

Immigrant Entrepreneurship¹ as a Field of Research²

Submitted: 21.07.17 | Accepted: 16.01.18

Beata Glinka*

The article presents immigrant entrepreneurship as a field of research. In the first section, the main concepts related to immigrant entrepreneurship are recounted. It is followed by an analysis of factors that give grounds for regarding immigrant entrepreneurship as a separate field of research. Several important trends and tendencies in immigrant entrepreneurship research are also outlined. The last section is devoted to a discussion on potential challenges faced by researchers.

Keywords: entrepreneurship, migrations, culture, immigrant entrepreneurship, cultural context of entrepreneurship, mixed embeddedness.

Przedsiębiorczość imigrantów jako dziedzina badań

Nadestany: 21.07.17 | Zaakceptowany do druku: 16.01.18

Celem artykułu jest przedstawienie przedsiębiorczości imigrantów jako obszaru badań, ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem jego kulturowego kontekstu. Tekst rozpoczyna prezentacja podstawowych pojęć związanych z przedsiębiorczością imigrantów. Wskazane zostały elementy specyfiki, które powodują, że przedsiębiorczość imigrantów może być traktowana jako odrębny obszar badawczy. W opracowaniu wskazano także wybrane trendy w badaniach i wyzwania stojące obecnie przed badaczami przedsiębiorczości imigrantów.

Słowa kluczowe: przedsiębiorczość, migracje, kultura, przedsiębiorczość migrantów, kulturowy kontekst przedsiębiorczości, mieszane zakorzenienie.

JEL: L26, F22, J15, O15

* **Beata Glinka** – Professor, PhD (habilitated), Faculty of Management, University of Warsaw.

Correspondence address: Faculty of Management, University of Warsaw, Szturmowa 1/3, 02-678 Warsaw;
e-mail: bglinka@wz.uw.edu.pl.

1. Introduction

Although migration and related phenomena have been intrinsic elements of human history since its very beginnings, in recent years, they have become anew the subject of a heated public debate. The debate requires these phenomena to be more thoroughly explored and understood, and therefore scholars representing different fields seem eager to undertake research in this area, attracted by the potential it offers in terms of both creating new models and concepts, and the practical application of research results. Public debate also touches upon migration policy-making and building relationships with migrant communities. In these areas, in-depth knowledge provided by the academia may prove particularly valuable.

This recent intensification of research on migration does not mean that it is a completely uncharted subject. After all, for many decades, economic aspects of migration processes have been explored by researchers worldwide, also in Poland. Economic causes of migration have been studied, as well as its consequences (for both countries of origin of migrants and host countries), labour market issues, etc. Immigrant entrepreneurship research is a relatively new field of investigation. First studies devoted to this subject can be traced back to the mid-20th century; research was largely limited to the most popular and favoured migration destinations, such as the United States. It was not until the turn of the millennium that the subject gained currency worldwide: concepts and models that now form the foundation of numerous research projects and theoretical debates in this area were developed during that period. Nowadays, immigrant entrepreneurship attracts a lot of attention of management science scholars, who avail themselves of the existing body of research offered by sociology, anthropology and economics.

In Poland, the growing popularity of research on immigrant entrepreneurship, focused on both Poles leaving the country and foreigners settling in Poland, can be traced back only a few years. This new interest has two sources: first, general entrepreneurship research has been developing and global trends have been quickly seized by Polish academics; second, the migration debate has been rapidly gaining ground both in Poland and throughout Europe.

First and foremost, it should be stressed that, by its very nature, research into migration phenomena, in particular immigrant entrepreneurship, revolves around intercultural relations. Although mainstream research – focused on broadly defined entrepreneurship – dismissed for quite some time the cultural context, the study of immigrant entrepreneurship embraced the social and cultural aspects almost from its very outset. Immigrant entrepreneurs set up their businesses within a new economic, political and cultural setting, which requires specific competences, the ability to navigate between and, at times, simultaneously operate within several divergent contexts. This

generates distinctive challenges from the point of view of both entrepreneurs themselves and scholars analysing this phenomenon.

Given the essence of the subject, the growing scale of migration phenomena and its dynamic character, immigrant entrepreneurship has become an important strand of entrepreneurship research. Several decades of research and development of theoretical models allow us to conclude that immigrant entrepreneurship forms a distinct area of investigation that deserves attention within broadly understood entrepreneurship research. We can already venture certain conjectures regarding major research areas and future challenges.

The aim of the paper is to define immigrant entrepreneurship as a specific field of research, placing particular emphasis on its cultural context. A field of research is understood as an area identified within a discipline or an area of inquiry in relation to which separate concepts or (middle-range) theories can be formulated, covering a number of specific research problems that general theories and the conceptual apparatus of a particular sub-discipline fail to adequately explain.

We shall begin by clarifying certain basic concepts related to immigrant entrepreneurship, pointing out particular elements that give grounds for treating immigrant entrepreneurship as a separate research area. Key trends in the study of this phenomenon are subsequently outlined. The final part of the paper is devoted to discussing selected problems and dilemmas emerging in immigrant entrepreneurship research.

The paper is based on literature review, several years of research and the results of previous projects (Glinka, 2013; Glinka & Brzozowska, 2015).

2. Immigrant Entrepreneurship – Basic Concepts

Several interrelated concepts can be identified in the extant literature, namely immigrant/migrant entrepreneurship, ethnic entrepreneurship and diaspora entrepreneurship.

Immigrant/migrant entrepreneurship (see also footnote 1) is generally defined as undertaking entrepreneurial activities, in particular creating new businesses by first or second-generation immigrants. According to the most commonly accepted definition formulated by the UN, a migrant is a person who moves to a country other than that of his/her usual residence for a period of at least 12 months (see Castles & Miller, 2011, p. 22), and immigrants are generally defined as those born abroad (first generation) or their children (second generation, i.e. people whose one or both parents were born abroad).

Ethnic entrepreneurship is generally understood as entrepreneurial activity based on connections and interactions between people who have common origins and share migration experiences (see Volery, 2007; Waldinger, Aldrich, Ward, & associates, 1990). Thus, ethnic entrepreneurs operate on

the ethnic market and ethnic business begins as the entrepreneur starts providing goods or services to other members of his/her community, satisfying specific needs of this particular group (Greene & Owen, 2004). Ethnic entrepreneurship is also defined more broadly, as actions of those who share ethnic origins, but are not necessarily immigrants: they may be descendants of immigrants, or belong to an ethnic minority long-established in a given country, or even represent the indigenous population of a given country (e.g. American Indians or Australian Aborigines).

The concept of **diaspora entrepreneurship** is similar to immigrant entrepreneurship; what distinguishes it from the latter is the emphasis on the fact that a diaspora is formed by migrants who maintain close ties with the country of origin (see e.g. Gabaccia, 2012; Harima, 2014; Vertovec, 2012), which means that they are also often involved in entrepreneurial activities in the country of origin.

From the comparison of the above definitions, it clearly transpires that the concept of immigrant entrepreneurship is broadest and most universal; as such, it shall be the focus of the present analysis.

As indicated above, during the last few decades, immigrant entrepreneurship has kindled growing interest reflected in numerous publications, mainly in North America, Europe and Oceania (Aliaga-Isla & Rialp, 2013). Numerous researchers (and a growing number of business analysts) point to potential benefits of entrepreneurial activity undertaken by immigrants for the economy as a whole, for entrepreneurs and for employees (both immigrants and nationals of the host country). The impact of immigrant entrepreneurs on the economies of host countries has been expounded in numerous publications (*inter alia* Akcigit, Grigsby, & Nicholas, 2017; Castles & Miller, 2011; Herman & Smith, 2010; Shapiro, 2011; Vorderwulbecke, 2013). Just as any entrepreneurs, immigrant entrepreneurs contribute to job creation and innovation. However, the difference in the case of immigrants lies in several factors inherent in their situation, namely: a) the transfer of unique competences into the host country, b) revivifying local communities through the „entrepreneurial spirit” c) boosting specific sectors, as well as geographical areas that may be less attractive to entrepreneurs from the host country, d) stimulating economic exchange between the host country and the country of origin. The latter factor testifies to immigrant entrepreneurship’s impact on the economy of the host country and of the country of origin. An intensification of economic exchange and financial transfers is invariably observed, regardless of any differences in the level of prosperity and economic development between the two countries.

Immigrant entrepreneurship is an important socio-economic phenomenon. It also seems specific enough to be analysed separately from other areas of entrepreneurship or management sciences. Several aspects testify to this specificity.

First, as pointed out above, the role of immigrant entrepreneurship in the economy goes beyond the field of broadly understood entrepreneurship (including the so-called international entrepreneurship).

Second, when analysed at a very general level, the essence of processes involved in the creation and development of business ventures by immigrants is similar (entrepreneurs combine opportunities, teams and resources, which form the basis of one of the most commonly accepted entrepreneurial process models, propounded by Timmons, cf. Timmons & Spinelli, 2008). However, these processes are specific, implemented in a different manner and they take place in another context (see Figure 1). Therefore, their complexity is at least potentially greater, because the institutional, social and economic conditions of the host country are combined with the knowledge, rules, customs and norms of conduct imported from the country of origin. Another difference lies in the self-identification of the entrepreneur, who creates his/her identity and perceives his/her role through the prism of four factors: being an immigrant, being an entrepreneur, being a member of a specific ethnic community or the community/society of the country of origin, and being a member of the host society (Glinka, 2013). Ways in which entrepreneurs operate and their decisions are influenced by a complex system of factors rooted in two contexts, at times completely discrepant.




Fig. 1. Dynamic model of factors that condition entrepreneurial processes implemented by immigrants. Source: Own study based on Glinka 2013.

Third, the diversity of contexts is particularly evident in the sphere of culture defined as a system of values, beliefs, symbols and norms of conduct. Culturally rooted visions of economy, desirable actions, ways of solving dilemmas that entrepreneurs bring along with them from the country of origin are contrasted with the values and symbols typical of the community, businesses or potential customers in the host country. This requires taking a number of decisions, in particular regarding the degree of involvement with local entities (competitors, business partners, customers, employees, etc.), as well as the acquisition of certain intercultural competences. The subject of cultural embeddedness of entrepreneurial activities is further explored in the following section of the paper.

3. Cultural Embeddedness of Immigrant Entrepreneurship

Nowadays – unlike only a dozen or so years ago – research and publications devoted to cultural aspects of entrepreneurship are relatively frequent (George & Zahra, 2002); it was only during the last decade that the subject of relations between culture and entrepreneurship has gained currency in Polish literature (Glinka, 2008).

Although a handful of publications had appeared earlier (see e.g. Berger, 1994; Fleming, 1979), the matter sparked sudden interest at the turn of the 21st century. A more systematic inclusion of cultural aspects into the debate on entrepreneurship was postulated by a growing number of scholars, as evidenced by the organization of conferences or the publication of special issues of leading journals, such as „Entrepreneurship. Theory and Practice” (Freytag & Thurik, 2010; George & Zahra, 2002; Hayton, George, & Zahra, 2002). Authors of these publications argued that the role of culture had not been sufficiently explored and they bemoaned the lack of comparative studies devoted to this matter. Numerous analyses published at that time (and even some of those published today) focus on the influence of national cultures on entrepreneurship and on the specific cultural context of different countries (Freytag & Thurik, 2010; Hayton et al., 2002). For this purpose, authors often availed themselves of classical models of intercultural management, in particular the cultural dimensions model developed nearly 40 years ago (and repeatedly modified) by G. Hofstede (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2011), as well as the model advanced by House and his research team (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004). Other studies have suggested that these models be modified, or postulated that the focus be shifted from specific features of national cultures to the diagnosis of values important from the point of view of individuals; it was posited, *inter alia*, by König’s team (König, Steinmetz, Frese, Rauch, & Wang, 2007), whose model included eight dimensions/key cultural values, namely institutional collectivism, in-group collectivism, avoidance of uncertainty, power distance, assertiveness, future orientation, humane orientation and performance orientation.

Against this background, analyses regarding immigrant entrepreneurship can be considered quite specific, as cultural aspects have long been accounted for in these analyses, often forming one of their main axes. Two reasons can be invoked to explain the difference. First, migration and its various facets, including immigrant entrepreneurship have been explored by researchers at the interface between social sciences, economic sciences and management sciences. The multiplicity of fields of research has translated into a variety of research perspectives, which have not been limited to traditional economic analyses. Secondly, by their very nature, migrations have invariably involved different cultural contexts, often very distant from one another. Cultural diversity of working styles and ways of doing business has always been evident and, as such, interesting to both researchers and members of host communities. Differences in language, customs, religion, behaviour and approach to customer service would all spark the interest of researchers, inciting them to explore and measure the impact of the cultural background, cultural diversity and intercultural competences of entrepreneurs on their decisions, the scale of entrepreneurial activity or business performance.

Therefore, it has somewhat been automatically assumed that entrepreneurial activities of immigrants are socially embedded (Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993), while numerous studies have explored particular ethnic groups of immigrants and their methods of dealing with new cultural and economic contexts (Chand & Ghorbani, 2011). In addition, immigrants are considered as groups contributing to diversity, while being highly diverse themselves (*superdiverse* in the words of Vertovec, 2007; Vertovec, 2012).

Numerous concepts relating to the entrepreneurship of immigrants and ethnic minorities are rooted in sociology or draw from various sociological concepts. These theories focus on explaining why immigrants take up entrepreneurial activity; among them, two concepts have gained particular currency: the disadvantage theory and the cultural theory (Volery, 2007).

The disadvantage theory indicates that immigrants set up their own businesses because it is practically the only way in which they can earn a living in a new country; it is, therefore, a form of forced entrepreneurship (Chrysostome, 2010).

Cultural concepts, on the other hand, indicate that if migrating groups come from a culture that favours entrepreneurship, they will undertake entrepreneurial initiatives in any country they choose to settle in (Light & Rosenstein, 1995). However, cultural factors could be regarded rather in terms of processes, i.e. not as a set of invariable values typical of every immigrant coming from a given country that predestine him/her to becoming an entrepreneur, but rather as dynamic interactions between values typical of various groups and their patterns of action, which are additionally influenced by the values and symbols of the host country (Glinka, 2013). In addition, immigrants carry a specific „cultural equipment” (Berger, 1994). Those who decide to

leave their country of origin a) are willing to face new challenges and actively seek opportunities (which seem to them more abundant outside of their home country), b) do not fit into the economic reality of their own country (and emigrate in search of work and/or a better life), or c) are persecuted, and therefore forced leave, as staying would be either difficult or downright impossible. Any of these three cases mean that the individual in question is not a typical representative of his/her nation. Therefore, certain common traits can be attributed to some immigrants, i.e. willingness to accept/take risks, diligence or persistence (see Masurel, Nijkamp, & Vindigni, 2004). In their study – which is, in fact, a praise of immigrant entrepreneurs – Herman and Smith argue that immigration in itself can be considered proof of one's entrepreneurial nature (Herman & Smith, 2010). They refer to immigrants in the United States and indicate that they bring the entrepreneurial spirit onto the American soil, with their willingness to take risks, openness to opportunities, perseverance, as well as a deep attachment to „traditional” American values, such as frugality and honesty.

Not only does the culture of the country of origin entice immigrants to establish their own business but, according to some studies, it determines to a large extent the orientation of business activities, as immigrants tend to undertake these types of activities that are popular, valued or widely accepted in their country of origin. This explains, for instance, why specific types of business activities dominate among immigrants from Asia, who tend to run restaurants, laundries or small stores (Leung, 2002). Having said that, we must remember that the type of activity depends not only on one's cultural background, but also on such factors as access to capital, market situation and competition (Volery, 2007).

To sum up, cultural embeddedness concepts and cultural context analyses form the natural basis for research into immigrant entrepreneurship. The latter focuses, *inter alia*, on the following matters:

- Cultural reasons for establishing a business (cultural background); culture of the country of origin and the cultural background as catalysts for immigrant entrepreneurship (Foreman-Peck & Zhou, 2013; Light & Rosenstein, 1995),
- Culture and social embeddedness as important factors determining the scale and type of entrepreneurial activity; differences in entrepreneurial activity between immigrant groups (Chand & Ghorbani, 2011; Foreman-Peck & Zhou, 2013; Hamilton, Dana, & Benfell, 2008),
- Assimilation strategies, segmental assimilation, cultural isolation and their consequences for business development strategies (Glinka, 2014; Hamilton et al., 2008; Portes & Zhou, 1993; Z. Valdez, 2012; Zhou, 2009),
- Intercultural competences, building relationships and one's social capital in the host country (Chand & Ghorbani, 2011; Light, 1972; Light, Bhachu, & Karageorgis, 1993).

A dozen years ago, in reference to research carried out in the Netherlands, Rath and Kloosterman (2000) noted that immigrant entrepreneurship research was largely focused on ethnic and cultural aspects of the phenomenon. They even argued that many scholars regard immigrant entrepreneurship as if it took place in an economic and institutional vacuum. This statement was made rather with reference to research conducted in Europe than in the US, where culture has been an important aspect of research, even though most often analysed through the prism of resources or resource generation potential (Dana, 2007).

Nevertheless, we ought to emphasize that culture has been omnipresent in immigrant entrepreneurship research. Although a comprehensive analysis of entrepreneurship would require taking into account social and cultural factors, in the case of immigrant entrepreneurship this postulate involves the deepening of analyses pertaining to economic and institutional factors.

4. Immigrant Entrepreneurship as a Field of Research – Selected Trends, Problems and Dilemmas

Nowadays, many researchers call for a holistic approach to the study of immigrant entrepreneurship. Within this trend, Kloosterman et al. (Kloosterman, 2010; Kloosterman & Rath, 2001; Kloosterman, van der Leun, & Rath, 1999) developed an appealing concept of mixed embeddedness. It is considered by some scholars as a breakthrough theory that has set out major directions in immigrant entrepreneurship research over the last two decades (Ram, Jones, & Villares-Varela, 2017).

Kloosterman points out that the claim about the social embeddedness of entrepreneurial activities has transpired to be of great use in the study of entrepreneurship in general, and of immigrant entrepreneurship in particular (Kloosterman, 2010). He adds, however, that by taking into account cultural factors and social capital, we cannot reach beyond the supply aspect of the phenomenon, which prevents us from fully grasping its complexity. It is, therefore, necessary to include aspects related to demand, which, in turn, is linked to the structure of opportunities perceived and capitalized on by entrepreneurs. This is the purpose that the concept of mixed embeddedness serves; consequently, the analysis can take into account a) actors operating in a specific context (immigrant entrepreneurs) and b) the structure of opportunities (Kloosterman, 2010, p. 27). The concept, therefore, encompasses socially embedded actors, the market and the institutional framework of the host country.

In this approach, mixed embeddedness is a concept or a research convention that organizes the efforts of researchers and, at the same time, allows for multiple interpretations; it is non-deterministic. It also legitimizes the use of a broad range of research methods and techniques, ranging from qualitative field studies focused on exploring the cultural context, entre-

preneurial strategies, longitudinal studies of the institutional framework, to quantitative methods used for describing the population. As Kloosterman rightly points out, this approach holds a lot of promise, and “The next step, inevitably, is to live up to these promises” (2010, p. 41)

Numerous opportunities, as well as several key challenges stem from a comprehensive approach to immigrant entrepreneurship (see also Glinka, 2013; Ram et al., 2017)

1. Despite a relatively large number of publications, many phenomena have yet to be fully elucidated. In addition, many “white spots” remain on the map of characteristics of specific immigrant groups in different host countries. In particular, very few studies pertain to immigrant entrepreneurship in countries that, historically, have not been major migration destinations, such as Poland. Other “white spots” are manifest in organization planning, strategy creation, inter-organizational cooperation, etc. This means that many concepts have not been generally applied, preventing the performance of wider-scale comparative analyses (this matter is further discussed below). Ram et al. (2017) list several areas that require, in their view, a more in-depth analysis, including the impact of regulations and of the institutional context, immigrant entrepreneurship analysed in the historical context, racism and market ghettoisation.

Apart from theoretical considerations, an insufficient analysis of entrepreneurial processes in which immigrants engage, and of their context hamper the design of migration policies based on empirical findings and not solely on ideological premises. However, as Rath and Kloosterman (2000, p. 665) emphasize, the translation of research directly into migration policy also induces certain limitations; the policy focus of research often prompts scholars to give priority to potential policy aspects, to the detriment of an extensive theoretical reflection.

2. Despite certain evident changes in this area, comparative studies are still scarce or insufficiently thorough. Many are limited to simple quantitative characteristics of a given population (e.g. comparisons of the number of enterprises or of the share of entrepreneurs in immigrant populations). Comparative research may involve several dimensions, the most obvious being a) the entrepreneurial activity of representatives of a given country in various migration destinations (Gabaccia, 2012)m and b) the activity of various immigrant groups in a given country (Foreman-Peck & Zhou, 2013). At this point, it should be stressed that attempts at filling research gaps and an intensification of comparative research are hampered by “logistic difficulties” inherent in the study itself and in reaching out to ethnic groups that are often unwilling to share their experiences, in particular with outsiders. For these reasons, immigrant entrepreneurship is a phenomenon that does not lend itself easily to investigation.

3. Maintaining a multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary approach to studying the phenomenon. As mentioned in the introduction, immigrant entrepreneurship research has traditionally been an area of interest of social sciences and humanities. Given the growing interest in the matter among economists and management science scholars, it is necessary to maintain the interdisciplinary character of research and to capitalize on the existing findings of sociologists, anthropologists and ethnographers who have explored this subject matter. It also requires the use of diverse methods applied to explore the phenomenon that has yet to be thoroughly analysed. This tendency to embrace concepts from other fields is common in management (Oswick, Fleming, & Hanlon, 2011), even though care must be taken to prevent possible distortions and limitations that may occur when questions and assumptions from other fields of research are embraced (Czakov, 2017; Suddaby, Hardy, & Huy, 2011).
4. Immigrant entrepreneurship research must take into account significant changes taking place both within migration phenomena (e.g. changing directions and forms of migration) and in entrepreneurial activities undertaken by immigrants. Volery (2007) advocated the need to forgo the „corner shop” formula and pointed to the growing diversity of ventures undertaken by migrants. These differences become even more visible when we compare different migration waves (e.g. from Poland to the US, Glinka, 2013) or generations of migrants (Brzozowska, 2015).

The above claims can be summed up with a fairly simple statement: a multidimensional and dynamic phenomenon requires research that will not unduly understate its complexity. Ram, Jones and Villares-Varela (Ram et al., 2017, p. 13) argue that a holistic, multi-dimensional approach testifying to the multiple roots of entrepreneurial activities can be considered the European contribution to this field of research. As these authors emphasize, American studies that have set the direction of investigation for many decades, supply aspects and considerations focused on resources (albeit often set within the social context) continue to predominate, with only a few exceptions, such as Zulema Valdez’s study (2011).

5. Conclusion

In their review on theory building, Shepherd and Suddaby (2017) enumerate various factors that initiate theorizing and emphasize the importance of detecting anomalies, tensions or conflicts that compel a researcher to investigate a specific subject matter. Among such sources of research inspiration they list paradoxes, insufficiencies or imperfections found in the extant literature, observations made and inconsistencies between theory and practice (see also Czakov, 2017). Due to the dynamic nature of migration, as well as the fact that certain phenomena related to immigrant entrepreneurship are now more thoroughly analysed and understood, there has been no shortage

of incentives to explore the subject. Many concepts regarding immigrant entrepreneurship were developed in the second half of the 20th century in the US. Given that the subject matter is immersed in culture and in subtle relations between cultural, economic and institutional factors, certain considerations did not lend themselves to a direct transfer into another field. The dynamics of migration and changes that have taken place in the United States alone for the past several decades have failed to foster a fundamental shift in the approach to immigrant entrepreneurship; research in this area seems to have ossified (Ram et al., 2017). Awareness of the imperfections of existing theories, which have prevented certain phenomena from being satisfactorily expounded, urge researchers to turn towards a more holistic approach. One of its most evident examples is the concept of mixed embeddedness and its theoretical framework, which is important, recognizable, widely known and applied in entrepreneurship analysis.

Nevertheless, it seems that there is ample ground for new theories and concepts in the field of immigrant entrepreneurship. Thus, immigrant entrepreneurship can be regarded not only as an actual research area, but also as a source of challenges and opportunities for researchers. At the same time, it is to be hoped that researchers who explore this subject matter will manage to avoid several pitfalls, some of which are also frequent in other areas of management science; they include:

- excessive simplification through the application of basic descriptive measures to characterize populations, which creates the illusion of generalization and comparability, but does not contribute to grasping the essence of the researched phenomena,
- disrupting the relationship between the scientific and the practical aspect of research; as migrations are now an important topic of public and political debate, scholars may be tempted to lean towards the kind of research design in which theory takes the back seat to the short-term goal of providing guidance for policy-makers,
- contextuality as an excuse; the contextual nature of immigrant entrepreneurship is unquestionable and contextuality prevents all results or theories from being directly translated into other populations (e.g. other ethnic groups) or other host countries. However, the contextual nature of research does not exempt researchers from the continuous problematization and comparison of their studies with existing theories and findings presented by other researchers.

It is possible to ensure balance in each of the above areas, as evidenced by research projects carried out internationally and, increasingly so, also in Poland. Each relatively new research area – and immigrant entrepreneurship can certainly be considered a novelty in Poland – attracts the attention of numerous researchers, encourages them to experiment and test the limits, with all positive and negative consequences that such endeavours may entail. There is, therefore, a risk of transferring inadequate (given the context)

or out-dated ideas, or of trivializing the phenomenon. Most importantly, however, one can expect compelling new research that exemplifies existing theories, or strives to develop new concepts that will lead to a greater understanding and a more accurate description of the phenomenon.

Endnotes

- ¹ “Immigrant entrepreneurship” and a broader term of “migrant entrepreneurship” are both referred to in the paper. As the majority of research pertaining to the analysed subject matter is focused on the activity of migrants in host countries, scholars tend to use the more narrow term of “immigrant entrepreneurship”.
- ² The paper was prepared as part of the project “Entrepreneurship of Immigrants from the Far East in Poland” financed by the National Science Centre UMO-2016/21/B/HS4/00767.

References

- Akcigit, U., Grigsby, J., & Nicholas, T. (2017). Research: Immigrants Played an Outsize Role in America's Age of Innovation. *Harvard Business Review Electronic Articles*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2017/04/research-immigrants-played-an-outsize-role-in-americas-age-of-innovation>.
- Aliaga-Isla, R., & Rialp, A. (2013). Systematic review of immigrant entrepreneurship literature: previous findings and ways forward. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 25(9–10), 819–844. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2013.845694>.
- Berger, B. (ed.) (1994). *Kultura przedsiębiorczości*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Rój.
- Brzozowska, A. (2015). *Przedsiębiorczość imigrantów wietnamskich w Polsce*. Niepublikowana rozprawa doktorska. Wydział Zarządzania UW. Warszawa.
- Castles, S., & Miller, M.J. (2011). *Migracje we współczesnym świecie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Chand, M., & Ghorbani, M. (2011). National culture, networks and ethnic entrepreneurship: A comparison of the Indian and Chinese immigrants in the US. *International Business Review*, 20, 593–606. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2011.02.009>.
- Chrysostome, E. (2010). The Success Factors of Necessity Immigrant Entrepreneurs: In Search of a Model. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 52(2), 137–152.
- Czakon, W. (2017). Tworzenie teorii w naukach o zarządzaniu. In: A. Sopińska & P. Wachowiak (eds.), *Wyzwania współczesnego zarządzania strategicznego* (pp. 143–160). Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza SGH.
- Dana, L.-P. (ed.) (2007). *Handbook of research on ethnic minority entrepreneurship. a co-evolutionary view on resource management*. Cheltenham, UK, Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar.
- Fleming, W.J. (1979). The cultural determinants of entrepreneurship and economic development: a case study of Mendoza Province, Argentina, 1861–1914 *The Journal of Economic History*, 39(1), 211–224.
- Foreman-Peck, J., & Zhou, P. (2013). The strength and persistence of entrepreneurial cultures. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 23, 163–187. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00191-011-0239-z>.
- Freytag, A., & Thurik, R. (eds.). (2010). *Entrepreneurship and culture*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer.
- Gabaccia, D.R. (2012). Is everywhere Nowhere? Nomads, nations, and the immigrant paradigm. In: P. Spickard (ed.), *Race and immigration in the United States. New Histories* (pp. 30–52). New York: Routledge.

- George, G., & Zahra, S.A. (2002). Culture and its Consequences for Entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 26, 27–29.
- Glinka, B. (2008). *Kulturowe uwarunkowania przedsiębiorczości w Polsce*. Warszawa: PWE.
- Glinka, B. (2013). *Przedsiębiorczość polskich imigrantów w USA: etnicznie, lokalnie, globalnie?* Warszawa: Poltext.
- Glinka, B. (2014). Strategies of Development of Polish Immigrant Entrepreneurs in the USA. In: B. Knežević & K. Wach (eds.), *International Business from the Central European Perspective*. Zagreb: Sveučilišna tiskara d.o.o./University of Zagreb Publishing House.
- Glinka, B., & Brzozowska, A. (2015). Immigrant entrepreneurs: in search of identity. *EBER*, 3(3), 51–76. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2015.030304>.
- Greene, P., & Owen, M. (2004). Race and ethnicity. In: W.B. Gartner, K.G. Shaver, N.M. Carter, & P.D. Reynolds (eds.), *Handbook of entrepreneurial dynamics: the process of business creation* (pp. 26–38). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Hamilton, R., Dana, L.-P., & Benfell, C. (2008). Changing cultures: an international study of migrant entrepreneurs. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 16(1), 89–105.
- Harima, A. (2014). Network Dynamics of Descending Diaspora Entrepreneurship: Multiple Case Studies with Japanese Entrepreneurs in Emerging Economies *JEMI*, 10(4), 65–92.
- Hayton, J.C., George, G., & Zahra, S. A. (2002). National Culture and Entrepreneurship: a Review of Behavioral Research. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 26, 33–52.
- Herman, R.T., & Smith, R.L. (2010). *Immigrant, Inc.: Why Immigrant Entrepreneurs Are Driving the New Economy (and how they will save the American worker)*. New Jersey: John Wiley&Sons.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G.J., & Minkov, M. (2011). *Kultury i organizacje*. Warszawa: PWE.
- House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P.W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership and organizations: GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Kloosterman, R. (2010). Matching Opportunities with Resources: A Framework for Analysing (Migrant) Entrepreneurship from a Mixed Embeddedness Perspective. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 22(1), 25–45.
- Kloosterman, R., & Rath, J. (2001). Immigrant entrepreneurs in advanced economies: mixed embeddedness further explored. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 27(2), 189–201.
- Kloosterman, R., van der Leun, J.P., & Rath, J. (1999). Mixed embeddedness, migrant entrepreneurship and informal economic activities. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 23(2), 253–267.
- König, C., Steinmetz, H., Frese, M., Rauch, A., & Wang, Z.-M. (2007). Scenario-based scales measuring cultural orientations of business owners. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 17(2), 211–239.
- Leung, M.W.H. (2002). From four-course Peking duck to take-away Singapore rice: An inquiry into the dynamics of the ethnic Chinese catering business in Germany. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 8(1/2), 134–147.
- Light, I. (1972). *Ethnic enterprise in America*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Light, I., Bhachu, P., & Karageorgis, S. (1993). Migration networks and immigrant entrepreneurship. In: I. Light & P. Bhachu (eds.), *Immigration and entrepreneurship. Culture, capital and ethnic networks* (pp. 25–49). New Brunswick, USA and London UK: Transaction Publishers.
- Light, I., & Rosenstein, C. (1995). *Race, ethnicity, and entrepreneurship in urban America*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

- Masurel, E., Nijkamp, P., & Vindigni, G. (2004). Breeding places for ethnic entrepreneurs: a comparative marketing approach. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 16, 77–86.
- Oswick, C., Fleming, P., & Hanlon, G. (2011). From Borrowing to Blending: Rethinking the processes of organizational theory building. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(2), 318–337.
- Portes, A., & Sensenbrenner, J. (1993). Embeddedness and immigration: Notes on the social determinants of economic action. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98(6), 1320–1350.
- Portes, A., & Zhou, M. (1993). The New Second Generation: segmented assimilation and its variants among post-1965 immigrant youth. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 530(Nov.), 74–98.
- Ram, M., Jones, T., & Villares-Varela, M. (2017). Migrant entrepreneurship: Reflections on research and practice. *International Small Business Journal*, 35(1), 3–18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0266242616678051>.
- Rath, J., & Kloosterman, R. (2000). Outsiders' Business: A Critical Review of Research on Immigrant Entrepreneurship. *International Migration Review*, 34(3), 657–681.
- Shapiro, G. (2011). *The Comeback: How Innovation Will Restore the American Dream*: Beaufort Books.
- Shepherd, D. A., & Suddaby, R. (2017). Theory Building: A Review and Integration. *Journal of Management*, 43(1), 59–86.
- Suddaby, R., Hardy, C., & Huy, Q.N. (2011). Where are the new theories of organization? Introduction to special topic forum. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(2), 236–246.
- Timmons, J., & Spinelli, S. (2008). *New Venture Creation. Entrepreneurship for the 21st Century – 8th Edition*: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Valdez, Z. (2011). *The New Entrepreneurs: How Race, Class, and Gender Shape American Enterprise*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Valdez, Z. (2012). Self-Employment as an Indicator of Segmented Assimilation among Six Ethnic Minority Groups. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, 2(4). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/2157-5665.1063>.
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024–1054.
- Vertovec, S. (2012). *Transnarodowość*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Volery, T. (2007). Ethnic entrepreneurship: a theoretical framework. In: L.-P. Dana (ed.), *Handbook of research on ethnic minority entrepreneurship. A co-evolutionary view on resource management*. (pp. 30–41). Cheltenham, UK, Northampton, MA USA: Edward Elgar.
- Vorderwulbecke, A. (2013). Entrepreneurship and migration. In: S.R. Xavier, D. Kelley, J. Kew, M. Herrington, & A. Vorderwulbecke (eds.), *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor. 2012 Global report* (pp. 42–50): Global Entrepreneurship Research Association (GERA).
- Waldinger, R., Aldrich, H., Ward, R., & associates. (1990). *Ethnic entrepreneurs. Immigrant business in industrial societies*. Newbury Park, London, New Delhi: SAGE publications.
- Zhou, M. (2009). *Contemporary Chinese America. Immigration, ethnicity, and community transformation*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.