



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Studying 'up' in migrant entrepreneurship

Privileged migrant entrepreneurs in Wroclaw, Poland

Girling, R.A.

Publication date

2021

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Girling, R. A. (2021). *Studying 'up' in migrant entrepreneurship: Privileged migrant entrepreneurs in Wroclaw, Poland*.

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

9.



CHAPTER 9

Conclusions

9.1. Introduction

This study has asked what happens when we study ‘up’ in migrant entrepreneurship. As a point of entry, I started with the story of Francesco (Italy) who, over 20 years ago, decided to migrate to his wife’s native city of Wroclaw, Poland, whereupon he subsequently opened his own architecture firm. Francesco’s story, I argued, presents a number of curious dilemmas for many of the leading theories within the field of migrant entrepreneurship. These dilemmas, I suggested, seem somehow connected to Francesco’s migration being ‘in reverse’, whereby he moved from an economically *more developed* country to one which is economically *less developed*. And, importantly, Francesco is not alone. Although part of a migration trend which is indeed far smaller than that of migration to core-states, he has been joined by over 13 million⁹² (in 2019 alone) other migrants who have likewise moved in a North-South direction, including myself. Of course, not all of them become entrepreneurs, but I could see with my own eyes (in Wroclaw) that many of them *do*. Despite this, the phenomenon of core-to-(semi)-periphery migrant entrepreneurship has received very little attention among scholars. Indeed, in a literature review by Dheer (2018) of 69 studies, he found that *none of them* analysed migration in this direction. Subsequently, this study has attempted to fill the gap in the literature by studying ‘up’ (Nader 1972; Gusterson 1997; Aguiar 2012). Yet, any attempt to study ‘up’ requires a ‘down’ against which to position itself. As such, this has been a comparative study which has not only included migrants from core-states (such as the USA, UK, and Germany), but also periphery-states (namely, Ukraine and Belarus). Wroclaw, as a city within a semi-periphery state, provided an ideal setting in which both subject groups could be observed in a relatively neutral environment. Importantly, the study’s results reveal variations between the two subject groups which are problematic for many of the existing theories. This, I argue, is indicative of how such theories have been rooted in dominant-subordinate periphery-to-core migratory contexts. As a direct consequence of this, through studying the micro level agency of migrant entrepreneurs who have migrated in the opposite direction, this study was able to ‘light up’ previously hidden assumptions and structures (Duneier 2014: 7). Thereupon, in order to foreground the importance of situating migrant entrepreneurship within these (uneven and global) structures, I subsequently proposed the concept of ‘Global-embeddedness’.

9.2. Why does this study matter?

As noted above, this study has helped to fill a gap in the literature. But what makes it a gap which is worth filling? Here, I provided five compelling reasons. First and

foremost, I proposed that there are important theoretical reasons to do so. Nader (1972: 5) warned against anthropologists' 'downward' facing preoccupation with disadvantaged groups and minorities. This, she states, inevitably creates a 'dominant-subordinate' relationship between the researcher and the subject of study and, subsequently, may be 'affecting the kinds of theories that we are weaving' (ibid). Indeed, despite this warning being issued well over 40 years ago, I argued that it still seems to ring true in the field of migrant entrepreneurship even today. This, I demonstrated, can be seen in the way that Francesco's situation (as an example of studying 'up' in migrant entrepreneurship) seems problematic for three of the most prominent theories within the field, namely, Disadvantage Theory (Light 1979; Johnson 2000; Clark & Drinkwater 2010), Ethnic Enclave Theory (Wilson & Portes 1980; Light et al 1994; Portes & Shafer 2006), and Mixed-embeddedness Approach (Kloosterman et al. 1999).

Starting with Disadvantage Theory (Light 1979; Johnson 2000; Clark & Drinkwater 2010), I questioned whether migrants, such as Francesco, are indeed, as the theory suggests, 'disadvantaged'. This theory would attribute his entrepreneurial adventures as merely an act of *necessity*, resulting from his disadvantaged migrant status, which curtails his ability to access the mainstream labour market. This, I argued, was certainly not the case with Francesco who certainly did not seem to occupy a disadvantaged position relative to the mainstream Polish society. After all, he had openly admitted to the social prestige he enjoyed as an Italian in Wroclaw and how he was viewed as 'exotic', not to mention how he had found high paid employment as an architect and, subsequently, did not start his own company out of necessity but, rather, *volition*.

I then turned to Ethnic Enclave Theory (Wilson & Portes 1980; Light et al 1994; Portes & Shafer 2006), another theory which makes efforts to explain the high rate of entrepreneurship among certain migrant populations. In contrast to Disadvantage Theory, however, this theory proposes that migrant entrepreneurs may have a distinct *advantage*, namely, a plentiful supply of affordable, co-ethnic labour. But, once again, I questioned whether this is true of migrants from core-states, such as Francesco, for whom, as an Italian in Wroclaw, a plentiful supply of affordable, co-ethnic labour seemed unlikely.

Finally, I suggested that Francesco's circumstances do not even seem to fit within arguably the most inclusive theory within the field, namely, that of Mixed-embeddedness Approach (Kloosterman et al. 1999). In a well-meaning and genuinely helpful attempt to create a typology of the opportunity structure, the authors assign the *host-country* as the largest unit of analysis (Kloosterman & Rath 2001). Yet, for Francesco, who has clients and investors in the UK, Ireland, and Italy, it would seem his opportunity structure extends well beyond the borders of the host-country.

Second, and returning to the original question of why this is a gap in the literature which is worth filling, I suggested that doing so may have methodological

implications for new research projects. If, for example, studying ‘up’ reveals the presence of hidden assumptions and structures, then this might serve as a reminder to other researchers about the importance of identifying taken-for-granted notions in their research.

Third, I postulated that shifting the focus toward more privileged forms of migration may help to change the negative narrative surrounding migration. Within the mainstream Western media, migrants are often presented as a homogenous, disadvantaged group. Although a small number of studies have helped to highlight that not all migrants are disadvantaged (e.g. Saxenian 1999; 2002; Froschauer & Wong 2012), such ideas have largely been drowned out amidst the wider narrative. Nonetheless, by more actively shining the spotlight upon more privileged forms of migration, we might begin to expand the semantic scope of ‘migrant’ beyond one of negativity and disadvantage.

Fourth, I proposed that there may even be theoretical ramifications *beyond the field of migrant entrepreneurship*, in particular in terms of global inequality. The most common indicator of inequality is wealth. What then, could be more meaningful, than researching those at the forefront of wealth creation, that is to say, *entrepreneurs*? I proposed that, through the micro-level analysis of migrant entrepreneurs from polar opposite sides of the economic spectrum, we might be able to shine a light upon the processes which create and reinforce global inequality.

Fifth, and finally, I suggested that there may be subsequent implications for policy-makers. After all, if the migrant entrepreneurship theories have been rooted in dominant-subordinate contexts, then what does that mean for the policy-makers, governments, and organizations who are building and implementing policy based upon such theories? This, I proposed, may be of particular relevance to policy-makers in (semi-)periphery countries for whom theories built upon core-state contexts may well be incompatible.

9.3. Why an heuristic model?

Having highlighted how studying ‘up’ appears to pose a number of problems for many of the existing theories, I needed, of course, to propose an alternative theoretical model for the purposes of conducting the study. Yet, as an explorative, inductive study, I attempted to withhold any final theoretical proposals until later on and, instead, proceeded with a heuristic model. By using this model, my aim was to include all possible variables, while remaining open to if and how they are connected to one another. In other words, I tried to include all the ingredients without yet knowing the exact recipe. As a starting point, this heuristic model included many variables from existing models. For example, I borrowed from Kloosterman’s (2010) division of ‘micro’, ‘meso’, and ‘macro’ layers which allowed me to break up the complex phenomenon of migrant entrepreneurship into more

manageable pieces. Additionally, in order to include variables of agency on a micro level, I borrowed from Light & Gold's (2000) typology of human, financial, social, and cultural capital. However, I also added two additional variables of my own. The first was that of 'motivations' which I added on the micro level and which, based on initial pilot interviews, as well as my own experiences, seemed to be playing an important role. The second was added on the macro level, whereby I extended it from not only including Wroclaw and Poland, but also a wider, supranational context which, once again based upon the initial pilot interviews, seemed to be of importance. It was only later, upon collecting the empirical data, that the full scale of this international context became apparent, subsequently leading to me proposing the term 'Global-embeddedness' (as will be seen in the 'Results' section).

9.4. Research questions

The purpose of this project was to study 'up' within the field of migrant entrepreneurship by exploring the phenomenon of migrant entrepreneurs from core-states in the emerging economy of Wroclaw, Poland, and to position this phenomenon against that of migrant entrepreneurs from periphery-states. Yet, as with any research project, it can be difficult to decide at what angle to approach the research. As such, in order to guide the study, I formulated three research questions:

1. How do migrant entrepreneurs from core and periphery countries, in the 'middle-ground', semi-periphery environment of Wroclaw, Poland, vary in their motivations and access to resources (financial, human, social, and cultural capital)?
2. How do these variations interact with the environment of Wroclaw, Poland, and the wider international context and how does this affect the everyday management of the firm, (ethnic) division of entrepreneurial labour, and the position of the firm in the wider economy?
3. How can these variations and interactions be theoretically explained?

9.5. Methodology

Wroclaw was chosen as the location of the study for four main reasons. First, it is a location where both subject groups can be found. Second, with a GDP of \$15,595, 63rd in the world (World Bank 2019), Poland neither belongs to the group of core-states, nor periphery and, subsequently, provides a relatively neutral, economic 'middle-ground' setting for the study. Third, Poland has been shown to have relatively high rates of migrant entrepreneurship (Nestorowicz 2012) so

not only did Wrocław provide the opportunity to migrants, but also, importantly, migrant *entrepreneurs*. Fourth, and finally, it was chosen for pragmatic reasons, as Wrocław has been the city within which I, myself, have lived and worked as a migrant entrepreneur for the past six years, lending itself well to certain advantages for the study (such as Polish language skills, familiarity with the local business environment, etc).

In terms of research design, I consciously chose a qualitative, comparative, Grounded Theory (Glaser & Strauss 1967) approach. This, importantly, I related back to how my choices enabled me to answer the research questions. First and foremost, a qualitative approach (in which I predominantly relied upon qualitative interviews) enabled me to go ‘deeper’ to gather the kind of rich, in-depth information which was necessary to answer the first two research questions. These questions, with a large number of variables, create an inherent level of complexity, for which qualitative interviews enabled me to understand, at a deeper level, not just the variations of motivations and resources of the two subject groups (i.e. Research Question 1), but also *how* these variations in motivations and resources of the two subject groups play out in the environment of Wrocław, Poland, and the wider international context (i.e. Research Question 2). Second, in terms of my choice of a comparative approach, this was inherently required in order to answer the first two questions which, of course, seek to explore variations between the two subject groups (and their interactions with the environment). Further, as an important component of a Grounded Theory approach, I also made use of ‘constant comparison’ which helped to identify emerging categories (Charmaz 2006) and, in doing so, was an important part of answering all three research questions. Third, and finally, I adopted a Grounded Theory approach for two main reasons. First, as an approach which aims to generate theory, it was well-suited to answering the third and final research question, namely, to theoretically account for data encountered in answering the first two research questions. Second, Grounded Theory’s consideration of hidden power dynamics is of particular relevance to this study. This, when combined with the ability to ground theory in data, permits the generation of new concepts separate from pre-existing theories which may themselves conceal hidden power relations.

My fieldwork took place between October 2018 and May 2020 and consisted of six distinct methods, all of which were chosen in accordance with the research design and their ability to collect and analyze the data necessary to answer the research questions. In terms of Research Questions 1 and 2 (pertaining to migrants’ motivations, their access to resources, and variations in these interact with the environment), I employed the following: 1. purposeful sampling; 2. qualitative interviews; 3. organizational coding; 4. constant comparison. In terms of Research Question 3, which concerns itself more with theoretically accounting for the data uncovered in the study, I made use of two additional methods, specifically: 5. theoretical coding; and 6. conceptualization. With regard to the

latter (conceptualization), this played a significant role in the genesis of the term 'Global-embeddedness' which was based upon emergent patterns and was chosen through a process of 'constantly trying to fit words to it to best capture its imageric meaning' (Glaser's 2002: 24) .

The research sample itself, in accordance with the comparative study research design, consisted of two main subject groups. The first group was made up of 41 migrant entrepreneurs from core states (the UK, the USA, Italy, France, Germany, Ireland, Finland, Portugal, Canada, Australia, and Israel), while the second group was made up of 24 migrant entrepreneurs from five periphery-states (Ukraine, Belarus, India, Nigeria, and South Africa). Although it was not done on purpose, the large majority of subjects were male (40/41 of those from core-states and 18/24 of those from periphery-states), which can partially be attributed to the preponderance of males within wider migration data. Further, in terms of industry sector, the migrants from core-states were better represented within the 'professional activities' and 'information and communication' sectors, while the majority of those from periphery-states were located within the 'gastronomy', 'wholesale', and 'construction' sectors. Importantly, this also seemed to reflect wider quantitative data concerning migrants in Poland.

In order to complement the data gathered from the two subject groups, I also collected additional information from a range of other sources. This consisted of qualitative interviews with almost one dozen local organizations which have regular contact with migrants and migrant entrepreneurs, such as the City of Wroclaw, various chambers of commerce, as well as a number of NGOs.

In conducting all of the above, the study faced several challenges in terms of both validity and generalizability. With regard to the former, these included language issues, transference, and the inclusion in the study of certain migrants who, perhaps, are not 'true entrepreneurs'. In order to mediate these challenges, I employed a number of strategies. For example, in terms of transference, which can 'cause researchers to lean toward certain themes, to actively look for evidence to support their positions' (Creswell 2003: 237), I made proactive efforts to be entirely transparent about my role in the study, writing in the first person to reflect my active participation as the main instrument collecting and interpreting the data. With regard to the latter, I argued that, even though the study might not be numerically representative, it could well be representative of underlying causal mechanisms which help to explain the 'how' of broader social phenomena (Lin 1998).

9.6. Results

The study yielded a number of important findings which I presented in four empirical chapters (3-7), as well as one theoretical chapter (8). I will now summarize these findings below.

9.6.1. Variations in motivations and access to resources

Motivations

In Chapter 3, I showed how, in contradiction to the mainstream literature and theories surrounding migrant entrepreneurship, it cannot be assumed that migrants, when relocating to new countries and starting their own businesses, are always motivated by money alone. Indeed, migrants from the core-states subject group often moved to Wrocław for non-economic reasons, such as for a Polish partner (and sometimes their extended family) or to improve their quality of life, while also taking into account other factors, such as Poland's geographic proximity to Western Europe. Importantly, even for those who moved to Wrocław for economic reasons, these reasons seem to be somewhat 'upside down', with Wrocław being chosen not for higher income, but instead for *lower costs*. This in itself seems to represent a kind of *geoarbitrage* (Hayes 2014), whereby the migrant entrepreneurs are geographically relocating in order to take advantage of global price disparities. Conversely, for those from the periphery-states subject group, motivations for moving to Wrocław seemed more likely to be based upon economic considerations, as well as negative factors within their country of origin, such as lack of 'rule of law'. However, this was not always the case, as some of them talked about migrating to improve their lifestyle or to inject some excitement and 'adventure' into their lives, which more closely resembles the motivations of many those from core-states.

With regard to motivations for opening a business, I similarly showed how such motivations, once again, cannot be assumed to be economic in character. In contradiction to Disadvantage Theory (Light 1979; Johnson 2000; Clark & Drinkwater 2010), the migrants from the core-states subject group, who seem to have easy access to well-paid employment within the mainstream labour market, (usually) do not open a business out of necessity, but do so instead out of volition, often in pursuit of more agency. Indeed, for many of them, it even seems to be the opposite of Disadvantage Theory, whereby they are only willing to return to the mainstream labour market if absolutely necessary. Conversely, for migrants from the periphery-states subject group, the theory seemed more applicable, as many (but by no means all) of them were pushed into entrepreneurship by restrictions to well-paid employment in the mainstream labour market.

In summary, the results show that migrant entrepreneurs' are not one homogenous group with identical motivations (Oliveira 2007), but instead have varying motivations (Masurel et al. 2002; Lin & Tao 2012) which cannot necessarily be assumed to be economic in character (Glinka & Brzozowska 2015; Rametse et al. 2018; Brzozowska & Glinka 2019) nor rooted in necessity (Ndofor and Priem 2011), and which are subject change over time (Knight 2015). Consequently, in highlighting the diversity of migrants' motivations, and the important role they play, the results of this study help to reveal the hitherto understated role of motivations in migrant entrepreneurship.

Access to resources

In Chapter 4, I showed how, in contradiction to the narrative of the ‘disadvantaged migrant’ so often depicted in (semi-)periphery-to-core migratory contexts, in an inverse context, migrant entrepreneurs do not always lack access to resources. On the contrary, I showed how they (sometimes, but not always) have relatively *high levels* of access to financial, human, social, and cultural capital. Such findings seem in line with other studies of migrant entrepreneurs from core-states (Stone & Stubbs 2007; Drake & Collard 2008; Marchant & Mottiar 2011; Andrejuk 2017). Yet, I also showed how, even within a periphery-to-core context, a lack of resources among migrant entrepreneurs likewise cannot always be assumed. In cases, many of the migrant entrepreneurs were also shown to have relatively high levels of access to a range of capital resources. This, similarly, lends support to other studies which have reported similar findings (Saxenian 1999; 2002; Kloosterman et al. 1999; Light & Gold 2000; Leung 2001; Masurel et al. 2002; Katila & Wahlbeck 2012; Lin & Tao 2012). That being said, I also highlighted the extensive variation, with several migrants from both groups also displaying a *lack* of access to various forms of resources.

Importantly, despite the two groups of migrants apparently not varying significantly in their levels of resources, they often vary in the geographic origin of such resources. While those from core-states (unsurprisingly) seem more likely to possess cultural and social capital from regions in core-states, conversely, those from periphery-states seem more likely to possess such forms of capital from periphery-states. This, as seen in Chapters 5, 6, and 7, had important implications in terms of how these variations in the origins of such capital plays out in an unequal environment.

9.6.2. Interactions with the environment

The location of migrants’ opportunity structures

In Chapter 5, I showed how it cannot be assumed that migrant entrepreneurs access opportunity structures exclusively within the host country only. Yet, what is interesting here is the variation between the two subject groups. While 51% of migrant entrepreneurs from core-states were found to access *international* opportunity structures, conversely, only a small number of those from periphery-states were found to do so, with the majority of them selling goods or services *locally* within the host country.

The (ethnic) division of labour

In Chapter 6, I showed how, in contrast to the ideas of Ethnic Enclave Theory (Wilson & Portes 1980; Light et al 1994; Min 2000; Drori & Lerner 2002), we cannot assume that migrant entrepreneurs take advantage of a plentiful supply of co-ethnic labour. Yet, once again, what was interesting here is the variation between the two subject groups. For the majority of those from the core-state subject group,

co-ethnic labour was neither cheap nor plentiful and, instead, they were found more likely to employ native, Polish labour. By contrast, those from the periphery-state subject group (notably, Ukraine) did indeed seem to be conforming to Ethnic Enclave Theory, with many of them employing co-ethnic labour.

Disadvantage and privilege

In Chapter 7, I showed how, in contrast to the mainstream narrative of the ‘disadvantaged migrant’, not all migrants can be assumed to be disadvantaged and, instead, often demonstrate the exact opposite, namely, privilege. In particular, migrants from core-states are, in general, granted a higher standing within the local environment, have greater access to well-paid employment, greater legal mobility, as well as possessing the apparent ability to bridge themselves to lucrative markets in core-states. Those from the periphery-state subject group, by contrast, often (but not always) experience the opposite. They do, however, appear to possess one notable privilege, specifically, their ability to access more affordable supplies of periphery labour.

9.6.3. Theoretical explanation: Global-embeddedness

In Chapter 8, in an attempt to theoretically account for the above findings, I proposed the concept of ‘Global-embeddedness’. Underpinning this concept is the existence of multiple layers (economic, technological, socio-cultural, politico-institutional) of a macro level environment which extend well-beyond the borders of the host country. All migrants, I argued, even those seemingly operating within the confines of the local, host country, are in fact embedded not only within their local environment, but also within this wider, global environment. It is the embeddedness of migrants (as well as their motivations and access to resources) within this global environment which, I proposed, can help us to understand the variations observed between the two subject groups and their interactions with the environment. In coining the term ‘Global-embeddedness’, my goal was to foreground the important role played by such macro level structures and the inherent power dynamics involved. While calls for such an approach have been more vocal within social sciences as a whole (Wallerstein 2004; Weiss 2005; Schiller & Faist 2013), the field of migrant entrepreneurship (as shown) has remained centred around the nation-state as the largest unit of analysis. Even for the studies which do go beyond the host country borders (Chen & Tan 2009; Solano 2015), the focus is often restricted to the binary paradigm of the host and home countries. As such, this study echoes calls for scholars to ‘jettison’ the nation-state as the largest unit of analysis (Schiller & Faist 2013: 5) and extends such a multilateral, global approach into the field of migrant entrepreneurship.

Subsequently, in order to demonstrate Global-embeddedness ‘in action’, I used the concept to explain four key variations encountered in this study: 1. Variation

in motivations; 2. Variation in the location of (accessed) opportunity structures; 3. Variation in the ethnic division of labour; and 4. Variation in privileges and disadvantages. It was, however, the latter (variation in privileges and disadvantages) which was shown to play a most prominent role here. Accordingly, I elevated this variation to the top of my discussion.

Variation in privileges and disadvantages

As a starting point, I showed how migrants' variation in their composition of privileges reflects migrants' position within the various layers of an uneven macro environment, that is to say, their *Global-embeddedness*. For example, those raised within core-states are bestowed with core-state cultural and social capital which, within global cultural and politico-institutional hierarchies, takes on structurally imposed value (Coleman 1988). This, in turn, often grants them a number of privileges, such as higher wages, greater legal mobility, greater chances of securing well-paid mainstream employment, and the ability to bridge oneself to affluent core-state markets. Conversely, those originating from periphery-states inherit periphery-state social and cultural capital which, within the same global cultural and politico-institutional hierarchies, takes on more negative value. This, conversely, leads to several disadvantages, such as lower wages, restricted legal mobility, less chance of securing well-paid mainstream employment, and less chance of bridging oneself to affluent core-state markets.

Variation in motivations

Such variation in privileges, I showed, then has a direct effect upon migrants' motivations for both migrating and starting their own business. In terms of the former, migrants' motivations for moving to Wrocław are themselves often a reflection of their variation in privileges. For example, migrants who are privileged by their citizenship within economically developed core-states are far less likely to be motivated to move to Wrocław for higher earnings and, as a result, are more likely to be motivated by other factors.

In terms of the latter, migrants' motivations for starting a business are, likewise, often shaped by their variation in privileges. For those from core-states, who largely as a result of their privileged position within socio-cultural hierarchies find it easier to secure well-paid employment, it is subsequently unsurprising that their main motivation for starting a business is seldom higher earnings. For those from periphery-states, by contrast, who through no fault of their own are handed a set of disadvantages (including greater difficulty securing well-paid employment), it is easy to understand why both their move to Wrocław, as well as their decision to open a business, are often (but not always) motivated by the prospect of higher earnings.

Variation in the location of (accessed) opportunity structures

Here I demonstrated how variation in the location of migrants' (accessed) opportunity structures is similarly caused by variation in migrants' composition of privileges. Those from core-states, by virtue of spending time within core-state cultures, are endowed with core-state cultural and social capital. Such capital, I showed, can be used as a bridge to affluent core-state markets. The access to such markets is further facilitated by core-state migrants' often favourable position within the politico-institutional and technological layers of an uneven, global environment.

Variation in the ethnic division of labour

Finally, I demonstrated how the above factors collectively lead to variations in the migrants' ethnic division of labour. Migrants' position with an uneven global macro environment (i.e. their Global-embeddedness), when combined with their motivations, leads to variations in the volume and cost of various ethnic pools of labour in Wrocław whereby, specifically, labour from core-states is less plentiful and more expensive than periphery-state labour (notably, from Ukraine). Here migrant entrepreneurs from Ukraine have an advantage, as they are subsequently able to leverage their periphery-state cultural and social capital as a bridge to this plentiful supply of affordable co-ethnic labour, while core-state migrants, by contrast, make do with a plentiful supply of native, Polish labour.

9.7. Implications of this study

“What will we do with such knowledge? ...it is an open question whether we will choose to use unearned advantage to weaken hidden systems of advantage, and whether we will use any of our arbitrary awarded power to try to reconstruct power systems on a broader base”, (McIntosh 1988: 36).

Finally, here at the end of this dissertation, I consider the implications of the study. In order to do so, I think it is fitting to return to where we began, that is to say, with the story of Francesco. Although seemingly insignificant on the surface, his story, I have shown over the past nine chapters, has several far reaching implications within the field of migrant entrepreneurship, not least in terms of problematizing the current theories and highlighting the implicit power relations hidden within them. Yet, Francesco's story (and that of many other privileged migrant entrepreneurs in the study), I argue, also carry implications further afield, specifically, for those interested in reducing *global inequality*. The key indicator most commonly used to measure inequality is wealth. As a study which concerns itself with those who are at the forefront of wealth creation, that is to say, *entrepreneurs*, this study's findings, I propose, are of great relevance to the issue of global inequality. Indeed, in this dissertation, I have closely scrutinised entrepreneurs from some of the

world's wealthiest nations and positioned these findings against those from those from some of the poorest. This, I have shown, has revealed how an uneven, global environment often privileges the former, while subjecting the latter to a number of disadvantages. The important point here is that such variation seems *systemic*. Unlike previous observations of systemic inequality, which have largely centred around the role of ethnicity (for example Young 2011 and Feagin 2017) and gender (see Ridgeway 2004, among others), this study has foregrounded that of inequality based upon *nationality and citizenship*. This in itself generates three implications.

First, for those looking to address inequality in societies, it suggests that we should extend the field of intersectionality (Crenshaw 1991; 2017) to also include one's nationality and citizenship.

Second, it questions the validity of success generated on the back of privilege rooted in one's position within global hierarchies. Those from core states who are often considered 'successful', such as millionaires, entrepreneurs, and even academics, may well owe some degree of their success to their favourable embeddedness within this systemic, global environment. Subsequently, in acknowledging this, those who have profited from their nationality might have to, in the words of McIntosh (1988: 30), 'give up the myth of meritocracy'.

Third, upon recognizing the systemic privilege and disadvantage created by one's position within an uneven global environment, we have to ask ourselves, once again in the words of McIntosh (quoted at the beginning of this section), 'what will we do with such knowledge?' Those interested in promoting the ideals of fairness and equality would likely agree that we, especially those of us who *benefit* from such systemic inequality, have a responsibility to use this knowledge to help make the world a fairer place. But, of course, making the decision to act is easy. How one can actually make a difference, in the face of such powerful, yet intangible, global hierarchies, is quite another question altogether. As a starting point, we could, suggests Choules 2006: 288), 'seriously consider renouncing the politico-legal construct of citizenship'. Indeed, tackling laws which treat people differently based upon citizenship or nationality would at least remove any legal fortification of citizenship privilege. However, even if such an ambitious plan could be achieved, it is likely that the cultural hierarchies, around which such laws were no doubt created to reinforce, would remain, conceivably in the same way that gender and racial inequality persists despite attempts in recent decades to address the legal injustices between sexes and ethnic groups. How, then, can these underlying hierarchies be tackled? As academic scholars, perhaps one of the best contributions we can make is to simply document the existence of such structures and how they function. After all, awareness of a problem is usually the first step toward solving it. This study has done exactly this, albeit only within the context of the specific phenomenon of migrant entrepreneurship. There remains, however, a multitude of other professions, sectors, and additional areas of research to explore. Here, scholars might consider how one's nationality contributes to the success (or failure)

of 'regular' employees or those who have *not* migrated. What role, for example, does this play in the success of a Dutch academic within the Netherlands? Or of a Polish police officer within Poland? And how does citizenship, nationality, and one's Global-embeddedness interact with other aspects of intersectionality, such as gender and ethnicity?

Last but not least, we should remember that the macro hierarchies encountered in this study only became visible through the micro level analysis of those who *benefit* from such hierarchies. This in itself forces us to ponder what else might be 'lit up' (Duneier 2014: 7) via the act of studying 'up' (Nader 1972; Gusterson 1997; Aguiar 2012). We (quite justifiably) write paper upon paper about 'the poor, the ethnic groups, the disadvantaged' (Nader 1972: 5), yet the relative advantages enjoyed by privileged elites - and the root causes of such privilege - remain largely unexplored (with some notable exceptions, for example Ho's (2009) ethnography of Wall Street financial institutions). What, in other words, a curious paradox it would be if the answers to solving social deprivation and hardship were not to be found in disadvantage alone but also, conversely, *privilege*.