Sensenbrenner, 1993). Portes and Zhou argue that this form of social capital (solidarity and trust) is not derived from a particular cultural value system, but stems from the situation in which the immigrant entrepreneurs find themselves in the host society. It is not ethnicity or value conservation which explains the rise of social capital within immigrant groups, but the particular circumstances of "foreignness" (Portes and Sensenbrenner, 1996). With increased acculturation and economic assimilation of minority groups into the majority population, the social capital of an enclave will dissipate and thus the basis of ethnic social capital for ethnic business will disappear. Therefore, the success of an ethnic business may depend on the existence of residential ethnic segregation and might paradoxically disappear with gradual assimilation.

Sanders and Nee (1996) have similarly built upon the idea of enforceable trust and reciprocity, although they focus on the role of family and not on ethnic ties within the social network of immigrant entrepreneurs. In a prior piece of empirical research they found that the family is often the main source of social capital. Because of collective interests and strong personal ties, the family facilitates the pooling of financial and labor resources. From this perspective, the family may function as a social organization of production involving the provision of paid and unpaid labor in the family business and mutual obligations and solidarity in the pursuit of collective goals.

On the other hand social capital theory does not exclusively focus on strong ties and group solidarity. Whether a link to a person is a strong-tie relation or a weak-tie relation (Granovetter, 1973) does not determine the amount of social capital inherent within this relation. Therefore, some network specialists have developed the idea of social capital further by exploring what the actual features of social capital are (e.g. Coleman, 1988). Social network theory stresses the structural position of a person, emphasizing that their position within a social network is responsible for the access to social capital. Network analysts study individuals' connections as their personal fields, seeing connections between these fields, and their links through social structures to labor markets (Wassermann and Faust, 1994). By introducing formal network analysis into immigrant entrepreneurship, researchers can find out how networks are part of immigrants' resources and how they shape economic activities (Greve and Salaff, 2005; Salaff, Greve and Wong, 2006). Social relations become social capital in several ways and strong ties might not always be the right business strategy. In their 2006 paper Salaff and co-authors show, for example, that Chinese immigrants in Canada have different ways of accessing social capital. They do not solely rely on ethnic networks, but also on professional networks outside the ethnic community. Start-ups, in particular, do not always happen within an immigrant niche, as often business opportunities for newcomers are more accessible outside the already highly contested ethnic enclave.

2.4 Transnationalism and globalization

So far we have seen that the literature on immigrant entrepreneurship has either focused a) on (cultural) characteristics of immigrants, b) on opportunity structures immigrants find in the host society or c) on cultural or structural networks within their community. The next step in theories on immigrant entrepreneurship was to go beyond the geographical and relational 'container' (i.e. the nation-state) of the host society by introducing transnationalism into the debate.

Since the 1990s a different perspective on immigrants' networks has developed through the (re-)introduction of the term transnationalism into migration scholarship. Glick-Schiller and colleagues define immigrants as

transmigrants “when they develop and maintain multiple relations – familial, economic, social, organizational, religious, and political– that span borders” (Glick, Schiller, Basch and Blanc-Szanton 1992: ix). The transnationalism debate and questions about the usefulness of the term have greatly influenced the scholarship on migration. It is therefore not surprising that research on migrant entrepreneurship has also been affected by this new turn in the social sciences. In 2002, Portes and colleagues introduced the term ‘transnational entrepreneurs’ (Portes, Guanizot and Haller, 2002: 278) into the debate on ethnic entrepreneurship. Portes and colleagues’ research is based on the Comparative Immigrant Entrepreneurship Project (CIEP), one of the first large-scale studies combining qualitative interviews and quantitative surveys on transnational entrepreneurship. They define transnational entrepreneurs as ethnic entrepreneurs whose business success depends on contacts and associates in their home countries or a third country. The entrepreneurship of these immigrants is therefore not bound by national borders but on the contrary is supposed to defy the restrictions of geography, citizenship, and nationhood. Portes and colleagues (ibid 2002) found that transnational entrepreneurs comprise a much larger share – often an outright majority – of self-employed immigrants. Although transnational immigrant entrepreneurs are certainly not a new phenomenon, the extensive economics and sociology literature on immigrant entrepreneurialism has for a long time ignored this issue. Researchers only began a few years ago to pay sufficient attention to the question of how new opportunities through processes of globalization and international migration affect the strategies of self-employed immigrants (compare Zhou’s review of immigrant entrepreneurship (2004)).

The theoretical approach of transnational resources can be easily situated within immigrant entrepreneurship theory, as once again ethnic resources are thought to be at the root of this special kind of entrepreneurship. Nevertheless, not every migrant entrepreneur is engaged in transnational activities and there has been little research so far on how and why transnational business activities can become a strategy for self-employed immigrants (Wong and Ng, 2002). A promising way of finding out more on the structure and relevance of transnational ties may be found in a structural theoretical approach researching the network structures mentioned above. Here social network analysis can be a useful means for viewing immigrants’ enterprises in the wider context of their transnational links (Greve and Salaff, 2005).

With the broadening of the perspective on immigrants within the labor market, another trend has been introduced into the research into immigrant self-employment: the global city. Globalization scholars argue that the urban context of an ethnic economy has been undergoing a striking change since the late 1960s/early 1970s. Shifts in communication and transportation technologies have reinforced existing divisions of labor. Some groups who are better endowed with capital, such as transnational capital, are further empowered while the have-nots, such as unskilled immigrants in particular, fall further behind. Nowadays most of the jobs are created in the knowledge and service oriented sectors of the economy. Sassen (2001) notes that the on-going process of globalization is clearly reflected within the immigrant economy in ‘global cities’. There is a rising sector of specialized, usually labor-intensive, small enterprises in major urban cores, often established and maintained by an immigrant labor force equipped with relatively small financial assets but rich human resources. Migrants and their small businesses in global cities are seen as a localization of globalization, where within a certain space polarization along lines of class, race, ethnicity, and gender are articulated. The global city as a shaping place for immigrant entrepreneurs has been developed further by Strüder (2003) who, as a geographer, likewise focuses on the idea that place, race and gender are interconnected and that this approach is crucial for understanding self-employment. In her view, the global city provides

a context where a wide range of possible subjectivities can be performed and is an important influence on the personal development of individuals, mainly in regard to gender roles. To summarize, the 'global city' approach shifts away from the nation-state as the analytical priority, but in contrast to the use of the transnationalism approach, which is mainly concerned with networks, scholars who focus on the 'global city' as an environment for immigrant entrepreneurship do this more in line with the interaction approach (Waldinger, Aldrich and Ward, 1990) by emphasizing opportunity structures as well as group relations. Thus, we can again find the importance of the business environment within the globalization debate, with the major difference that this environment of the "host society" as a "global city" is more precisely specified.

3 Part 2: From androcentric to gendered

Although there have been many studies available since the 1980s on the unpaid or underpaid wage labor of immigrant and ethnic women (Bonacich, 1987, Phizacklea, 1983), research on entrepreneurship among immigrant women has been scarce (Lee, 2006). Research on gender within the ethnic economy was mostly focused on women helping out in male-owned businesses. Although women working in family businesses might have been co-owners, they had the status of 'family workers'. Yet the term 'family labor' concealed the fact that women often contribute substantially to the family business and further underscored the already obscured status of immigrant women entrepreneurs (Lee, 2006).

Today scholars agree that 'unpaid family labor' was and is a distinctive feature in explaining the success of immigrant enterprises; the exploitation of female kinship labor is even seen as one of the 'building blocks' of the emergence of ethnic economies (Anthias, 1992). This gender blindness, where female work was subsumed under family labor, was followed by a phase where gender was introduced into migrant entrepreneurship by emphasizing inequality in terms of less upward mobility and general discrimination in comparison to male entrepreneurs (Phizacklea, 1988).

In the 1990s women entrepreneurs became the focus of researchers. In her study on Iranian immigrant women entrepreneurs, Dallalfar (1994) addresses the lack of gender specificity in immigration literature on ethnic economies. Although the role of immigrant women in the labor market has been discussed extensively, women as innovators with their own business strategies have not been analyzed. In her case study on two Iranian women Dallalfar points out, that immigrant women do not only rely on ethnic and class resources, as described by Light and Karageorgis (1994), but also on gender. An antithetic view comes from the German geographer Felicitas Hillmann. In her research on Turkish and Kurdish women entrepreneurs in Germany, Hillmann (1998) argues that immigrant women tend to become self-employed outside the confinement of a tight ethnic network. Women do not consider themselves embodiments of the ethnic economy; many locate their businesses outside of their community for the explicit purpose of securing a German clientele. With this observation Hillmann challenges the mainstream hypothesis regarding ethnic social capital as a key business resource. Hillmann states that the concept of "ethnic business" is a "male" concept, as the connection to an ethnic community for female entrepreneurs is looser. While men "dominate the ethnic economy" (Hillmann, 1999: 280) women have to leave the strong ethnic networks in order to achieve economic advancement. If women are embedded in an ethnic network they feel more oppressed by the migrant family structures and the imposed norms concerning appropriate gender and ethnic behavior than men.

This focus on how gender and ethnicity shape the entrepreneurship of immigrant women has since played a substantial role. Strüder's (2003) research among self-employed Turkish-speaking women, for example, shows that for some immigrant women their perceived function in the community, for example as "mother and wife, guardian of gendered norms and practices" (Strüder, 2003:190) impacts the way they start and grow their businesses. The norms of the "imagined community" (Strüder, 2003) act in a restrictive manner and shape the strategies migrant women can employ, though without completely stripping their agency from them (Essers, 2007, see also Apitzsch and Kontos, 2003).

With the growing debate in feminist research on intersectionality and on how gender, ethnicity and class are interrelated, research on immigrant women who become self-employed has also adopted this approach in explaining the diversity of women immigrant entrepreneurs. Including class within the analysis of ethnic entrepreneurs was not a new approach intro-

duced by feminist researchers. In fact, it has long been argued that the theory of ethnic entrepreneurship did not give sufficient weight to issues related to social class. As Light and Rosenstein point out, an investigation of class resources is critical to any understanding of ethnic entrepreneurs. Different immigrants have different kinds of class and ethnic resources. Light and Rosenstein (1995) proposed a resources theory of entrepreneurship, in which ethnic resources and class resources combine in varying combinations for different ethnic groups at different times to shape the incidence and nature of entrepreneurship. In addition to analyzing the influence of class and ethnicity on immigrant self-employment, gender as a structuring factor has been added to the theoretical framework (Anthias, 2003, Essers, 2007) with the intention of developing a framework for interpreting and evaluating immigrant women's social position or status. Class, ethnicity and gender intersect in different ways for different ethnic groups in different places over time. Why immigrant women go into business is influenced by gender, ethnicity, class and immigration, and embedded in the social structure of a community, of marital relationships and of family responsibilities (Low 2003).

4 Part 3: From the US to Europe

Although it is safe to say that the rise of immigrant business ownership is an international trend, research has focused particularly on relatively deregulated Anglo-Saxon economies; but there has also been some attention to non-Anglo-Saxon European nations. Therefore it is not surprising that the most substantial body of literature on immigrant business activity has clearly been that focusing on the United States. Although the literature is vast, so far cultural factors, opportunity structures and social network remain the main explanatory theses in the US context. Much of the literature rehearses the 'culture' versus 'structure' debate on the formation of immigrant or ethnic minority businesses. The number and quality of the insights which have emerged from studies on Anglo-Saxon countries have frequently led to the application of these theories in other national contexts, usually by applying the very same theories, with a few of their assumptions modified, to another nation-state context.

For Great Britain, for example, Werbner (1984) used the term 'entrepreneurial chain' to describe how successful Pakistani entrepreneurs in Manchester's garment industry provide sponsorship, advice, credit, and patronage to their network of family and friends. Her results show that the critical factor in the success of Pakistani businessmen is their cultural heritage (Werbner 1990). Such attributes, rather than the wider environment, are seen as central to the development of Asian business. Werbner is thus in line with the 'cultural resources' and 'network' approach and applies it to the context of Britain. In her later work Werbner (2001) makes reference to the 'ethnic enclave model', but demonstrates through the example of Asians in Manchester that the concept of ethnic enclave should be redefined by taking into account changes over time. According to Werbner, ethnic enclaves stop being ethnic enclaves because the concentration within certain industries begins to vanish after the second or third generation has taken over from the pioneers, and enterprises "stop being ethnic in anything apart from the identity of the owner" (ibid: 688). At this point they show no more distinctive culture of entrepreneurship and stop being interesting to the researcher. Phizacklea and Ram (1996) in their paper on ethnic business in Britain and France stress the fact that 'ethnic' enterprises are embedded in complex social and political relations which are beyond the control of immigrants as they are partly shaped by a national-political context. They thus build their theoretical input on the theoretical ideas of social embeddedness, but develop their ideas further by stressing the fact that "ethnicity itself is shaped by political relations" (Phizacklea and Ram, 1996:320).

In France, as in many European countries, immigrants were mostly seen as short-term salaried workers and their decision to stay and to become business-owners has certainly not been encouraged by French legislation (Pallida 1992). Explanatory factors for the rising numbers of the 'entreprenariat ethnique' are presented on two levels; on the one hand the structure of the host society determines the limited opportunity structures for immigrants in France, on the other the 'ethnicity' of the immigrants provides them with some advantages such as trust and solidarity and therefore enables immigrant entrepreneurship (Dinh, 2005). We can therefore find a strong influence of the "interactive" model in the French scholarship on immigrant entrepreneurship. Today there has been a shift in French scholarship on self-employed immigrants which focuses on the transnational social capital of immigrant entrepreneurs. The work of Alain Tarrus (1995), for example, shows that migrants' transnational business networks are rooted in local economic settings. As documented by the pioneer work done by this researcher, the city of Marseille is a major node in these transnational business networks, which he sees as "une

société cosmopolite” perpetuating the colonial order of the region of origin of the immigrant entrepreneurs within the new setting of the host society. Another transnational approach has been recently introduced with the notion “économie de diaspora” (diasporic economy). Researchers focus on entrepreneurs of the same ethnic group (Chinese immigrants) who maintain strong links with each throughout different national environments (Ma Mung, 2004). The transnational networks of these immigrant entrepreneurs are seen as a business strategy originating from the diasporic experience of the communities. (Transnational) Entrepreneurship is therefore not only a means of integration into the host society’s labor market, but also a means to gain autonomy from the host society by reproducing a cultural identity through these diasporic business networks. In Germany, most of the theoretical models that have been elaborated to explain ethnic entrepreneurship refer to the question of the ‘integration’ of immigrants and are more or less based on the idea of an enclave economy or social upward mobility out of the enclave economy. The protected market hypothesis is one example of a theory related to the specific situation of immigrants’ ‘integration’ or ‘segregation’. According to this theory, migrants had special needs that forced them to go to ethnic shops – a fact that led to the development of the some ethnic economies such as the Turkish economy in Germany, where these businesses were seen as “supplementing” (Ergänzungsökonomie) the German economy and therefore being “ausser Konkurrenz” (noncompetitive) for the mainstream economy of the host society (Blaschke and Ersöz, 1986). Yet as the entrepreneurship of immigrants in Germany has flourished, the notion of ‘Ergänzungsökonomie’ is outdated for several reasons. To begin with, many German shops have adapted their products to customers from important ethnic groups and thus made ‘ethnic’ shops redundant. Furthermore, second and third-generation migrants have also adapted their needs, and now tend to use non-ethnic products. Today very few businesses can survive by relying exclusively on ethnic customers (Sen and Goldberg, 1997). The declining role of the protected market calls into question the relevance of the ethnic ‘niche’ or ‘enclave’ model. What has been criticized by Waldinger (1993) regarding the US can also be applied to the situation in Europe. Opening a business always demands knowledge of how things work in the host society. Relying solely on the resources of an ethnic enclave is therefore not enough to guarantee economic success over an extended period of time. Moreover, the idea of the economic niche has been widely criticized, as it does not take into account individual motives such as the desire for social mobility or better earnings. Today, immigrants’ business activities have become an important factor within the German labor market and are thus suddenly seen as a solution to many immigration problems, from unemployment to “integration” issues. The question of whether self-employment leads to ‘integration’ has been hotly debated in the literature on ethnic economies⁴ but its impact on the incorporation of immigrants into the host societies has not yet been determined (Pécoud 2003).

New theoretical inputs from Europe only came into play at a relatively late stage. The most prominent theoretical input came from the Dutch scholars Kloosterman and Rath with their book on ‘immigrant entrepreneurs’ (2003) (earlier work 2001 and by Kloosterman, van der Leun and Rath, 1999). Kloosterman and Rath argue that US-based approaches have only limited applicability to the conditions of immigrant entrepreneurs in European settings, as they do not take into account the specific

⁴ On the one hand it seems that self-employment leads to socioeconomic perspectives for members of minorities and shows their willingness to establish themselves in the host society (Şen 1991). On the other hand self-employment can increase segregation and isolation from the host society. Furthermore self-employment of immigrants is not always a successful endeavor and failure can lead to precarious circumstances (Leicht 2001).

conditions (welfare state arrangements and the concomitant set of specific rules and regulations) of immigrant entrepreneurship in Europe. At the same time critics have suggested that US approaches have so far “relegated the role of government policy to a background variable” (Min and Bozorgmehr, 2003:33).

In response to this gap in the theoretical framework on immigrant entrepreneurship Kloosterman and Rath adopted a new theoretical approach to immigrant entrepreneurship, a mixed embeddedness approach. This theoretical concept moves beyond the interactive approach proposed by Waldinger, Aldrich and Ward. They argue that opportunity structures interact with group characteristics to give rise to ethnic entrepreneurship. For Kloosterman and Rath, it is crucial to recognize that neither cultural advantage nor economic environment operate in an institutional vacuum. To be able to compare the entrepreneurship of immigrants in different countries, the regulatory regime has to be taken into account⁵. Political and legal concepts are seen as a vital framework which can completely change the number, types and significance of immigrant businesses in any economy. Relevant issues include constructions of nationality, policies on immigration and assimilation, credentialism in business registration, and attitudes to the enforcement of laws and regulations. In their framework, several factors are given equal weight: the group characteristics of immigrant entrepreneurs, the aspects of the opportunity structure and the mediating role of institutions.

Kloosterman and Rath’s strong point from my perspective is the absence of the word ‘ethnic’ in their concept (and in their book title). The two editors argue that “ethnicity is not a very good starting point, especially for international comparisons, and that ethnic resources may invite too narrow a focus on the entrepreneurship of immigrants. Looking at ethnicity will not suffice to account for the differences between countries” (Kloosterman and Rath, 2003: 142).

A similar perspective has been developed by Etienne Piguet (1999) for immigrant entrepreneurship in Switzerland. With his ‘model of convergence’ Piguet claims that immigrants and natives (Swiss) are not that different in their entrepreneurship. As a consequence he sees the similarities (and not the differences) between the two groups as the main reason for the evolving entrepreneurship among immigrants. Immigrants increasingly adopt a native way of life, with the same economic choices and possibilities. According to Piguet such a model of convergence can be explained by the specificities of immigration into Europe, mainly immigration rates which are more or less stable over recent years, and a very successful second and third generation of immigrants. This is an important point and can also be found in the work of Kloosterman and Rath, who are also concerned to depart from the long-term argument that immigrant entrepreneurs differ from general business owners because they are endowed with ethnic resources.

Although these new theoretical frameworks can be seen as a considerable influence on the European scholarship on immigrant entrepreneurs, one major perspective has so far been missing. Kloosterman and Rath’s book “Immigrant Entrepreneurs”, like the majority of works on immigrant/ethnic entrepreneurship, still focuses solely on macro and meso factors that determine immigrant entrepreneurship. This is somewhat of a loss, as the emphasis on the relationship of structure and agency, pioneered by Light and Waldinger (Tseng, 2004), is overridden by the conceptual framework of ‘mixed embeddedness’, where the focus is on different trajectories and path dependencies arising from different policy and structural contexts,

⁵ See Hall (1986) for the concept of institutions and cross-national comparisons.

and less on the question of how these opportunity structures are shaped or influenced by individual or group agency⁶ The embeddedness of entrepreneurs in politico-economic structures and network resources will not be contested here. However, the focus on structures and networks turns a blind eye to the micro-oriented theoretical approach. As Yen-Fen Tseng (2004) points out, “the neglect of a micro-level explanation reflects a social science paradigm that emphasizes hard variables (e.g. patterns, structures, networks and organization) at the expense of soft variables (e.g. meaning, identity, symbols, rules, values).” (Tseng, 2004:526). As a result, research on self-employed immigrants focused for a long time on industrial structure, self-employment rates of certain groups and ethnic networks, but very little on the process of socialization into entrepreneurship.

4.1 The Biographical Perspective

As a part of a this new approach towards the self-employment of immigrants several European scholars (Apitzsch and Kontos, 2003, Kupferberg, 2003) have adopted a biographical perspective, in order to stress the fact that the entrepreneur is a reflective agent choosing appropriate actions within a set of given opportunity structures. Apitzsch (2003) sees this perspective as broadening the concept of ‘mixed embeddedness’ by adding the aspect of biographical processuality of entrepreneurial socialization. The aim is to formulate the new concept of the ‘biographical embeddedness’ of self-employment. From a biographical perspective, ethnic business should be explained as a dynamic process related to individual agency (Kontos 2003). It should not be underestimated that individuals do not always accept the limited possibilities open to them, but that they go beyond them and innovate (Apitzsch, 2001). Hence, future research on immigrant entrepreneurship should take into consideration the opening up of opportunities by the immigrants themselves. Pütz (2003) applies a similar approach by criticizing the structural focus in the existing literature on immigrant entrepreneurship. In his view, scholars have for a long time interpreted the actions of the entrepreneurs mainly by putting the perspective on structures which are beyond the entrepreneurs’ influence. With his concept of ‘transculturality as a practice’, Pütz focuses on a more action-oriented approach that concentrates on an individual level. Consequently he introduces ideas of transculturality and hybridity into his analysis, since according to him entrepreneurs are members of different communities at the same time. Transculturality is a resource stemming from the biographical experience of the subjects and shapes the ability of entrepreneurs to profit from their embeddedness, but also to replace their embeddedness by other more resourceful capital if necessary.

⁶ It should also be noted here that structures do not only shape individuals, but individuals also shape structures, a point which has not really been developed by research on self-employed immigrants. As Zhou notes: “The burgeoning research on ethnic entrepreneurship has been more concerned with the causes and effects of entrepreneurship on economic integration among immigrant and ethnic minorities than with its influence on the social contexts mediating ethnic economic life, and has largely overlooked its non-economic effects” (ibid 2004:1060).

5 Conclusion

The studies of Light (1972) and Bonacich (1973) at the beginning of the 1970s initiated the research focus on ethnic minorities in modern western industrial states. With their ground-breaking research the two scholars started a controversial debate on the self-employment of immigrants and on the question of how entrepreneurship is related to certain ethnic or cultural characteristics and/or the structural context in which they start their own business.

For a long time, the theoretical approach to immigrant entrepreneurship could be divided into a cultural, a relational and a structural approach:

The cultural approach sees values and cultural elements as the essential determinants of entrepreneurial activity. Cultural theorists believe that each migrant has brought with him a set of entrepreneurial skills that have been ingrained from an early age through family or the community. For Chinese immigrants in the US, for instance, cultural theory stresses the sojourning mentality of the Chinese and their kinship structure as part of the secret of their entrepreneurial success (see Li (1993) for the shortcomings of this approach). These skills are also known as ethnic resources. Such explanations are still taken into account, but not as the sole explanation (Light and Rosenstein, 1995). Some scholars see the ethnic enclave and middleman theory as part of this cultural tradition (Greve and Salaff, 2005), I would subsume the middleman theory and the ethnic enclave theory under the relational approach, which focuses primarily on the extent to which belonging to an ethnic minority can influence one's entrepreneurial activity (Zhou, 1992). Both lines of thinking, the cultural theory and the relational theory, concentrate on the resources either of individuals or of groups, based on a rather static view of ethnicity, shared experience or cultural traits, emphasizing 'characteristics' of entrepreneurs through the context they act in. Today, the emphasis on culture as a resource is highly contested (Leicht et al., 2001) mostly due to an overall discomfort with the term 'ethnicity'. Moreover, the idea that some groups bring with them a business culture that propels entrepreneurship is not as convincing today as it once might have been. This is because an increasing number of immigrant entrepreneurs now belong to the second generation and therefore cannot have actual ethnic business experience as part of the cultural capital they brought from their country of origin (Pécoud, 2001). However, it must be noted here that this theoretical approach was not based on the urge to essentialize immigrant cultures but was formulated due to the empirical fact that not all immigrant or ethnic groups showed the same aspiration for self-employment. Cultural theories on 'ethnic entrepreneurship' were developed in order to explain the different rates of self-employment among immigrant groups. Due to higher or lower self-employment rates among different ethnic and immigrant groups, the question arose as to how culture or ethnicity were facilitating the step into entrepreneurship.

A more structural approach has been developed by Waldinger and colleagues (1990) building on three interactive components: opportunity structures, group characteristics and ethnic strategies. Migrants' choice, according to this interactive model, depends a great deal on the structure of opportunity the migrants encounter in a receiving society. The notion of opportunity structure relates to social, political and economic circumstances that offer the migrants opportunities to start businesses. As a result of a combination of both the existing opportunity structures and the group characteristics, different ethnic strategies emerge. As the migrants encounter unfavorable situations such as job discrimination and other hardships in the receiving region, they switch to self-employment activities as a safety measure (nDoen et al., 1998). This line of argu-

ment is in accord with the “blocked mobility” theory, in which it is argued that migrants and local-born workers encounter similar labor market circumstances (Light, 1995). Opportunity structures have so far been seen as very influential on the propensity for self-employment. For instance, recent studies show a close correspondence between the niches where immigrants and minorities find work, and those where they become entrepreneurs (Hiebert, 2002 for Canada). A further development in the structural line of theoretical stances on entrepreneurship is the mixed embeddedness approach developed by Kloostermann and Rath (2000). This concept for the first time emphasizes the role of the institutional context and explains the concentration of ethnic businesses in particular regions and sectors. The state as enabler or constrainer of immigrant enterprise plays an important role in the development of immigrant entrepreneurship and the international differences, notably between the United States and Western Europe, are therefore not surprising.

The debate between culture and structure, between the individual and the group, between institutional framework and biographical experience, and ultimately between institutions and agency, shows that self-employed immigrants are neither fixated by cultural transmission or socialization, nor independent individuals acting deliberately to achieve pre-specified ends, nor are they pre-defined by structuring structures or mediating institutions.

We have seen that most of the older literature on the self-employment of immigrants deals with two questions: “Why and how do immigrants succeed in small businesses apparently shunned by natives, and why and how do some groups do better than others?” (Basu and Werbner, 2001:239). It also seems that in more recent scholarship the question has moved away from the groupist perspective and has concentrated more on the individual. The dilemma represented by these different approaches is partly based on the nature of immigrant entrepreneurship. In fact, it appears that immigrant enterprise does not have just one explanation, entrepreneurial outcomes are not only shaped by group membership, but also by “contextual effects” (Portes and Rumbaut, 1990). Immigrants are individuals from different ethno-cultural groups acting within different ethno-national frameworks. They do not all become entrepreneurs for the same reason. The actor in the process of decision-making is an (ethnic or immigrant) individual. An individual can be described by demographic characteristics such as gender, marital status, and age; by biographical capital such as the ability to experience agency within a certain set of structures by cultural capital components such as level of education, work experience, specific language literacy, cultural knowledge etc, and by social capital such as access to resources, trustworthy networks, and relatives and friends ready to support the individual. All these factors and characteristics are influential upon the path to becoming an immigrant business owner. At the same time individuals belong to an ethnic or immigrant group or community, which by means of social capital can serve as an important supplier with resources such as economic capital, information, labor resources etc. Social capital depends on the community’s social and financial capitals and is limited by the size of one’s network but also by the individual resources of the people within the network. In this sense it is essential to take into consideration that an immigrant entrepreneur’s social capital is an individual and a group resource at the same time.

Furthermore, the individual acts within a certain set of opportunity structures. An individual makes a decision to engage in self-employment during a certain stage in life. In addition, the decision is influenced by the current traditional labor market situation together with existing market opportunity structures. The components of this system do not exist in isolation but within a political and economic institutional framework which is usually influenced by national laws which either stimulate or limit the entrepreneurial activities of immigrants. And last but not least, some individual factors such as gender are not lim-

ited to one sector but are influential on all kinds of individual, group, structural and institutional levels. Out of the interplay of individual characteristics, the cultural, social and financial capital and the opportunities generated by group characteristics in combination with existing market opportunity structures and institutional frameworks, a certain strategy is developed by the individual. This strategy evolves within agency and opportunity structures, and relative to the very specific context in which self-employed immigrants find themselves, it can be transnational, ethnic or non-ethnic, family-oriented or individual, cosmopolitan, hybrid or local, innovative or conservative.

6 References

- Anthias, Floya, and Nishi Mehta. 2003. "The Intersection between Gender, the Family and Self-Employment: The Family as a Resource." *International Review of Sociology/Revue Internationale de Sociologie* 13:105-116.
- Apitzsch, Ursula. 2001. "Self-employment activities concerning women and minorities: their success or failure in relation to social citizenship policies (SEM). Final Report." TSER Program.
- . 2003. "Gaining Autonomy in Self-Employment Processes. The Biographical Embeddedness of Women's and Migrants' Business." *International Review of Sociology/Revue Internationale de Sociologie* 13:163-182.
- Apitzsch, Ursula, and Maria Kontos. 2003. "Introduction." *International Review of Sociology/Revue Internationale de Sociologie* 13:67-76.
- . 2003. "Self-employment, Gender and Migration." *International Review of Sociology / Revue Internationale de Sociologie* 13:67-76.
- Blalock, H.M., Jr. . 1967. *Toward a theory of minority-group relations*. New York: John Wiley.
- Blaschke, Jochen, and Ahmet Ersöz. 1986. "Die Türkische Ökonomie in Berlin." *Forum - Zeitschrift für Ausländerfragen und Kultur* H 1:58-69.
- Bonacich, Edna. 1973. "A theory of middleman minorities." *American Sociological Review* 38:583-594.
- . 1987. ""Making It" in America: A Social Evaluation of the Ethics of Immigrant Entrepreneurship." *Sociological Perspectives* 30:446-466.
- Bonacich, Edna, and John Modell. 1980. *The Economic Basis of Ethnic Solidarity: Small Business in the Japanese American Community*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Boyd, Monica. 1989. "Family and Personal Networks in International Migration: Recent Developments and New Agendas " *International Migration Review* 23:638-670.
- Cobas, Jose A. 1988. "Some Problems in the Sociology of the Ethnic Economy, Paper 12." in *1988-89 - Conference on Comparative Ethnicity: The Conference Papers*, edited by Institute for Social Science Research: Working Paper: University of California Los Angeles.
- Coleman, James S. 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital." *The American Journal of Sociology* 94:S95-S120.
- Dallalfar, Arlene. 1994. "Iranian women as Immigrant Entrepreneurs." *Gender & Society* 8:541-561.

- Deakins, David, Mohammed Ishaq, David Smallbone, Geoff Whittam, and Janette Wyper. 2007. "Ethnic Minority Businesses in Scotland and the Role of Social Capital" *International Small Business Journal* 25:307-326.
- Dickens, William T., and Kevin Lang. 1985. "A Test of Dual Labor Market Theory." *The American Economic Review* 75:792-805.
- Dinh, Bernard. 2005. "L'entreprenariat ethnique en France et dans le monde anglo-saxon, bilan des connaissances, inventaire bibliographique commenté." Pp. 130: rapport CNRS - FASILD.
- Doeringer, Peter B., and Michael J. Piore. 1971. *Internal labor markets and manpower analysis*. Lexington: D.C. Heath.
- Essers, Caroline. 2007. "Entrepreneurship on the public-private divide: Businesswomen of Turkish and Moroccan descent playing family ties." in *Reconnecting diversity to critical organization and gender studies: Critical Management Studies Conference*. Manchester.
- Glick Schiller, Nina, Basch Linda G., and Szanton Blanc Cristina. 1992. *Towards a transnational perspective on migration : race, class, ethnicity, and nationalism reconsidered*. New York, N.Y.: New York Academy of Sciences.
- Goldberg, Andreas, and Faruk Sen. 1997. "Türkische Unternehmer in Deutschland. Wirtschaftliche Aktivitäten einer Einwanderungsgesellschaft in einem komplexen Wirtschaftssystem." Pp. 63-84 in *Zuwanderung und Stadtentwicklung*, edited by Hartmut Häussermann and Ingrid Oswald. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Granovetter, Mark. 1973. "The Strength of Weak Ties." *American Journal of Sociology* 78:1360-1380.
- Greve, Arent, and Janet Salaff. 2005. "Social Network Approach to Understand the Ethnic Economy: A Theoretical Discourse1." *GeoJournal* 64.
- Hall, Peter A. 1986. *Governing the economy the politics of state intervention in Britain and France*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hiebert, Daniel. 2002. "Economic associations of immigrant self-employment in Canada." *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research* 8:93-112.
- Hillman, Felicitas. 1999. "A Look at the 'Hidden Side': Turkish Women in Berlin's Ethnic Labour Market." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 23:267-282.
- Hillmann, Felicitas. 1998. "Türkische Unternehmerinnen und Beschäftigte im Berliner ethnischen Gewerbe." in *Discussion Paper*. Berlin.
- . 2000. "Ethnisierung oder Internationalisierung? Ethnische Ökonomien als Schnittpunkte von Migrationssystem und Arbeitsmarkt in Berlin." *Prokla* 30:415-432.

- Horowitz, Donald. 1985. *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kloosterman, Robert , and Jan Rath. 2001. "Immigrant entrepreneurs in advanced economies: mixed embeddedness further explored." *Journal of Ethnic and Migraton Studies* 27:189-202.
- Kloosterman, Robert, and Jan Rath (Eds.). 2003. *Immigrant Entrepreneurs: Venturing Abroad in the Age of Globalization*: Berg.
- Kloosterman, Robert, Joanne van der Leun, and Jan Rath. 1999. "Mixed Embeddedness: (In)formal Economic Activities and Immigrant Businesses in the Netherlands." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 23:252-266.
- Kontos, Maria. 2003. "Erwerbswirtschaftliche Selbständigkeit von Migrantinnen." Pp. 111-142 in *Migration, Biographie und Geschlechterverhältnisse*, edited by Ursula Apitzsch and Dorothea Jansen. Münster: Verlag Westfälisches Dampfboot.
- Kupferberg, Feiwei. 2003. "The Established and the Newcomers: What Makes Immigrant and Women Entrepreneurs So Special?" *International Review of Sociology/Revue Internationale de Sociologie* 13:89-104.
- Lee, Eunju. 2006. "Gendered processes : Korean immigrant small business ownership." Pp. viii, 211 p. New York: LFB Scholarly Pub.
- Leicht, Rene, Markus Leiss, Ralf Philipp, and Robert Stromeyer. 2001. "Ausländische Selbständige in Baden-Württemberg." *Grüne Reihe des Instituts für Mittelstandsforschung* 43.
- Li, Peter S. 1993. "Chinese Investment and Business in Canada: Ethnic Entrepreneurship Reconsidered." *Pacific Affairs* 66:219-243.
- Light, Ivan. 1972. *Ethnic Enterprise in America*. Berkeley: University of California.
- . 1979. "Disadvantaged Minorities in Self-Employment " *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 20:31-45.
- Light, Ivan, and Carolyn Rosenstein. 1995. *Race, Ethnicity, and Entrepreneurship in Urban America*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Light, Ivan Hubert. 1993. *Immigration and entrepreneurship. Culture, capital, and ethnic networks*. New Brunswick [etc.]: Transaction Publishers.
- Light, Ivan H., and Steven J. Gold. 2000. *Ethnic Economies*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Light, Ivan H., and Stavros Karageorgis. 1994. "The Ethnic Economy." in *Handbook of Economic Sociology*, edited by Neil Smelser and Richard Swedberg: Princeton U.P., & Russell Sage.

- Low, Angeline. 2003. "Embedded Intersections of Immigrant Female Entrepreneurship: A Study of Asian-born Women Entrepreneurs in Sydney. Unpublished PhD Thesis by Research." Sydney, Australia: University of Technology.
- Ma Mung, Emmanuel. 2000. *La Diaspora chinoise, géographie d'une migration*. Paris: Ophrys.
- Min, Pyong Gap, and Mehdi Bozorgmehr. 2003. "United States: The Entrepreneurial Cutting Edge." Pp. 17-37 in *Immigrant Entrepreneurs: Venturing Abroad in the Age of Globalization*, edited by Robert Kloosterman and Jan Rath. Oxford, New York: Berg.
- Morokvasic, Mirjana. 1988. "Garment Production in a Metropole of Fashion: Small Enterprise, Immigrants and Immigrant Entrepreneurs." *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 9:83-97.
- nDoen, Marthen L., Cees Gorter, Peter Nijkamp, and Piet Rietveld. 1998. "Ethnic Entrepreneurship and Migration: A Survey from Developing Countries." *Tinbergen Institute Discussion Papers* 081.
- Pallida, Salvatore. 1992. "Le développement des activités indépendantes des immigrés en Europe et en France." *Revue Européenne des Migrations Internationales* 8.
- Pécoud, Antoine. 2001. "Unemployment, Self-employment and Multiculturalism Among German-Turks in Berlin." in *13th SASE Annual Meeting on Socio-Economics*. University of Amsterdam.
- . 2003. "Entrepreneurship and Identity: Cosmopolitanism and Cultural Competencies Among German-Turkish Businesspeople in Berlin." *JOURNAL OF ETHNIC AND MIGRATION STUDIES* 30:3-20.
- Phizacklea, Annie. 1983. "In the front line. Introduction." in *One way ticket: Migration and female labour*, edited by Annie Phizacklea. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- . 1988. "Through the Eye of the Needle: Immigrants and Enterprise in New York's Garment Trades." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 12:340-342.
- Phizacklea, Annie, and Monder Ram. 1996. "Being Your Own Boss: Ethnic Minority Entrepreneurs in Comparative Perspective." *Work Employment Society* 10:319-339.
- Piguet, Etienne. 1999. *Les migrations créatrices*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Portes, Alejandro. 1998. "Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24:1-24.
- Portes, Alejandro, and Robert L. Bach. 1985. *Latin Journey: Cuban and Mexican Immigrants in the United States*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Portes, Alejandro, and Rubén Gustavo Rumbaut. 1990. *Immigrant America a portrait*. Berkeley [etc.]: University of California Press.
- Portes, Alejandro, Luis Eduardo Guarnizo, and William J. Haller. 2002. "Transnational Entrepreneurs: An Alternative Form of Immigrant Economic Adaptation." *American Sociological Review* 67:278-298.
- Portes, Alejandro, and Julia Sensenbrenner. 1993. "Embeddedness and Immigration: Notes on the Social Determinants of Economic Action." *The American Journal of Sociology* 98:1320-1350.
- Portes, Alejandro, and Min Zhou. 1992. "Gaining the Upper Hand: Economic Mobility Among Immigrant and Domestic Minorities." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 15:491-522.
- Pütz, Robert. 2003. "Culture and Entrepreneurship - Remarks on Transculturality as Practice." *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 94:554-563.
- Rath, Jan, and Robert Kloosterman. 2000. "Outsiders' Business: A Critical Review of Research on Immigrant Entrepreneurship." *International Migration Review* 34:657-681.
- Rogers, Everett M. 1995. *Diffusion of innovations*. New York [etc.]: Free Press.
- Salaff, Janet, Arent Greve, and Siu-Lun Wong. 2006. "Chapter 6: Business social networks and immigrant entrepreneurs from China." Pp. 99-119 in *Chinese Ethnic Business: Global and local perspectives*, edited by Eric Fong and Chiu Luk. London: Routledge.
- Sanders, Jimmy M., and Victor Nee. 1996. "Immigrant Self-Employment: The Family as Social Capital and the Value of Human Capital." *American Sociological Review* 61:231-249.
- Sassen, Saskia. 2001. *The global city : New York, London, Tokyo*. Tokyo Princeton N.J. [etc.] Princeton Univ. Pr.,
- Strüder, Inge. 2003. "Self-Employed Turkish-Speaking Women in London: Opportunities and Constraints Within and Beyond the Ethnic Economy." *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation* 4:185-195.
- Strüder, Inge R. 2001. "Migrant self-employment in a European global city – the importance of gendered power relations and performances of belonging for Turkish women in London." *Research Paper Geography and Environment* 74:1-36.
<http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/geographyAndEnvironment/research/Researchpapers/rp74.pdf>
- Tarrus, Alain. 1995. *Arabes de France dans l'économie mondiale souterraine*. Paris: Éd. de l'Aube.

- Tseng, Yen-Fen. 2004. "Book Review: Immigrant Entrepreneurs: Venturing Abroad in the Age of Globalization." *International Sociology* 19:524-527.
- Waldinger, Roger. 1986. "Immigrant Enterprise: A Critique and Reformulation." *Theory and Society* 15:249-285.
- . 1993. "The Ethnic Enclave Debate Revisited." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 17:444-452.
- Waldinger, Roger, Howard Aldrich, and Robin Ward. 1990. "Opportunities, Group Characteristics, and Strategies." Pp. 13-48 in *Ethnic Entrepreneurs*, edited by Roger Waldinger, Howard Aldrich, and Robin Ward. Newbury Park/London/New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Waldinger, Roger David. 1986. *Through the eye of the needle: immigrants and enterprise in New York's garment trades*. New York, N.Y. [etc.]: New York University Press.
- Weber, Max. 1996. *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. (Translated by Talcott Parsons, introduction by Randall Collins) Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury.
- Werbner, Pnina. 1984. "Business on Trust: Pakistani Entrepreneurship in the Manchester Garment Trade " Pp. 166-188 in *Ethnic Communities in Business* : , edited by Robin Ward and Richard Jenkins. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1990. "Renewing an Industrial Past: British Pakistani Entrepreneurship in Manchester." *Migration* 8:17-41.
- . 2001. "Metaphors of spatiality and networks in the plural city: a critique of the ethnic enclave debate." *Sociology* 35:671 - 693
- Wilson, Kenneth L, and Alejandro Portes. 1980. "Immigrant enclaves: An analysis of the labor market experiences of Cubans in Miami." *American Journal of Sociology* 86:295-319.
- Wong, Lloyd L, and Michele Ng. 2002. "The emergence of small transnational enterprise in Vancouver: the case of Chinese entrepreneur immigrants." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 26:508-530.
- Zhou, Min. 1992. *Chinatown The socioeconomic potential of an urban enclave*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- . 2004. "Revisiting Ethnic Entrepreneurship: Convergences, Controversies, and Conceptual Advancements." *International Migration Review* 38:1040-1074.

The purpose of this article is to provide an overview of the contribution of various scholars to the study of migration and self-employment. This article shows that research on self-employed immigrants has come a long way, incorporating new findings of migration theory and developing different perspectives on a micro-, meso-, and macro-level of research. The rich literature on entrepreneurship demonstrates that it is most difficult to state generalizations regarding factors influencing the entrepreneurship of immigrants. Immigrant enterprise does not have just one explanation, because immigrants are individuals from different ethno-cultural groups acting within different ethno-national frameworks.

As a researcher and programme coordinator at Kalaidos University of Applied Sciences Raphaela Hettlage is looking at „entrepreneurship“ from different perspectives. The findings of this working paper are based on her dissertation thesis on migrant entrepreneurs.

Die Kalaidos Fachhochschule Schweiz ist eine vom Bund genehmigte und beaufsichtigte Fachhochschule gemäss dem Bundesgesetz vom 6. Oktober 1995 über die Fachhochschulen.

Die Kalaidos Bildungsgruppe Schweiz vereinigt Bildungsinstitute von der Volksschul- und Gymnasialstufe über die berufliche Aus- und Weiterbildung bis zur Fachhochschul- und Universitätsstufe. Als Bildungsgruppe verfügt Kalaidos zudem über ein methodisch-didaktisches Kompetenzzentrum, über ein Bildungsmedienhaus und über Unternehmen, die auf innerbetriebliche Bildungskonzepte spezialisiert sind. Als Partner von Menschen aller Lebensphasen sowie Unternehmen jeglicher Grösse und Branche bietet Kalaidos bedürfnisgerechte, zielorientierte und effiziente Bildungsleistungen an.

Herausgeberin

Kalaidos Fachhochschule
Hohlstrasse 535
CH-8048 Zürich
Switzerland
Telefon +41 44 200 19 00
www.kalaidos-fh.ch
info@kalaidos-fh.ch