CHAPTER 12

NOTIONS AND PRACTICES OF DIFFERENCES: AN EPILOGUE ON THE DIVERSITY OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND MIGRATION

Sakura Yamamura and Paul Lassalle

ABSTRACT

Diversity is becoming the context through which researchers can account for different aspects of increasingly complexifying conditions of both entrepreneurship and migration. Taking a superdiversity perspective, this chapter uncovers and conceptualises what is diversifying particularly in migrant entrepreneurship. The authors identify four different dimensions of diversity and diversification affecting the activities of migrant entrepreneurs. First, with diversifying flows of migration, the characteristics of the entrepreneurs themselves as individual (usually transnational) migrants are diversifying. Second, with changing migration contexts, resources deriving from migration experiences are diversifying, exemplified by the different forms of transnational capitals used in entrepreneurship. Third, through migrant-led processes of diversification in the larger society, the main markets are diversifying, providing further opportunities to migrant entrepreneurs. Last but not least, the entrepreneurial strategies of migrant entrepreneurs are accordingly also diversifying, whereby finding different breaking-out strategies beyond the classical notion of only serving ethnic niche markets arise.

Global Migration, Entrepreneurship and Society
Contemporary Issues in Entrepreneurship Research, Volume 13, 195–211
Copyright © 2021 by Emerald Publishing Limited
All rights of reproduction in any form reserved
ISSN: 2040-7246/doi:10.1108/S2040-724620210000013013

These diversities are embedded in the context of the overall superdiversifying society in which migrant entrepreneurs emerge and struggle to establish. By disentangling the different dimensions of diversity, this chapter contextualises debates on entrepreneurship and migration, including those in the present edited book, into the larger debate on the societal turn to superdiversity. It further discusses the notions and practices of differences embodied in migrant entrepreneurship, beyond the notion of the ethnic niche and the disadvantaged striving for market integration.

Keywords: Migrant-led diversity; migrant entrepreneurship; ethnic minority entrepreneurship; superdiversity; intersectionality; diversification strategies

INTRODUCTION

The connection between the increasingly important and interrelated societal phenomenon of inter and transnational migrations and entrepreneurship has attracted interest in the field of migrant entrepreneurship studies (Brzozowski, Cucculelli, & Surdej, 2014; Honig, 2019; Solano, 2019; Vershinina, Rodgers, McAdam, & Clinton, 2019). This reflects the general tendency of diversifications of diversity in society, which has been recently much discussed in social sciences, particularly in migration research (Glick-Schiller, Çaglar, & Guldbrandsen, 2006; Vertovec, 2007). From simply receiving predominantly one migration type of individuals with similar characteristics, for example, male able low-skilled guest workers, societies nowadays are characterised by not only a growing number of different origins, but also a diversity of socio-economic, skill levels, religious, linguistic, ethnic or gender backgrounds. Also, the intensity and frequency of the cross-border activities and operations have also increased compared to uni-directional immigrations more common centuries ago. Societies are increasingly marked by such different dimensions of migration-led diversity (e.g. Grzymala-Kazłowska & Phillimore, 2018; Walker, 2018). The societal and economic effects of the diversification of diversity, also termed *superdiversity* by Vertovec (2007), has also found resonance in ethnic minority and migrant entrepreneurship literature (Ram et al., 2013; Sepulveda, Syrett, & Lyon, 2011; Yamamura & Lassalle, 2019). Diversity or even superdiversity is increasingly becoming the relevant context from which to analyse different perspectives and aspects of the complex and increasingly complexifying conditions of both entrepreneurship and migration. In the growing research field on diversity in and of entrepreneurship, however, there is somewhat an increasing confusion of the different diversity and diversification aspects of entrepreneurship. *What and who is diversifying* when we talk about diversity in migrant entrepreneurship?

This closing chapter gives a systematic and concise overview of contexts of the entrepreneurship and migration nexus, and proposes how the different and diversifying research strands within entrepreneurship research can be categorised for more clarification for the subfield. It suggests where inputs from other disciplines

can be synergetic for entrepreneurship research and vice versa, where perspectives and expertise from entrepreneurship might be able to shed better light on issues of migration and integration in contemporary societies. By disentangling the strands within this subfield, this chapter contextualises the debates on entrepreneurship and migration, including those in the present edited book, into the larger debate on the societal turn to superdiversity, and discusses the actual notions and practices of differences embodied in migrant entrepreneurship. It discusses the specificity of migrant entrepreneurship beyond the notion of the ethnic niche and the disadvantaged striving for market integration, debating it from a diversity and diversification perspective, and pushes the borders of migrant entrepreneurship research to rethinking issues of social inequality and the assumption of difference. It sketches out topics and fields on the interrelation between entrepreneurship and migration for further discussion in future research.

We distinguish the following four dimensions of diversity and diversification in the context of migrant entrepreneurship:

- (I) Diversity in types of migrant and ethnic minority entrepreneurs.
- (II) Diversity of business conditions through migration contexts.
- (III) Diversification through migrant-led diversity.
- (IV) Diversification of entrepreneurial venture.

Whereas *diversity* in this context signifies the novel constellation of the entrepreneurs' population (I) or conditions in which entrepreneurs are embedded (II), *diversifications* are occurring as processes of changing societal contexts (III) and/or entrepreneurial activities undertaken by migrant entrepreneurs as a reaction to the entrepreneurial environment (IV).

(I) DIVERSITY IN TYPES OF MIGRANT AND ETHNIC MINORITY ENTREPRENEURS

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, what the superdiversity approach points out is that contemporary societies are diversifying since the diversity of *individual characteristics* of migrants is increasing. Through globalisation and technological innovations, interactions and exchanges with different cultures beyond borders have become more frequent, more intense and importantly also more affordable. Especially, the mobility of people and thus flows of migration have increased, leading to the societal diversification in various countries, a phenomenon that has particularly become visible in urban centres (Hall, 2015; Wessendorf, 2013). The constellation of the migrant population and ethnic minorities with regard to ethnicity, nationalities or age, and also religions and languages has significantly diversified over the last decades (Blommaert, 2013; Grzymala-Kazłowska & Phillimore, 2018). Countries, but specifically cities, such as London have been described to become superdiverse, depicting a society with an 'increased number of new, small and scattered, multiple-origin, transnationally connected, socio-economically differentiated and legally stratified immigrants

who have arrived over the last decade' (Vertovec, 2007, p. 1024). Also, crucial for the migrant population is the diversification of legal statuses and migration channels by and through which individuals have moved. These statuses do not only focus on guest workers or labour migrants, but also on family migration, different skills-oriented labour migration or student migration (Vertovec, 2010). They also encompass refugee migration that are contributing to the diversity in the migrant population. Such legal statuses and the specific migration channels that migrants use are crucial especially for migrant entrepreneurs (Drinkwater, Eade, & Garapich, 2009; Garapich, 2008), and also impact on the settlement of the migrant entrepreneurs. Depending on the legal framework and the migration-related social networks, in which they are embedded, entrepreneurial ventures operate differently. In fact, the diversification of diversities at the individual level displayed in Fig. 1 results also in the diversity in types of migrant and ethnic minority entrepreneurs. Whereas the societal diversity on the individual attributes are diversifying in society at large (left), the issues of migrant-specific characteristics and contexts are diversifying, too (right), leading to an even more complex context for migrant entrepreneurship. As a consequence of this migrant-led diversity, entrepreneurs themselves, and by that also the entrepreneurial ventures, face more options and opportunities in the diverse and cosmopolitan environment, as exemplified in the works of Nummela et al. (this volume) and Shinnie et al. (this volume) and others in the literature (Ram et al., 2013; Sepulveda et al., 2011; Yamamura & Lassalle, 2019).

Furthermore, what is also diversifying is the *migration context* itself. This particular perspective can be observed within entrepreneurship debates. As migration patterns, which concern the entrepreneurs themselves as individuals are diversifying, there are increasing diversity of studies on different types of entrepreneurs: from uni- to multidirectional migration, including diaspora and transnational entrepreneurship (Elo, Täube, & Volovelsky, 2019; Shinnie et al., this volume; Trehan et al., this volume; Vershinina et al., 2019). Research interested in the nexus of entrepreneurship and migration have also considered the situation of return migrant entrepreneurs (Bai, Holmström-Lind, & Johanson, 2018; Barjaba, this volume; Pruthi, 2014), and have drawn attention to refugee entrepreneurs (Al-Dajani, Carter, & Williams, 2016; Heilbrunn, this volume), and in extreme cases, on deported entrepreneurs and their reterritorialisation. The changing legal contexts of migration and migration regimes are impacting the flow of migrants towards certain destinations. This happened after the 2004 enlargement of the EU to Central and Eastern European Countries, which have led to an unexpected flow of economic migration towards the countries who opened their borders, such as the UK (Drinkwater et al., 2009). As Borkowski et al. (this volume) are writing, the changing legal context of migration is impacting the flows and thence entrepreneurship too.

In terms of the diversity of contexts of migration, intergenerational issues are also considered in the study of migrant entrepreneurship, especially to highlight the difference between first and second generations (Christopher, 2017; Rusinovic, 2008). This debate is loosely connected to ethnic minority entrepreneurship literature as these entrepreneurs might not have migrated themselves,

Fig. 1 The Diversification of Diversities.

and therefore do not focus on the migration conditions and contexts (as in Fig. 2). Second (or further) generation are thus out of scope of *migrant* entrepreneurship per se. Yet, they are embedded in disadvantages and other contexts of path-dependent ethnic minority positions within mainstream societies and therefore participate in the nexus of migration and entrepreneurship. These multiple

positions of disadvantage have led to disadvantaged access to labour markets and other economic opportunities, including in accessing the resources needed to create a new venture (Carter, Mwaura, Ram, Trehan, & Jones, 2015; Högberg, Schölin, Ram, & Jones, 2016; Mwaura et al., 2018; Ram, Smallbone, Deakins, & Jones, 2003; Smallbone, Bertotti, & Ekanem, 2005). This integration of multiple disadvantages and labels therefore questions the whole concept of *ethnic* entrepreneurship (cf. Egorova, this volume; Korede, this volume), which is mostly used as an umbrella term, encompassing the diversity of a population compared to the mainstream. However, it does not account for the influence of migration contexts on specific entrepreneurial practices.

Moreover, recent development in social sciences also call for a better incorporation of the societal diversification into the definition of migrant entrepreneurship. Migrant entrepreneurs should be further investigated from their individual positionality and situatedness at the intersection of different diversity dimensions, i.e. gender, religious, migration status or ethnicity, upon which they experience multiple discriminations. As discussed above, the notions of diversity and diversification go beyond the sole consideration of nationalities and origins (Vertovec, 2007). Such diversification of diversities is represented amongst the population of ethnic minority entrepreneurs themselves. There is a growing recognition that individuals (and likewise, entrepreneurs) endorse a diversity of attributes (such as race, gender or migrant), each of them constituting a specific characteristic, which constitute the 'identity' of an individual (Luger, 2017). Individuals situated at the intersection of these categories, face specific systemic discriminations, due to their multiple disadvantaged positions in society (Lewis, 2006; McCall, 2005). Building on the work of Crenshaw (1991), entrepreneurship scholars have started to consider intersectional lenses to the understanding of entrepreneurship in such contexts (Scott & Hussain, 2019; Valdez, 2016). Recent papers have focussed on the study of various categories and attributes, including gender (Marlow & McAdam, 2013; Wang & Morrell, 2015) and ethnicity (Barrett & Vershinina, 2017). Looking at the level of the individual entrepreneur's attributes, intersectionality is the study of the complexity of entrepreneurship, beyond broader categories of migrants or ethnic minority (Martinez Dy, Marlow, & Martin, 2017). It is the recognition that society is becoming more complex and more diverse, and that entrepreneurs at the intersection of different attributes require distinctive support or attention, but also can identify or create very specific and novel opportunities. Entrepreneurs (including migrant entrepreneurs) situated at the intersection between these categories operate in specific conditions, experience specific challenges and barriers in the labour market and in entrepreneurship, and make different contributions to society. These developments in entrepreneurship approaches to diversity in entrepreneurship also call for consideration of a wider variety of attributes, including researching sexual and gender minority in entrepreneurship [such as Lesbian, gay, Bisexual and Trans (LGBT) entrepreneurship] and to really look at the intersection of diverse attributes (and not just their addition). As for migrant entrepreneurs, we can acknowledge the diversity of situations, challenges and markets, in which these entrepreneurs act, identifying and creating opportunities, and, therefore, they

explore additional niches, innovative practices and entrepreneurial activities. There is, for example, a niche market for gay products and services (such as love cakes or gay hospitality) or services for women migrants (such as specifically tailored legal advice or language classes). Intersectional entrepreneurs could be combining these opportunities for an even more specific niche market (such as legal advice for same-sex interracial/national marriages), but doing so also comes with challenges that are characteristically faced by both types of minorities, or more complex challenges emerging from the intersectionality itself.

(II) DIVERSITY OF BUSINESS CONDITIONS THROUGH MIGRATION CONTEXTS

Migrant entrepreneurs not only have different individual characteristics compared to the local mainstream entrepreneurs in terms of their nationality/origins or legal status, but they also operate in specific conditions and in different contexts, in which they are embedded (Dabić, Vlačić, Paul, Dana, 2020; Solano, 2019). Whilst the local host country environment provides unique challenges (or barriers) to migrant entrepreneurs, they are still able to create and exploit specific opportunities within their local ecosystem and to react to the conditions of the local opportunity structure (Kloosterman, Rusinovic, & Yeboah, 2016; Lassalle & McElwee, 2016). By doing so, they navigate within the different contexts and exercise their agency through different forms of bricolage for the survival and the development of their business (Lassalle & Scott, 2018; Villares-Varela, Ram, & Jones, 2018).

As highlighted in the literature, migrant entrepreneurs tend to have fewer available resources (mostly financial capital) than mainstream local entrepreneurs do (Carter et al., 2015; Deakins, Ishaq, Smallbone, Whittam, & Wyper, 2007). However, being part of a group provides a number of additional benefits to its group members. Historically, migrants from similar origins (e.g. migrants from Puerto Rico in the USA) tend to stay together (Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993; Zhou, 2004). This phenomenon means living in similar areas and – most importantly – socialising together. This community socialisation is not necessarily exclusive of other forms of socialisation, including in the new phenomenon of superdiverse societies and in a context of growing cosmopolitanism (Datta, 2009; Vertovec, 2007). Nevertheless, most migrants socialise with fellow migrants and are embedded in community with fellow migrants from the same country of origin or from neighbouring countries (e.g. Ryan, 2011).

Being migrants, they have access specific resources from the different home and host countries networks, in which they are embedded (Lassalle, Johanson, Nicholson, & Milena, 2020; Vershinina et al., 2019). Cross-border migration is thus accompanied with the creation and the mobilisation of cross-border resources shared amongst different social networks situated in different contexts (Portes, Guarnizo, & Haller, 2002). The literature has long identified how migrant entrepreneurs rely on resources from community networks (Aldrich & Waldinger, 1990; Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993; Waldinger, 2005; Zhou & Logan,

1989). These resources (and their usage for entrepreneurial activities) include finance, support, labour and access to community markets (Jones, Ram, Edwards, Kiselincev, & Muchenje, 2012; Vershinina, Barrett, & Meyer, 2011). Migrant entrepreneurs subsequently use these resources to create opportunities in the host country (Kloosterman, 2010; Lassalle et al., 2020).

Debate on network embeddedness has extended to increasingly consider the role of transnational social contexts in accessing relevant resources and markets (Brzozowski, Cucculelli, & Surdej, 2017; Honig, 2019; Vershinina et al., 2019). Transnational entrepreneurs use their transnational connections and embeddedness in different locations, enabled by transnational flows and networks. Different migration experiences give access to a wider diversity of resources, including transnational social capital (Bagwell, 2018). Social and economic embeddedness in two (or more) countries provide transnational migrant entrepreneurs with further opportunities to operate across borders. More often, they use these transnational ties to gain competitive advantage in the host country, either to serve the migrant community or the larger mainstream population (Bagwell, 2018; Rusinovic, 2008; Solano, 2019) or to create new ventures whilst returning to their home countries or joining another destination (Bai et al., 2018). Given the importance of multiple embeddedness in the process of transnational entrepreneurship, it is not surprising to see the application of the mixed embeddedness perspective (Kloosterman & Rath, 2001) in analysing the different contexts, in which transnational entrepreneurs operate (Bagwell, 2018; Solano, 2019). This includes interest in the host country's opportunity structure as a combination of local and migration social and economic contexts and opportunity structures (Martínez Arboleya, this volume; Bagwell, 2018; Lassalle & McElwee, 2016), home country ties (Brzozowski et al., 2014) and transnational community networks (Barjaba, this volume; Honig, 2019; Shinnie et al., this volume; Vershinina et al., 2019).

The flourishing interest of research in the diversifying contexts of migrant entrepreneurship has led to the emergence of new terms, such as expatpreneurs (Vance, McNulty, Paik, & D'Mello, 2016). Whether this is old wine in new bottles or not, such tendency shows that the nexus of migration and entrepreneurship is increasingly diversifying and goes beyond the sole consideration of migrant entrepreneurship from South to North. Following from this, novel and original research should challenge the South to North approach and should now consider; North to South, South to South, as well as adopting more critical approaches to the focus on the Global North (cf. Heilbrunn, this volume).

Finally, the analysis of the diversifying number of migration contexts calls for an analysis of particular geographical conditions within the destination countries. In addition to cross-country comparisons of migrant entrepreneurship activities (Dabić et al., 2020; Nathan, 2016), there is a need to explore the context-specific institutional, socio-economic conditions in which migrant entrepreneurs operate. This first refers back to the local opportunity structure mentioned above (Kloosterman, 2010; Lassalle & McElwee, 2016). However, it also requires multi-level analysis and consideration of the different geographical and administrative levels of the nation, region and urban areas. This would help further understanding the diversity of migration contexts within destination countries, between superdiverse cities and rural areas, between active regions and the periphery.

Fig. 2 Perspectives on the Migration and Entrepreneurship Nexus.

Summarising these research strands and trends (Fig. 2), we can distinguish two broader literature streams, that is, the entrepreneurial research on ethnic minority entrepreneurs (I) and those on different types of migrant entrepreneurs, such as diaspora, refugee or transnational entrepreneurs. Although there are overlaps in the topics of research, the perspectives from which entrepreneurship are viewed tend to slightly differ. On the one hand, the types of ethnic community contexts and specific business strategies within these specific entrepreneurial environments are more dominant in the research on ethnic minority entrepreneurs (I), which correspondingly has the reference to mainstream conditions of entrepreneurship in focus. On the other hand, consequential also to the denomination of the migrant entrepreneurs according to the migration context, those literature on migrant entrepreneurs tend to focus more on types of migration contexts and conditions, and the specific entrepreneurial practices resulting from them (II). Both research strands indeed overlap – in some cases even are mixed up conceptually. What must be pointed out is that the perspectives should be complementing each other, and thus need more conceptual distinction and advancement to better grasp the overall context. After all, these perspectives crystallised above clearly illustrate the growing complexity of diversities in which the migration and entrepreneurship nexus is contextualised.

(III) DIVERSIFICATION THROUGH MIGRANT-LED DIVERSITY

As noted above, the indigenous population as well as the migrant populations are diversifying (cf. Rienzo & Vargas-Silva, 2018). This also means that the markets and the customer bases are increasingly diversifying. Such societal diversification brings about even more opportunities for entrepreneurs to cater the customers with diversified products and services. Simultaneously, the pressure to find diversification strategies to accommodate to such increasingly diversified market becomes higher, too. Yet, competitions arising from it also bears potentials for entrepreneurial minds and contributes to the vibrant entrepreneurial landscape.

This means that differences of diversity characteristics and degree are depending on space and locational issues, which can be observed at different levels of superdiverse streets and neighbourhood (Hall, 2015; Wessendorf, 2013) and also require different scales and levels of analysis (as presented above). Diversification is occurring as a process aligning with changing wider societal contexts of

transnationalism and cosmopolitanism (Nummela et al., this volume; Vertovec, 2010). These changes challenge the traditional place and community-bound understanding of migrant entrepreneurship with further consideration of the transnational links, ties and practices (Borkowski et al., this volume; Shinnie et al., this volume). Migrant-led diversification of societies is then providing favourable conditions for the diversification of migrant entrepreneurship. Yet, these diversification processes enabled by transnational migration are embedded in the urban and the local levels (Meissner & Vertovec, 2014).

As discussed above, this diversification of society provides additional opportunities to ethnic minority and migrant entrepreneurs to start their new venture. The customer base is diversifying itself through the process of diversification in receiving societies, providing more opportunities for a diversity of products and services. In addition, there is overall a stronger demand for a diversity of products amongst the general mainstream population, with changes of taste and demand, especially in urban contexts (Nathan, 2016). Markets are evolving and there is an overall more pronounced openness in societies to diverse products or services, which provides favourable conditions for entrepreneurs. In parallel to the transnational flows of migration, and because of the social and institutional isolation in rural areas, migration into cities is also increasing, especially of the young and the diverse. Migrants favour the superdiverse cities such as London and New York, and also migrate into smaller but important urban centres such as Manchester or Hamburg with a diverse population.

It is a logical choice for a migrant entrepreneur to prefer a more diverse urban environment. Cities with higher ethnic diversity and diversity from other minorities (e.g. gender minorities) provide better conditions for ethnic minority entrepreneurs to start-up (Baycan-Levent and Nijkamp, 2009). In these cities, such as London or New York, there is higher visibility and acceptance of diversity (Vertovec, 2007). Yet, the urban setting itself does not necessarily reduce the disadvantages and discrimination that migrant entrepreneurs face. As we can observe, the actual diversity varies greatly within between cities and also between districts within a city (Wekker, 2019), such as Soho in London or Queens in New York and the visible signs of diversity in these districts and boroughs. The urban environment is reflected in the diversity of the local population and of ethnic minority and migrant entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurial diversity (and superdiversity) should not be reduced to visible 'world food' outlets and restaurants located in 'cosmopolitan' districts, but should also consider the diversity of the business types and sectors represented, the diversity of the actual entrepreneurs and the diversity of the population which constitute their customer base. Looking at the local level of the street (Hall, 2015) is revealing high differences in terms of actual diversity of the entrepreneurial landscape (Yamamura & Lassalle, 2019). Using the Entrepreneurial Superdiversity Index, they demonstrate that, for example, a street with 20 businesses from the same ethnic group (a cluster) operating in the same sector (e.g. catering) is actually less diverse than a street with less businesses but from a wider diversity of ethnic groups and operating in a wider diversity of sectors (Yamamura & Lassalle, 2019). These districts are market environments in which minority entrepreneurs are embedded

when establishing and running their entrepreneurial ventures. The opportunity also benefits from the concentration of co-ethnics and of other minority groups within the city, for example, in ethnic ‘enclaves’ (areas with a high concentration of one ethnic group), but most importantly, in vibrant and diverse areas. These elements of diversity of the market and presence of the community are mentioned as crucial factors when choosing the location to start-up (Zhou, 2004). We thus observe a concentration of ethnic minority entrepreneurs in specific cities rather than in others (cf. Nathan, 2016). Therefore, there are specific urban-level policies introduced by municipalities to promote and support a diverse and inclusive society and capitalise from the local diversity to encourage vibrancy and entrepreneurial activities.

(IV) THE DIVERSIFICATION STRATEGIES OF
MIGRANT ENTREPRENEURS

We finally observe that the entrepreneurial *strategies* pursued by migrant entrepreneurs are also diversifying and extending beyond the ethnic niche and beyond serving ethnic products (mostly food) to a mainstream population (middlemen in the sense of Zhou, 2004). Entrepreneurial strategies, including debates around the identification or the creation of opportunities, are a core interest of entrepreneurship studies (Davidsson, 2017; Wood & McKinley, 2018). In migrant entrepreneurship, the question of opportunity is related to the existence of an ethnic niche market (Waldinger, 2005; Werbner, 2001), and to the ease of access and the viability of such niche. However, the diversification of societies has enabled migrant and ethnic minority entrepreneurs to go beyond the sole so-called ‘enclave economy’ bounded by co-ethnicity and space (Zhou, 2004). As discussed above, opportunities are sought and created in the new migration-led and super-diverse urban contexts (Hall, 2011; Yamamura & Lassalle, 2019). The consideration of the diversification of entrepreneurial action enact or react towards these opportunities requires further scrutiny.

Fig. 3 The Diversification of the Migrant Entrepreneurial Venture.

The analysis of different break-out strategies thus extends the understanding of opportunities from the classical notion of only serving ethnic niche markets to further consideration of diversification of the entrepreneurial venture. As displayed in Fig. 3, the *diversification* of migrant entrepreneurial ventures relates to three aspects: market diversification, product and service diversification and diversification of sourcing and supply chain.

The first diversification refers to the *market* itself. Customer bases and markets are also diversifying as noted before, but in this case, migrant entrepreneurs are diversifying in terms of the market that they are targeting. As noted elsewhere (Kloosterman, 2010; Lassalle & McElwee, 2016; Zhou, 2004; Zhuang, 2019), most ethnic minority entrepreneurs start by targeting the ethnic community niche market. For example, Chinese migrant entrepreneurs in Canada target the Chinese community in the host country by offering food, catering or tailored services (such as housing estate and education). Due to their embeddedness in social networks, cultural proximity, socialisation, trust and mutual understanding, migrant entrepreneurs have better and easier access to the community niche market than mainstream entrepreneurs (Sepulveda et al., 2011). By breaking in, migrant entrepreneurs enter the community niche market, to which they provide products and services. However, the community niche market is limited in size and therefore may constrain further business development (e.g. growth prospects) or can compromise the sustainability of the new venture (Deakins, Smallbone, Ishaq, Whittam, & Wyper, 2009; Villares-Varela et al., 2018). Sometimes, the community niche market can also shrink due to remigration of a share of the migrant population returning to their home country or migrating to another destination. Consequently, ethnic minority entrepreneurs seek additional or alternative customers to maintain sales of their products. Migrant entrepreneurs can then target multiple ethnic niches (e.g. more generic Eastern European or Asian markets), or look at the mainstream market, either acting as middlemen (offering ethnic products to the mainstream) or by breaking-out to non-ethnic mainstream markets (Lassalle & Scott, 2018; Shinnie et al., this volume; Zhou, 2004). Such breakouts to the mainstream also require a change of products and services to appeal to the mainstream customers' market. In both cases, the aim is to gain access to a broader customer base. However, in order to access the mainstream customer base, migrant entrepreneurs need to gain access to specific forms of capitals and to become embedded into the local institutional and social contexts (Deakins et al., 2007; Lassalle et al., 2020). This includes socialisation within local networks (to acquire relevant social capital) and engaging with local institutions (Deakins et al., 2007; Jones et al. 2012). Migrant entrepreneurs often lack some of the necessary resources to access the local market in the first place (Carter et al., 2015; Ram et al., 2003). They also often lack language proficiency (including the use of business terminology) to engage with support and funding institutions (Mwaura et al., 2018). They also lack awareness of the suitable advertisement channels to reach other customers. Migrant entrepreneurs thus often chose to incrementally diversify their customer base starting with other migrant community groups (Lassalle & Scott, 2018). For example, a Korean migrant entrepreneur would look for Chinese migrant customers, or a Nigerian migrant entrepreneur to other African migrant populations.

Second, the diversification strategies also refer to the actual diversification of products and services been offered to the customers. Entrepreneurs diversify the range of offerings by bringing new products and services (e.g. a Polish delicatessen adding Russian or even Italian products) or even by changing their overall business strategy, such as a Polish IT shop moving into mainstream graphic design. By doing so, migrant entrepreneurs identify or create additional opportunities to develop their business, whether they continue serving the niche market with more value-added products and services, or whether they use the diversification of their offering to diversify their customer base as well. The diversification of the product and service offering also relies on the migrant entrepreneurs' embeddedness in specific business and institutional networks to be able to access relevant information, products and funding to support the change of strategy towards diversification (Lassalle et al., 2020). Examples of this phenomenon are diverse: adding a tanning salon to a hairdressing business (for an Eastern European clientele), providing home service software support for an IT shop operating in the Polish community niche market or diversification into home-ware products for a delicatessen selling to the Nigerian community. This also include readapting products/services to a different taste, or bringing knowledge and skills from different countries into their businesses (Bagwell, 2018; Solano, 2019). The latter example also demonstrates the importance of the reliance on transnational social networks for the access to specific resources (Vershina et al., 2019). As they operate across different countries, some transnational migrant entrepreneurs identify the opportunity to be located in two (or more) markets simultaneously (Brzozowski et al., 2014; Santamaria-Alvarez, Munoz-Castro, Sarmiento-Gonzalez & Marín-Zapata, 2018). These entrepreneurs use their social networks in both countries to create more opportunities in their host country market (Rusinovic, 2008).

The third aspect within the diversification of ventures of migrant entrepreneurs is to diversify the supply chains, creating a stronger competitive advantage in the host country. This encompasses using transnational connection and direct sourcing to bypass intermediaries, using other supply chains from other migrant and ethnic minority groups (e.g. Caribbean restaurant sourcing from a Chinese supplier, both based in the UK) or even sourcing from mainstream firms (mainstream market has started diversifying, with, for example, vegan tofu products being produced irrespective of the Asian ethnic market). Migrant entrepreneurs located in superdiverse urban environment can especially benefit from the diversity of the population to gain access to a wider range of suppliers and transnational networks (Nathan, 2015; Smallbone, Kitching, & Athayde, 2010). The diversification of supply chains is indeed enabled by the embeddedness of the migrant entrepreneurs in a diversity of transnational networks used for importing/sourcing in the country of origin as they often need to be embedded in business networks in both (or more countries) to take advantage of this dual embeddedness (Wahlbeck, 2018). Migrant entrepreneurs diversifying their supply chain develop a stronger position in the host country market. In a context of growing transnational flows of products and services, such diversification of their supply chain activities thus contribute to the survival and the development of migrant entrepreneurs' ventures. These diversification strategies of migrant

entrepreneurs are embedded in the context of the overall superdiversifying society. Transnational migrant entrepreneurs establish their ventures, with their uniqueness in a context of growing competition between diversifying mainstream and minority businesses.

CONCLUSION

Conceptualisations of *what* has been diversifying is a recent trend in the field of migrant entrepreneurship studies. Starting from discussions on mixed embeddedness (Kloosterman & Rath, 2001), debates have started to further consider the notion of diversity, including through research on superdiversity in entrepreneurship (Ram et al., 2013; Sepulveda et al., 2011; Yamamura & Lassalle, 2019), transnational entrepreneurship (Brzozowski et al., 2017; Solano, 2019; Vershinina et al., 2019) and intersectionality (Barrett & Vershinina, 2017; Valdez, 2016). This volume takes a stand in these debates and helps rethinking the importance of the nexus between migrant-led diversity and the activities of migrant entrepreneurs.

This closing chapter identifies four dimensions of diversity and diversification in the context of migrant entrepreneurship. The *diversity* at the individual level of the entrepreneur as a migrant highlights the novel constellation of the entrepreneur's population (I). Diversity also relates to the diversifying conditions in which entrepreneurs are embedded, leading to a diversity of types of migrant entrepreneurs (II). Moreover, processes of *migrant-led diversity* and the diversification of customer base observed in different locations provide opportunities for migrant entrepreneurs (III). Finally, in migrant entrepreneurship, *diversification* also relates to the diversifying *entrepreneurial* activities undertaken by migrant entrepreneurs as a reaction to the entrepreneurial environment, in terms of market, product offering and sourcing strategies (IV).

By disentangling the different meanings and uses of the notion of diversity within this the field of migrant entrepreneurship, this chapter contributes to the consideration of the specificity of migrant entrepreneurship beyond the notion of the ethnic niche and the disadvantaged striving for market integration. By presenting migrant entrepreneurship through a diversity and diversification perspective, it calls for a more explicit consideration of the nexus between entrepreneurship and migration (and indeed, migrant-led diversification of societies) for further discussion in migrant entrepreneurship research.

REFERENCES

- Al-Dajani, H., Carter, S., & Williams, C. (2016). Women's resourcefulness in the informal economy: Evidence from Jordan. In R. L. Gervais & P. M. Millea (Eds.), *Exploring resources, life-balance and well-being of women who work in a global context* (pp. 35–54). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Aldrich, H. E., & Waldinger, R. (1990). Ethnicity and entrepreneurship. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 16, 111–135.

- Bagwell, S. (2018). From mixed embeddedness to transnational mixed embeddedness: An exploration of Vietnamese businesses in London. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 24, 104–120.
- Bai, W., Holmström-Lind, C., & Johanson, M. (2018). Leveraging networks, capabilities and opportunities for international success: A study on returnee entrepreneurial ventures. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 34, 51–62.
- Barrett, R., & Vershinina, N. (2017). Intersectionality of ethnic and entrepreneurial identities: A study of post-war Polish entrepreneurs in an English city. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 55, 430–443.
- Baycan-Levent, T., & Nijkamp, P. (2009). Characteristics of migrant entrepreneurship in Europe. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 21(4), 375–397.
- Blommaert, J. (2013). *Ethnography, superdiversity and linguistic landscapes: Chronicles of complexity*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Brzozowski, J., Cucculelli, M., & Surdej, A. (2014). Transnational ties and performance of immigrant entrepreneurs: The role of home-country conditions. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 26, 546–573.
- Brzozowski, J., Cucculelli, M., & Surdej, A. (2017). The determinants of transnational entrepreneurship and transnational ties' dynamics among immigrant entrepreneurs in ICT sector in Italy. *International Migration*, 55, 105–125.
- Carter, S., Mwaura, S., Ram, M., Trehan, K., & Jones, T. (2015). Barriers to ethnic minority and women's enterprise: Existing evidence, policy tensions and unsettled questions. *International Small Business Journal*, 33, 49–69.
- Christopher, M. M. (2017). Identity and difference – Re-thinking UK South Asian entrepreneurship. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 11, 564–589.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43, 1241–1299.
- Dabić, M., Vlačić, B., Paul, J., & Dana, L.-P. (2020). Immigrant entrepreneurship: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 113, 25–38.
- Datta, A. (2009). Places of everyday cosmopolitanisms: East European construction workers in London. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 41, 353–370.
- Davidsson, P. (2017). Reflections on misgivings about “dismantling” the opportunity construct. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 7, 65–67.
- Deakins, D., Ishaq, M., Smallbone, D., Whittam, G., & Wyper, J. (2007). Ethnic minority businesses in Scotland and the role of social capital. *International Small Business Journal*, 25, 307–326.
- Deakins, D., Smallbone, D., Ishaq, M., Whittam, G., & Wyper, J. (2009). Minority ethnic enterprise in Scotland. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35, 309–330.
- Drinkwater, S., Eade, J., & Garapich, M. (2009). Poles apart? EU enlargement and the labour market outcomes of immigrants in the United Kingdom. *International Migration*, 47, 161–190.
- Elo, M., Täube, F., & Volovelsky, E. K. (2019). Migration ‘against the tide’: Location and Jewish diaspora entrepreneurs. *Regional Studies*, 53, 95–106.
- Garapich, M. P. (2008). The migration industry and civil society: Polish immigrants in the United Kingdom before and after EU enlargement. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 34, 735–752.
- Glick-Schiller, N. G., Çaglar, A., & Guldbrandsen, T. C. (2006). Beyond the ethnic lens: Locality, globality, and born-again incorporation. *American Ethnologist*, 33, 612–633.
- Grzymala-Kazłowska, A., & Phillimore, J. (2018). Introduction: Rethinking integration. New perspectives on adaptation and settlement in the era of super-diversity. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 44, 179–196.
- Hall, S. M. (2011). High street adaptations: Ethnicity, independent retail practices, and localism in London's urban margins. *Environment and Planning A*, 43, 2571–2588.
- Hall, S. M. (2015). Super-diverse street: A ‘trans-ethnography’ across migrant localities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 38, 22–37.
- Högberg, L., Schölin, T., Ram, M., & Jones, T. (2016). Categorising and labelling entrepreneurs: Business support organisations constructing the other through prefixes of ethnicity and immigration. *International Small Business Journal*, 34, 242–260.

- Honig, B. (2019). Exploring the intersection of transnational, ethnic, and migration entrepreneurship. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46(10), 1974–1990.
- Jones, T., Ram, M., Edwards, P., Kiselincev, A., & Muchenje, L. (2012). New migrant enterprise: Novelty or historical continuity?. *Urban Studies*, 49, 3159–3176.
- Kloosterman, R. (2010). Matching opportunities with resources: A framework for analysing (migrant) entrepreneurship from a mixed embeddedness perspective. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 22, 25–45.
- Kloosterman, R., & Rath, J. (2001). Immigrant entrepreneurs in advanced economies: Mixed embeddedness further explored. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 27, 189–201.
- Kloosterman, R. C., Rusinovic, K., & Yeboah, D. (2016). Super-diverse migrants-similar trajectories? Ghanaian entrepreneurship in the Netherlands seen from a mixed embeddedness perspective. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42, 913–932.
- Lassalle, P., Johanson, M., Nicholson, J. D., & Milena, R.-M. (2020). Migrant entrepreneurship and markets: The dynamic role of embeddedness in networks in the creation of opportunities. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 91, 523–536.
- Lassalle, P., & McElwee, G. (2016). Polish entrepreneurs in Glasgow and entrepreneurial opportunity structure. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 22, 260–281.
- Lassalle, P., & Scott, J. M. (2018). Breaking-out? A reconceptualisation of the business development process through diversification: The case of Polish new migrant entrepreneurs in Glasgow. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 44, 2524–2543.
- Lewis, P. (2006). The quest for invisibility: Female entrepreneurs and the masculine norm of entrepreneurship. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 13, 453–469.
- Luger, J. D. (2017). But I'm just an artist!? Intersections, identity, meaning, and context. *Antipode*, 49, 1329–1348.
- Marlow, S., & McAdam, M. (2013). Gender and entrepreneurship: Advancing debate and challenging myths; exploring the mystery of the under-performing female entrepreneur. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 19, 114–124.
- Martinez Dy, A., Marlow, S., & Martin, L. (2017). A web of opportunity or the same old story? Women digital entrepreneurs and intersectionality theory. *Human Relations*, 70, 286–311.
- McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 30, 1771–1800.
- Meissner, F., & Vertovec, S. (2014). Comparing super-diversity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 38, 541–555.
- Mwaura, S., Levie, J., Lassalle, P., Stoyanov, S., & Carter, S. (2018). Taking steps to combat barriers to ethnic minority enterprise in Scotland. [Report commissioned by the Scottish Government, pp.1–37].
- Nathan, M. (2015). After Florida: Towards an economics of diversity. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 22, 3–19.
- Nathan, M. (2016). Ethnic diversity and business performance: Which firms? Which cities? *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 48, 2462–2483.
- Portes, A., Guarnizo, L. E., & Haller, W. J. (2002). Transnational entrepreneurs: An alternative form of immigrant economic adaptation. *American Sociological Review*, 67, 278–298.
- Portes, A., & Sensenbrenner, J. (1993). Embeddedness and immigration: Notes on the social determinants of economic action. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98, 1320–1350.
- Pruthi, S. (2014). Social ties and venture creation by returnee entrepreneurs. *International Business Review*, 23, 1139–1152.
- Ram, M., Jones, T., Edwards, P., Kiselincev, A., Muchenje, L., & Woldeesenbet, K. (2013). Engaging with super-diversity: New migrant businesses and the research-policy nexus. *International Small Business Journal*, 31, 337–356.
- Ram, M., Smallbone, D., Deakins, D., & Jones, T. (2003). Banking on 'break-out': Finance and the development of ethnic minority businesses. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 29, 663–681.
- Rienzo, C., & Vargas-Silva, C. (2018). Migrants in the UK: An overview. Migration Observatory briefing, COMPAS, University of Oxford.
- Rusinovic, K. (2008). Transnational embeddedness: Transnational activities and networks among first- and second-generation immigrant entrepreneurs in the Netherlands. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 34, 431–451.

- Ryan, L. (2011). Migrants' social networks and weak ties: Accessing resources and constructing relationships post-migration. *The Sociological Review*, 59, 707–724.
- Santamaria-Alvarez, S. M., Munoz-Castro, D. C., Sarmiento-Gonzalez, M. A., & Marin-Zapata, S. I. (2018). Fragmented networks and transnational entrepreneurship: Building strategies to prosper in challenging surroundings. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, 16, 244–275.
- Scott, J. M., & Hussain, J. (2019). Exploring intersectionality issues in entrepreneurial finance: Policy responses and future research directions. *Strategic Change*, 28, 37–45.
- Sepulveda, L., Syrett, S., & Lyon, F. (2011). Population superdiversity and new migrant enterprise: The case of London. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 23, 469–497.
- Smallbone, D., Bertotti, M., & Ekanem, I. (2005). Diversification in ethnic minority business. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 12, 41–56.
- Smallbone, D., Kitching, J., & Athayde, R. (2010). Ethnic diversity, entrepreneurship and competitiveness in a global city. *International Small Business Journal*, 28, 174–190.
- Solano, G. (2019). The mixed embeddedness of transnational migrant entrepreneurs: Moroccans in Amsterdam and Milan. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46(10), 2067–2085.
- Valdez, Z. (2016). Intersectionality, the household economy, and ethnic entrepreneurship. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 39, 1618–1636.
- Vance, C. M., McNulty, Y., Paik, Y., & D'Mello, J. (2016). The expat-preneur: Conceptualizing a growing international career phenomenon. *Journal of Global Mobility*, 4(2), 202–224.
- Vershinina, N., Barrett, R., & Meyer, M. (2011). Forms of capital, intra-ethnic variation and Polish entrepreneurs in Leicester. *Work, Employment & Society*, 25, 101–117.
- Vershinina, N., Rodgers, P., McAdam, M., & Clinton, E. (2019). Transnational migrant entrepreneurship, gender and family business. *Global Networks*, 19, 238–260.
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30, 1024–1054.
- Vertovec, S. (2010). Conceiving and researching transnationalism. *Selected Studies in International Migration and Immigrant Incorporation*, 22(2), 447–462.
- Villares-Varela, M., Ram, M., & Jones, T. (2018). Bricolage as survival, growth and transformation: The role of patch-working in the social agency of migrant entrepreneurs. *Work, Employment and Society*, 32, 942–962.
- Wahlbeck, Ö. (2018). Combining mixed embeddedness and transnationalism: The utilization of social resources among Turkish migrant entrepreneurs. *Sociologica*, 12(2), 73–86.
- Waldinger, R. (2005). Networks and niches: The continuing significance of ethnic connections. In G. Loury, T. Modood, & S. Teles (Eds.), *Ethnicity, social mobility, and public policy: Comparing the USA and UK* (pp. 342–362). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Walker, K. (2018). Locating neighbourhood diversity in the American metropolis. *Urban Studies*, 55, 116–132.
- Wang, Q., & Morrell, E. (2015). Gender and entrepreneurship revisited from a community perspective: Experiences in a new immigrant gateway and beyond. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 47, 2645–2662.
- Wekker, F. (2019). “We have to teach them diversity”: On demographic transformations and lived reality in an Amsterdam working-class neighbourhood. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 42, 89–104.
- Werbner, P. (2001). Metaphors of spatiality and networks in the plural city: A critique of the ethnic enclave economy debate. *Sociology*, 35, 671–693.
- Wessendorf, S. (2013). Commonplace diversity and the ‘ethos of mixing’: Perceptions of difference in a London neighbourhood. *Identities*, 20, 407–422.
- Wood, M. S., & McKinley, W. (2020). The Entrepreneurial Opportunity Construct: Dislodge or Leverage? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 34(3), 352–365.
- Yamamura, S., & Lassalle, P. (2019). Approximating entrepreneurial superdiversity: Reconceptualizing the superdiversity debate in ethnic minority entrepreneurship. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46(11), 2218–2239.
- Zhou, M. (2004). Revisiting ethnic entrepreneurship: Convergencies, controversies, and conceptual advancements. *International Migration Review*, 38, 1040–1074.
- Zhou, M., & Logan, J. R. (1989). Returns on human capital in ethnic enclaves: New York City's Chinatown. *American Sociological Review*, 54, 809–820.
- Zhuang, Z. C. (2019). Ethnic entrepreneurship and placemaking in Toronto's ethnic retail neighbourhoods. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*, 110, 520–537.