

WestminsterResearch

<http://www.westminster.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>

**Widening the focus on informal entrepreneurship through the
lens of intersectionality**

Granados, M. and Rosli, A.

A paper presented at the 78th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management.
Chicago, Illinois 10 - 14 Aug 2018.

The abstract was published in the Academy of Management Proceedings, Vol. 2018,
No. 1, 14805 and is available at:

<https://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2018.14805abstract>

The WestminsterResearch online digital archive at the University of Westminster aims to make the research output of the University available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the authors and/or copyright owners.

Whilst further distribution of specific materials from within this archive is forbidden, you may freely distribute the URL of WestminsterResearch: (<http://westminsterresearch.wmin.ac.uk/>).

In case of abuse or copyright appearing without permission e-mail repository@westminster.ac.uk

Widening the focus on informal entrepreneurship through the lens of intersectionality

ABSTRACT

The article explores the struggle of those involve with the entrepreneurial activities in the informal economy, within the challenging socio-economic environments. It investigates the extent to which intersectionality through structural, disciplinary, hegemonic and interpersonal power associated with poor, marginalised groups influence their entrepreneurial actions and rights collectively. Studies either view entrepreneurs through an informality lens, as marginalised populations engaged in low-quality activities, or through a formality lens, as engaged in relatively higher quality entrepreneurial activities more as a necessity choice. The aim of this paper is to evaluate critically these explanations through intersectionality power in relation to waste pickers entrepreneurs in the informal sector in Colombia.

Keywords

Intersectionality, informal entrepreneurship, marganalised social group, waste pickers, poverty

INTRODUCTION

The article explores the struggle of those involve with the entrepreneurial activities in the informal economy, within the challenging socio-economic environments. It investigates the extent to which intersectionality, associated with poor, marginalised groups, influence their entrepreneurial practices and rights both at individual and collective level. The notion of

informal entrepreneurial activity has become increasingly important in the field of entrepreneurship with examples of interesting or new types of entrepreneurs (see example of (Webb, Tihanyi, Ireland, & Sirmon, 2009; Xheneti, Smallbone, & Welter, 2013). The heterogeneity of entrepreneurial activity, actors, and resources is acknowledged but underdeveloped in the entrepreneurship literature (Zahra & Wright, 2011). This may be due to an inherent ‘success bias’ of entrepreneurial activity, focusing towards generating positive economic wealth (Ruef, Aldrich, & Carter, 2003).

In particular, the term ‘informal entrepreneurial activities’ has been introduced to specifically describe the set of illegal yet legitimate (to some large groups due to certain norms, values, and beliefs that define socially acceptable behaviour) activities (Aldrich & Baker, 2001; Webb, Bruton, Tihanyi, & Ireland, 2013) through which actors recognize and exploit opportunities as it remains unregistered, but derive income from the production of legal goods and services (Nichter & Goldmark, 2009:1455).

Surprisingly, there is a lack of research investigating informal entrepreneurial activity, from intersectionality perspective, given that entrepreneurship research should be about understanding the action on the ground (Sarasvathy, 2004), to help define the core of the field and proposes new opportunities for future research (e.g. Shane & Venkataraman, 2000) in order to challenge existing assumptions and tackle important societal problems (Sarasvathy, 2004). This lack is also surprising given arguments that informal entrepreneurial activity is relevant particularly for the poor, marginalised groups (Mahalingam, 2007; Valdez, 2011a). Such informal entrepreneurial activity is essential for leading towards socially inclusive growth through entrepreneurship research and, axiomatically, for economic growth (Hall, Matos, Sheehan, & Silvestre, 2012; McMullen, 2011).

To provide clarity, we define intersectionality as an interplay between the person and

social location that is situated in relation to other locations in a web of power matrix, recognizing that diversity and power are embedded and intertwined in any social phenomena (Mahalingam, 2007). We address the specific research question: *'How does intersectionality powers influence the level of entrepreneurial informality of marginalised social groups?* Accordingly, we adopt an intersectionality approach, investigating the structural, disciplinary, hegemonic and interpersonal power domains as suggested by Collins (2000) and Dill and Zambrana (2009). This approach is applied often in the context of gender and diversity (Tatli & Özbilgin, 2012) but has started to get attention within entrepreneurship (Romero & Valdez, 2016).

This paper follows a qualitative narrative research design with a group of waste pickers in Colombia focused upon how things 'unfold over time' (Johansson, 2004). This type of research design is useful to identify mechanisms that influence unfolding events (Elliot, 2005) in order to unfold the lived experience of the marginalised entrepreneurs in maintaining their functioning despite experiencing adversity.

This research provides two contributions to the literature.

First, we shed new light on the dichotomy of formal and informal entrepreneurship. Our research offers an exploration of marginalised group of entrepreneurs through the intersectional perspective, not merely as binary classification of formal versus informal entrepreneurship, but to evolve into a multidimensional continuum that is responsive to their needs and rights. Secondly, we contribute to the entrepreneurship literature by illustrating how the structural, disciplinary, hegemonic and interpersonal power associated with poor, marginalised groups influence their entrepreneurial actions and rights collectively; and that when these entrepreneurs faced one challenges after another, there are always other people that will take advantage through the use of power and structure. This insight will allow

scholars and policy makers to better understand how the informal economy can be managed via appropriate incentives and controls.

LITERATURE REVIEW

To provide the conceptual background for this study, we reviewed the extant literature that focus on informal entrepreneurial activities and intersectionality discussion. Previous studies have discussed how myriad motivations that lead individuals to operate informally, focusing on constraints, strategies, and abilities of entrepreneurs to operate and grow their ventures in the informal economy (e.g. Ketchen, Ireland, & Webb, 2014; Webb et al., 2013) and sparingly on how the intersectionality powers can help facilitate entrepreneurial initiatives (e.g. Alinia, 2015; Knight, 2016). However, we have limited knowledge of how intersectionality powers influence entrepreneurial informality and the reasoning behind it (Knight, 2016; Webb et al., 2013), particularly for the marginalised social groups.

The following sections provide a conceptual background for the study: first, by discussing this research gap from the perspective of informal entrepreneurial activities and, second, by uncovering its importance through intersectionality.

Informal entrepreneurial activities

Several studies have looked into the informal entrepreneurial activities, focusing both on the dichotomy of formal versus informal (Bruton, Ireland, & Ketchen, 2012; Webb et al., 2013; Williams & Shahid, 2016) and also its continuous process (Godfrey, 2011; Guha-Khasnobis, Kanbur, & Ostrom, 2006). The function of formal and informal institutional boundaries somehow reflects how entrepreneurs can be fully compliant with certain legal definitions while in conflict with others (De Castro, Khavul, & Bruton, 2014; Godfrey, 2011).

This explanation is particularly important for understanding informal entrepreneurial activities due to their diverse set of situational factors that influence individuals to undertake entrepreneurship activities and also the incongruence between what is defined as legitimate by formal and informal institutions (Webb et al., 2009). According to Webb and colleagues (2009) the differences between what the society understand to be legal—as specified by laws and regulations—and what they consider to be legitimate—as specified by norms, values, and beliefs (Dowling & Pfeffer, 1975; Scott, 1995) made it more pressing to research. This is because, informal entrepreneurial activities takes into consideration the norms and attitudes of a society and how it influence opportunity (Gurtoo & Williams, 2009).

Researchers have analysed the tension that can exist between entrepreneurs and formal institutions (Webb, Ireland, & Ketchen, 2014), due to the focusing on the magnitude and boundaries of these activities (Karunakaran & Balasubramaniam, 2012) while being influenced by myriad factors (Webb et al., 2013). Karunakaran and Balasubramaniam (2012) refer this as the "interwoven institutional logics" that transcend different sectors of life such as work, family, and social groups and steer people toward entrepreneurial practices within the informal economy. Rogerson (2001) provides some examples of the experience of cities across the developing world where the waste economy is a significant area for informal entrepreneurship and Medina (2008) takes it further to explain how these informal entrepreneurs have been widely and continuously portrayed as necessity-driven in Latin America.

This opens up some discussion on the incentives that drive the formation of informal (Thai & Turkina, 2014), including issue on trust as key motivational force in entrepreneurs' decision to develop an informal rather than a formal business (Maloney, 2004; Williams & Shahid, 2016) strategic choice to be informal (i.e., to not register) and its association from

industry condition (Siqueira, Webb, & Bruton, 2016), creates compelling questions about how informal firms surface and operate (Webb et al., 2009). Some have looked at the long-term impact of other forms of informality on institutional and societal development, focusing on particular social woes in communities to the forms of informality present in them (e.g.: Karunakaran & Balasubramaniam, 2012; Lloret, 2012). These studies highlight the incongruence between what is legal and what society, or an influential subsection of it, considers to be legitimate, suggesting that several aspects must be made clear to ensure sustainable socially constructed entrepreneurial practices (Lloret, 2012). These include: how informality creates both constructive and destructive effects on society, and how institutional policies and/or enforcement while maintaining the constructive outcomes (Dau & Cuervo-Cazurra, 2014a; Webb et al., 2013) where it can be better captured or described by a continuum along which there are degrees of informality (De Castro et al., 2014).

Nevertheless, the notions of informal economy simultaneously reflect complications, as a leftover from the previous formal mode, or disadvantaged participants for creating opportunities for themselves. (Hunt & Kiefer, 2012). Bruton and colleagues (2012) suggested that some individual coming from specific demographics, are excluded from formal opportunities due to cultural/societal biases or caste systems which pushed into informality. In a study of the street hawkers populations operating informally in India, (Williams and Gurtoo (2013) provides a concrete examples of the heterogeneous nature of entrepreneurship in the informal economy, reflecting entrepreneurship among the desperately poor, either as marginalised populations engaged in a survival practice, or voluntary entrants doing so either as a rational economic decision in the face of extreme disadvantage in the labour market or as a lifestyle choice (Dadzie & Cho, 1989; Light & Rosenstein, 1995; Romero & Valdez, 2016; Valdez, 2011a; Verdaguer, 2009). Conversely, Williams and Shahid (2016) explain that the desire to build relationships may be a stronger driver of informal activity than are

marginalisation and desperation. This is particularly so in settings of desperate poverty (Medina, 2008; Colin, Williams & Nadin, 2012). The reliance on solidarity and out of group trust concept that reflect the unity or agreement of action with mutual support within group (Khavul, Pérez-Nordtvedt, & Wood, 2010), particularly for grassroots and bottom-up (BOP) entrepreneurs (Viswanathan, Sridharan, Ritchie, Venugopal, & Jung, 2012).

The heterogeneity discussion not only question on the implication of informality, on its benefit or the fact that it might create its own barriers that limit the individuals from progressing (Bruton et al., 2012; Medina, 2008), but also serve as a call for a finer grained, more nuanced explanation on its importance (Williams & Gurtoo, 2013). Hence, there is still a need to explore further the nature of informal entrepreneurship, understanding how individual, institutional and society powers can confine together to positively or negatively influence the entrepreneurial initiatives of marginalised groups. Our empirical findings, focusing on waste pickers and on the Colombian context, are aimed at filling this gap.

Intersectionality and its application in entrepreneurship

Intersectionality is considered a theoretical paradigm (Crenshaw, 1991) or an analytical strategy (Dill & Zambrana, 2009) that has its roots in feminist thought and studies multiple overlapping marginalisation both at individual and institutional level (Crenshaw, 1991; McCall, 2005). This approach has been applied to examine the dynamics of power and interlocking systems in social divisions not only gender but also other social groupings (Karam & Jamali, 2017; Zinn & Dill, 1996). Thus, intersectionality pays special attention to inequalities and recognises the systemic power dynamics that occur when multiple dimensions of social differences interact across individuals, institutions and society influences (Collins, 2000; McCall, 2005; Walby, Armstrong, & Strid, 2012; Yuval-Davis,

2006, 2011). Previous work on intersectionality studies focused on the categories of discrimination¹ including gender, ethnicity, disability, age, religion/belief and sexual orientation (Windsong, 2018), and Walby and colleagues (Walby et al., 2012) suggested there is a need to focus on inequalities instead, including the study of social class as an economic, social and cultural phenomena (Bradley, 2014; Savage et al., 2013). Moreover, studies have also looked on the importance of systemic power dynamics and social inequalities to explore differences and similarities across and within social groups that experience marginalisation (Ozanne & Fischer, 2012). Hence, by drawing on the extant intersectionality literature that discusses the systemic power dynamics and social inequalities affecting social groups, we discuss four broader, interrelated areas of further investigation which may shed light on *intersectionality powers influencing the level of entrepreneurial informality of marginalised social groups*. These intersectionality powers are drawn from the previous work of Collins (2000) and Dill and Zambrana (2009).

First, discussion on *structural power* makes reference to the dimensions of institutional identities that maintain systems of inequality (Naples, 2009). This involves institutional structures of society that would help with the understanding of how institutions are organized to produce subordination through practices and regulation of citizenship rights, such as, racial segregation, exclusionary policies, internments, forced relocation and denial of the right to own property (Dill & Zambrana, 2009). This is being coordinated through institutions such as, government, legal system, educational structure, labour market and media, among others (Knight, 2016). Even though the influence of structural powers supported in institutions has been studied in the context of entrepreneurship (Bjørnskov & Foss, 2016; Gohmann, 2012;

¹ As recognised by EU Treaty of Amsterdam in 1997 (Council Directives 2000/43/EC, 2000/78/EC, 2004/113/EC)

Hopkins, 2016) and informal entrepreneurship (Dau & Cuervo-Cazurra, 2014b), there is still a lack of understanding on the challenges related to structural powers experienced by certain groups and their intersecting identities in facilitating or constraining their entrepreneurial initiatives (McBride, Hebson, & Holgate, 2014; Mulinari & Selberg, 2013; Zander, Zander, Gaffney, & Olsson, 2010). Moreover, intersectionality has not been used extensively to study the impact of structures of discrimination and systems of power and inequality in entrepreneurial endeavours (Rodriguez, Holvino, Fletcher, & Nkomo, 2016).

Second, the understanding of *disciplinary power* is also crucial, particularly focusing on practices that sustain bureaucratic hierarchies in supporting any entrepreneurial activities (Collins, 2000). Literature has highlighted the importance of formal policies, not only towards supporting the established institutions but also towards engaging in successful interaction between the government and the marginalised groups (Alinia, 2015; Knight, 2016). These studies show that the locations of resources outside of or within some communities are important (Knight, 2016). Moreover, literature shows that those with power can contribute to improving support and engagement with the marginalized groups, by providing access to financial support (Smith-Hunter, 2006), by establishing clear support mechanisms for disability coverage, parental benefits/leave, pension plans and employment insurance opportunities (Cranford & Vosko, 2006) and by providing training and organisational support in managing collective entrepreneurial activities/expectations (Knight, 2016). Yet, these may be reinforced further through bureaucratic practices that somehow perpetuate and maintain inequality (Collins, 2000; Dill & Zambrana, 2009). While the crucial role of disciplinary power in supporting marginalized social groups has been clearly established, surprisingly little has been discussed in relation to their entrepreneurial activities.

Third, *hegemonic power*, can be explained as cultural ideologies, images, representations, consciousness and knowledge that influence the ways members of various

social groups are viewed and depicted in the society at large (Collins, 2000; Dill & Zambrana, 2009), could also play a significant role in influencing the level of entrepreneurial informality of marginalised social groups. Collins (2000) argues that by manipulating ideology and culture, the hegemonic domain acts as a link between social institutions, their organisational practices and the level of everyday social interaction. These ideologies and images normally justify oppression that can be internalized by people and be seen as systems of ‘common sense’ ideas (Alinia, 2015). The literature has identified that these deep-rooted, internalised and taken-for-granted ideas are reproduced by structures and institutions that justified policies and practices in the structural and disciplinary domain, and by ordinary people in their daily practice and interactions (Naples, 2009). The literature has identified that such power intensifies the positive and masculine discourse of entrepreneurship, mostly in its non-reflexivity and ideological prejudices and stereotypes, which affect women and ethnic minorities entrepreneurial opportunities (Bruni, Gherardi, & Poggio, 2004; da Costa & Silva Saraiva, 2012; Verduijn & Essers, 2013). It is recognised that hegemonic power is driven normally from the reproduction of class hierarchies in capitalist nations that results in entrepreneurship being shaped in ways that legitimise some entrepreneurs while marginalising others (Gill, 2014). We expect that the hegemonic power influence the identities and perceptions of marginalised social groups to pursue informal entrepreneurial activities, however, we lack an understanding of how precisely they would facilitate this process.

Finally, *interpersonal power*, as part of the routinized, day-to-day interactions and practices of how people treat one another (Collins, 2000), also can influence the level of entrepreneurial activities. Literature has highlighted that these practices are very familiar, systemic and recurrent and often go unnoticed, often serving to reinforce the status quo (Alinia, 2015; Knight, 2016). Further studies on ‘survivalist entrepreneurship’ explored how

everyday interactions between society and marginalised social groups are pushing these minorities towards self-employment because of discrimination in the labour market, in and out of the formal sector (Dadzie & Cho, 1989; Light & Rosenstein, 1995; Romero & Valdez, 2016; Ruiz Castro & Holvino, 2016; Valdez, 2011b; Verdaguer, 2009). However, these studies have focused separately on the individual elements of intersectionality and the societal/institutional elements. There is still a need to explore further the combining implications of both individual and society intersectionality, and their intertwining relations with economic, cultural and social context into entrepreneurial practices by marginalised social groups.

In summary, building on the literature that explains the intersectionality powers and its application in entrepreneurship, we have discussed how power is organised and maintained in four interrelated domains or ways in relation to entrepreneurship. In these domains, power structures subordinate others based on dimensions of their identities and maintain systems of inequality (Naples, 2009). Importantly, these four dimensions of power are intertwined together to shape marginalised social groups' social, political and economic lives. Our empirical evidence is aimed at investigating whether intersectionality powers influence the level of entrepreneurial informality of marginalised social groups and, if so, how.

METHODS

This empirical study relies on evidence drawn from a single case study of a marginalised social group of waste pickers in Colombia. Even though Colombia is considered an entrepreneurial 'all-rounded' country due to its high proportion of ambitious and innovative entrepreneurs by the World Economic Forum and GEM (2015), there are still high levels of informality and quality of employment in light of the problems of job security and

social inequality (Ferreira, 2016). The waste pickers are based in the city of Cali, and rely on the Navarro garbage dump, a place where they have been developing their economic activity of recycling for over 30 years (RRA Think Tank, 2010). Threatened with the closure of the Navarro garbage dump, in 2008, they filed a legal action for protection against several municipal entities with the support of the CIVISOL Foundation², considering that their rights to work and to a dignified life had been violated. The case was presented to the Colombian Constitutional Court, and the Court recognised that waste pickers' fundamental rights to a life with dignity regarding their right to work, health, education, food, and dignified housing, were materially harmed and therefore ordered the municipality of Cali to immediately adopt measures to ensure the effective enjoyment of their rights.

This case provided a good context for this research as it provides a unique and extraordinary situation to study the complexity of intersectionality and its relationship with entrepreneurship. The legal action taken by the Colombian Constitutional Court (T-291 ruling) recognised firstly, that waste pickers must be treated as a social group following the doctrines on equality and discrimination from Fiss (1976) and Young (2002), and secondly, the marginalised nature of this social group based on their extreme poverty conditions, hostile physical and social environment, and social stigmas associated to them. The Court recognised their right as entrepreneurs in the waste marketplace, regardless of the informal nature of their activities or circumstances of poverty and this provides the context as part of providing the important insights into the actual setting at hand on informality (Bruton et al., 2012; Thai & Turkina, 2014).

² CIVISOL (Civicism and Solidarity Foundation for Systemic Change) (www.civisol.org) is a foundation founded in Colombia that detects, projects and advances systemic changes in both the law and the culture of society. In this way it seeks to contribute to democracy being deliberative, effective justice, and truly inclusive development.

Moreover, the Court prohibited the exclusion of the waste pickers from any public procurement for contracts regarding the design or implementation of advantageous uses of waste, including, among others, recycling and composting. Since the ruling T-291-2009 was issued, the waste market in Colombia has changed remarkably, as was originally intended by the waste pickers and the CIVISOL Foundation. Currently, multi-national waste management companies are required to reach out to waste pickers' non-profit organisations and seek strategic alliances with them.

The way the Colombian Constitutional Court addressed the marginalised nature of waste pickers permitted this study under the intersectionality approach, which recognised the multiple overlapping marginalisation at individual and group level (Crenshaw, 1991; McCall, 2005; Saatcioglu & Corus, 2014). The particularities of the case study explored in this research made it imperative to look not only at the different identities presented in the social group, but also at the economic, social, cultural and political context in which the group and the external conditions interact (Saatcioglu & Corus, 2014).

We have adopted a narrative approach that provides stories of related events (Abbott, 1992), particularly in relation to how and why phenomena emerge, develop, grow or terminate over time (Langley, Smallman, Tsoukas, & Van de Ven, 2013). We attempt to contextualize the waste pickers' entrepreneurial practice by establishing links with the past, present and future to generate meaning (Garud, Gehman, & Giuliani, 2014). It is therefore, useful to study this case through the narrative approach as it offered additional facets of contexts, either through spatial, time, practice, and/or change (Zahra & Wright, 2011:73), which help when exploring phenomena for which data are rare or 'sensitive' (Byrne & Shepherd, 2015:376). Following sections illustrate how we have adopted narrative approach during both data collection and analysis stages.

Data sources

Table 1 summarizes our data and sources. We began by gathering extensive longitudinal data on July 2016 through publicly available archival sources between the years 2004 (before T-291 ruling) and 2017 to reflect the event before, during and after the ruling. These publications (both offline and online) dealt with the initial relationships among key stakeholders (including the waste pickers, the Colombian Constitutional Court, CIVISOL Foundation and local authorities), the unfolding of the new ruling, and the changing behaviors of other stakeholders as the ruling was introduced. These multiple sources of data are advantageous as it helps to “reconstructing the unfolding of individual and collective action patterns leading up to relatively unique events” (Burgelman, 2011:594). This triangulation across data helps to generate a richer understanding of the intersectionality that unfold and leads to the identification of intersectionality power in relation to waste pickers entrepreneurs in the informal sector in Colombia (Jack & Raturi, 2006).

 Insert Table 1 about here

Data analysis

To study this case, we are analysing the narratives from different actors involved, as suggested by Garud and colleagues (2014). Data analysis was informed partly by the four themes that emerged from the literature review (structural, disciplinary, hegemonic and interpersonal power), and were examined according to four analytical questions, similar to the questions suggested by Collins (2000); (1) *How social institutions are organised to reproduce waste pickers subordination overtime that affect their entrepreneurial actions?* (2) *How the State and other institutions rely on bureaucracy and surveillance to regulate inequalities experienced by waste pickers when trying to entrepreneur?* (3) *How cultural ideologies, stereotypes, images and representation do influence the ways waste pickers are*

viewed and depicted by the society that justify or support unequal practices in the structural and disciplinary domains? (4) How everyday social interactions between individuals and groups are reinforcing inequalities experience by waste pickers when trying to entrepreneur?

We conduct a more fine-grained analysis through constant comparison of data from various sources in relation to the themes identified that helped us to construct a sequence of events or narrative (Elliot, 2005) that includes written and graphic illustrations of the events that had transpired based on the T-291 ruling. We also made margin notes and analytical notes to record emerging patterns, identifying possible construct, relationships and time frames (Richards, 2009). The outcomes of this initial thematic analysis were then discussed and agreed by the authors, which was later checked by the founder of CIVISOL to ensure validity of the narrative. In the next section, we present the findings of our analysis to offer readers an overall context of the event (see Table 2 for summary of the narrative), reflecting into the three periods by establishing links with the past, present and future to generate meaning (Garud et al., 2014).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

'undoubtedly, the waste pickers are a social group ... given the long existence of the landfill, and the presence for decades of people digging among their rubbish to provide a source of income, has formed a group with its own identity, whose members understand that their conditions of life, depend in large part on the conditions they can generate as a community.' (T-291 Ruling pg 56)

How does intersectionality powers influence the level of entrepreneurial informality of marginalised social groups? To address this question, we relate a narrative of functioning in the three time-periods: Period 1 that refers to informal (survivalist) entrepreneurial practices by waste pickers (before T291 ruling); Period 2 that reflects during the development of the T291 ruling that formalised the work of waste pickers in 2009; and Period 3 that make

reference to the implementation of ruling and entrepreneurial consolidation (after T291 ruling), as reflected in Table 2.

The evidence builds on the dimensions discussed in the literature review, which are the structural (institutional structures of society); disciplinary (practices that sustain bureaucratic hierarchies); hegemonic (images, symbols and ideologies that shape consciousness); and interpersonal power (patterns of interaction between individuals and groups). Evidence supporting the narrative is summarised in Table 2. This evidence provides generalised support for the actions, context and impact of entrepreneurial practices experienced by the Colombian waste pickers in the months before, during and after the ruling. Importantly, our findings provide a view of the importance of systemic power dynamics and social inequalities that help to shed light on its implication within social groups that experience marginalisation (Ozanne & Fischer, 2012), helping to move research beyond the exploration of intersectionality in informal entrepreneurship as an extraneous event.

 Insert Table 2 about here

Structural power

As can be observed in Table 2, the T-291 ruling provided a legal environment that protected the waste pickers' rights to work as entrepreneurs in the waste economy, formalising their trade as public service providers.

'It should not be forgotten that recyclers, even if informally, acted as entrepreneurs, so that a suitable alternative, rather than converting them into employees of large recycling companies, is to allow them a space so that they can continue to act as entrepreneurs, promoting their organizational capacity and strengthening their capacities and opportunities to properly exercise the activity they had been developing over time.' T-291 ruling

To analyse how social institutions are organised to reproduce waste pickers subordination overtime that affect their entrepreneurial actions, it is important to understand how the structural power was assumed by different social institutions over the three Periods analysed. For instance, during *Period 1* structural power was assumed mainly by local authorities who provided informal consent to waste pickers to practice their activities of recycling. However, because of this informality, waste pickers lacked any power and were subject to further marginalisation. This resulted in the T-291 ruling where structural power was assumed by the Constitutional Court in *Period 2*. During this period, the marginalised condition of waste pickers was acknowledged and the government exercised power over local authorities to force them to respect the entrepreneurial activities of waste pickers. This resulted in the establishment of a new social institution in *Period 3*, the waste pickers association (ARCA). However, the analysis of the different narratives studied in this paper highlighted the role of the following five different social institutions in reproducing waste pickers subordination during this period:

- Local government by not allowing waste pickers to participate in the economic activity of waste management, restricting their access to public tenders and to decision-making processes related to public waste management. The tenders included normally criteria that were not socially inclusive and were not possible for waste pickers organisations to meet (high investment, prior experience, size, among others). Even though in the T-291 ruling in *Period 2* compelled public tenders to meet inclusion standards allowing waste pickers to participate according to their specific conditions: organisational capacity, lack of investment capital, and technical knowledge in a public contract, this was not taken into consideration in future tenders in *Period 3*. By not participating in the public tenders, the entrepreneurial company

established by waste pickers in *Period 3* cannot formally offer their service and participate in the waste economy.

- Financial institutions by not allowing the waste pickers association established in *Period 3* to access financial resources which can allow them to build capacity necessary to operate and participate in public tenders. The marginalised conditions of waste pickers are not accepted by these institutions. This has been a well-recognised restriction of small firms, more importantly, for grassroots and bottom-up (BOP) entrepreneurs (Kolk, Rivera-Santos, & Rufin, 2013).
- Constitutional court by not following the application and implementation of the ruling in *Period 3*, passing the responsibility to local government institutions that lack the operational capacity to control it or lack the 'intentions' to follow the ruling. In this case, other areas such as, corruption and MCS access to alter developing countries legal systems can be attributed to this, which has been studied from legal and CSR perspectives (Karam & Jamali, 2017). The deep analysis of these conditions is outside the scope of this study.
- Universities/supporting institutions by taking advantage of the ingenuity and marginalised conditions of waste pickers to capture their valuable knowledge and expertise over the three periods (1,2 and 3). These universities or supporting organisations work collaboratively with multinational companies, as part of their CSR programmes, to capture the knowledge and then apply it into their own recycling projects and collection systems. This knowledge acquired for more than 40 years is one of the main sources of the competitive advantage that waste pickers have, without which they would not be able to succeed in their entrepreneurial activities, as has been previously recognised in informal entrepreneurship studies (Dau & Cuervo-Cazurra, 2014b).

- Media by supporting and encouraging the hegemonic powers that made waste pickers a subordinated, marginalised group. Media in developing countries tends to support the interest of bigger economic powers and institutions, which, in the case of waste pickers, means supporting their main rivals in accessing the waste economy as entrepreneurs.

In analysing the entrepreneurial process of waste pickers, it became apparent that the historical and ongoing structural power imposed by the local authorities and the government on waste pickers featured as the primary source of discontent and oppression of this marginalised group. Furthermore, this oppression has now being deepened by new players interested in the profitable waste market, such as, private organisations that have the resources and power to alter public institution practices.

Disciplinary power

In *Period 2* it was evident how meanings attached to waste pickers identities emerged through the structural and disciplinary power exercise by the Colombian Constitutional Court through the T-291 ruling. Their recognition as a social group, and more importantly, as a marginalised group, transform their identity as an informal and irregular unemployed street worker (as reflected in *Period 1*), to a group with rights that needed to be taken into account in the socio-economic ecosystem of the waste economy (as reflected in *Period 2*). However, their socio-economic situation is somehow worse than that before the ruling (as reflected in *Period 3*). This is due to their lack of technical, legal and administrative knowledge that somehow limit their participation as entrepreneurs in the waste market. Their ‘circumstances of poverty’ were taken advantage off, not only by the local authorities that established bureaucratic ‘barriers’, but also by the private sector, who established a competing formal association of waste pickers that offer employment opportunities to waste pickers, limiting

their opportunities to work in solidarity within their own community. Financial institutions have also followed the bureaucratic practices to impede waste pickers access to investment capital. These formal institutions conveyed their corporate and business practices and routines based on norms that not necessarily reflected with what was dictated and demanded by legal authorities, despite the legal ruling requirement that recognised the waste pickers as entrepreneurs in the waste marketplace, regardless of the informal nature of their activities or circumstances of poverty.

Although the T-291 ruling demanded local authorities to provide educational and technical support to waste pickers to become entrepreneurs in the waste economy, these institutions have not provided any of this in *Period 3*. This put the waste pickers in a worse position than before; not only that they are still in poor conditions and have to scavenging their activities daily to survive, but also with no power and knowledge that can help them to execute bureaucratic requirements to allow them to function effectively as a legit formal entity. Certainly, cultural ideologies and representation attributed by the society to waste pickers are embedded in these policies and practices, determining who is perceived as a reliable, dependable individual, business partner, borrower or employees, and somehow being influenced by other systems of power, hegemonic and interpersonal (Knight, 2016).

Hegemonic power

Our finding shows that waste pickers experienced *hegemonic and structural* power through the local authorities' failure to recognise ARCA rights to participate in the public tender in *Period 3*, taking advantage of their lack of technical understanding of the tendering process, as well as the lack of 'lobby' actions required to secure at least their participation in the tender. This, they argued, allowed local authorities in *Period 3* to ignore distinct waste

pickers rights acquired with the T-291 ruling in *Period 2* and to maintain structural control over waste pickers activism initiatives.

Current image and stereotypes associated with waste pickers are still rooted in societies as the Colombian, with higher levels of social inequality and marked social class distinctions (Ferreira, 2016). As indicated in Table 2, society has perceived waste pickers at the lowest social category by relating them with the waste itself (*Period 1*). Waste pickers carried the image and stereotypes associated with it, as things that are not needed any more, dirty, smelly with no respect on its usefulness. Despite the ruling, this perception stays and has affected waste pickers entrepreneurial practice throughout the three periods analysed. This is because, the society can support and acknowledge their informal practice, but it does not recognise their new identity as formal entrepreneurs as it sits outside their own cultural ideology associated with this marginalised group. Without the support from the society in addition to the role of media in supporting the interest of larger private organisations, waste pickers cannot operate formally and freely in the waste economy.

These images and stereotypes embedded in society have also transcended into waste pickers own perceptions and identities as entrepreneurs. The marginalisation they have been exposed to for so many years has been internalised and influence their own capabilities' perceptions, which is reflected in their own personal barriers to see themselves as entrepreneurs, as leaders of their group and formal actors in the economy (Gill & Larson, 2014). These deep-rooted, internalised and taken-for-granted ideas are reproduced by social institutions and society in their daily practice and interactions with waste pickers (Alinia, 2015).

Within waste pickers, there are sub-groups that suffer further marginalisation due to hegemonic powers. These are women, elderly, disable, and ex-convicts/ex-guerrilla members.

In the case of women, they are normally affected by machismo and big job inequalities since family care and household responsibilities are still largely assigned to them. Elderly people are not normally considered strong enough to be employed in this type of work and only find in the informality of waste collection some income to survive. Disable people, similarly than elderly, are neglected from formal employment opportunities and are not considered in the entrepreneurial practices supported by larger corporations. Lastly, ex-convicts or ex-guerrilla members carry with them the image of violence and rebellion that restrict them access to traditional systems and forms of employment or entrepreneurship. All these subgroups suffer for a new layer that intersects with their marginalised condition as waste pickers, influencing the way structural and disciplinary powers can execute further discrimination towards them.

This particular conceptualisation of hegemonic power emphasizes exactly that informal and subtle aspect of power from social institutions and society that is of crucial importance to understand waste pickers entrepreneurial practices. As was observed in gender studies (Benschop & Doorewaard, 2012), there are concealed processes of meaning and identity formation that encourage consent with the dominant institutional discourses, in this case from local authorities, and the acceptance of their practices, despite the possible disadvantages of these practices for waste pickers and their solidarity association.

Interpersonal power

In relation to the interpersonal power, our finding shows that waste pickers identities were not necessarily determined by externally imposed and discriminatory meaning. Building on our finding in relation to the hegemonic power, the interactions between waste pickers and the public, who they see every day when collecting their waste in the streets, reinforces the society's perception of them as a marginalised group of people associated with the negative connotation given to waste. Moreover, in the occasional opportunity that members of the

waste pickers associations are invited by local authorities to discuss issues related to waste management, it is evident how their lack of technical and administrative knowledge, as well as their lower social class, reinforces the perception of local authorities and their own as informal and inexperienced group of people that is not credible as successful entrepreneurs.

Even though this example provides a pessimistic view of how the interpersonal power reinforces the inequalities of waste pickers, it is important to recognise that this is the power that waste pickers are fighting the most. Waste pickers recognised the importance of working together as a group, as a collective social entity following the T-291 ruling that allow them to become entrepreneurs formally (*Period 2*). The interactions among themselves daily, together with the recognition given by the Constitutional Court as solidarity waste entrepreneurs, and not to forget the support from CIVISOL Foundation (NGO supporting the association), the waste pickers were empowered to recognise and defend their own practice, their important role in society and the environment, and their recognition as citizens with legal rights. Indeed, the statutes of ARCA, the solidarity organisation formed in *Period 3*, acknowledge not only their differences as street collectors and landfill collectors, but they also acknowledge the elderly, disable, and ex-convicts/ex-guerrilla. Although their self-image has been affected after all the years of constant marginalisation, as indicated in the hegemonic power discussion, their work as an association has changed slightly how they are perceiving themselves, at the same time as how society is starting to perceive them, although not to as what they expected. It is still a difficult journey as many members of the associations under survivalist conditions have decided to go back to informality or illegal practices due to the lack of immediate answers or actions.

Table 3 provides a summary of the intersectionality powers and their impact before, during and after the T291 ruling as discussed in the previous sections.

Insert Table 3 about here

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this research was to explore the struggle of those involve with the entrepreneurial activities in the informal economy, within the challenging socio-economic environments. The intersection between multiple dimensions of social differences would indicate systemic power dynamic and social equalities affecting social groups (Ozanne & Fischer, 2012). Waste pickers provided a context different from those explored in existing research, namely informal entrepreneurship (see Webb et al., 2013). Our aim was to understand how intersectionality, associated with poor, marginalised groups, influence waste pickers' entrepreneurial practices and rights. This aim had implications for four intersectionality powers important to entrepreneurship research: structural; disciplinary; hegemonic; and interpersonal power (See Table 2 and Table 3). The study also had implication on how policy makers could facilitate the process of marginalised social group pursuing entrepreneurial activities. We implemented a narrative approach to address the research question, 'How does intersectionality powers influence the level of entrepreneurial informality of marginalised social groups?'.

Findings from this study revealed the decision made by the Colombian Constitutional Court of formalising the entrepreneurial practice of waste pickers (structural and disciplinary power) did not address the real issue of inequality experienced by the social group. The discussion is not about making them formal or informal, but more about legitimising their position and identity in the waste economy. Our evidence also revealed that waste pickers are affected by the hegemonic and interpersonal powers directly as a social group, emphasising the day to day struggles they faced when trying to pursue their entrepreneurial activities as a solidarity association. These powers, as well as disciplinary powers exercised by other social

institutions, such as, private sector and media, have serious implications on the collective and solidarity motivations of waste pickers, which resulted in some of them leaving the organisation, despite of being empowered by the Constitutional Court as formal entrepreneurs.

Our findings have two implications for the broader entrepreneurship literature.

First, our findings extend the discussion on the multidimensional continuum of formal and informal entrepreneurship. Past research had mainly highlighted the binary classification of informal vs formal entrepreneurship (Webb et al, 2013) - in which the notion of continuous process was suggested (Godfrey, 2011; Guha-Khasnobis et al., 2006) but, to our knowledge, neither empirically tested nor explained in detailed in relation to marginalised group. Those papers that view informal entrepreneurship as continuous process mainly discussed entrepreneurship activities and its incongruence between what is defined as legitimate by one formal institutions compared to the other (De Castro et al., 2014; Godfrey, 2011). The originality of our study is on 1) the open discussion on power and how certain marginalised groups are subject to interseccionalities that will always restrict their opportunities to participate and practice as entrepreneurs in a formal economy and market, 2) particularly, in relation to the implication on what is considered to be legitimate —as specified by norms, values, and beliefs (Dowling & Pfeffer, 1975; Scott, 1995). The discussion is not about making them formal or informal, but more about legitimising their position and identity in the waste economy.

The challenges that the waste pickers have to go through prior, during and after the T291 ruling calls into question the implicit assumption that formal entrepreneurship provide advantage for the marginalised group for creating opportunities for themselves. In particular, it emerged that the recognition of the waste pickers as capable and legit entrepreneurs

formally with in-depth knowledge, can be challenged by the norms, values and beliefs exercised by the intersectionality power that somehow preclude the use of formal/informal discussions; an economically accepted meaning that are distinct from more social interpretations. This contribution has important implications for parties involved in supporting marginalised group as to how to define and support formal and informal entrepreneurship activities, which will encourage and incentivise marginalised group to play this crucial role, and as a result, ensuring the generation of sustainable socially constructed entrepreneurial practices.

Second, our findings provide evidence of the impact of structures of discrimination and systems of power and inequality in entrepreneurial endeavours through the intersectionality approach. Previous studies have used intersectionality focusing specifically on gender, ethnicity, class and racial identities to examine the conditions, barriers and motivations for starting a business (Agius Vallejo & Canizales, 2016; Dadzie & Cho, 1989; Dy, Marlow, & Martin, 2016; Light & Rosenstein, 1995; Romero & Valdez, 2016; Ruiz Castro & Holvino, 2016; Valdez, 2016; Verdaguer, 2009; Verduijn & Essers, 2013; Wingfield & Taylor, 2016). However, these studies have focused separately on the individual and societal/institutional elements of intersectionality, without analysing further the intertwining relations with the economic, cultural and social context, as well as focusing only on the disadvantaged groups without considering the role of the powerful within sets of unequal social relations. In relation to intersectionality, the originality of our study is on 1) the more complete understanding of the challenges related to the structural, disciplinary, hegemonic and interpersonal powers experienced by marginalised social groups and their intersecting identities in influencing their entrepreneurial initiatives, 2) the confirmation that intersectionality powers, such as hegemonic and interpersonal, and structural inequalities persisted despite policy initiatives (structural power) to promote equal opportunities to

marginalised social groups, as the ones followed by the Colombian Constitutional Court, and 3) consequently, intersectionality power affecting the entrepreneurial conditions of the marginalised group was organised and maintained in the four interrelated domains, where each of the powers influence the others and it is the combination of the four that makes the waste pickers case so difficult to see progressing.

As was suggested by Collins (2000), by manipulating the image and culture surrounding waste pickers, the hegemonic power acted as a link between the social institutions (legal authorities, media, private sector, among others), their organisational practices, and the level of everyday social interactions with these institutions, society and among themselves. Thus, we demonstrate that when these entrepreneurs faced one challenge after another, there are always other people that will take advantage through the use of power and structure. This insight will allow scholars and policy makers to better understand how the intersection influencing marginalised social groups maintain power dynamics and inequalities, and how all powers need to be considered when supporting these social groups.

This research has limitations to consider. Firstly, the evidence was collected in a single country—Colombia, and from the very specific case of the waste pickers located in Cali. This allows us to control the national context, and also with the type of intersectionality powers on which we focused. Future research from other countries would be important, as the evidence has shown that different countries and institutional settings provide different kinds of affect (Gohmann, 2012). Second, while we focused on the intersectionality powers, future research could explore further the interrelation between the four powers and its influence in entrepreneurship activities of marginalised groups, particularly since literature has shown that these powers intertwined together to shape social groups' social, political and economic lives

(Collins, 2000; Naples, 2009). Finally, we have highlighted the challenges and struggles of the waste pickers in engaging in their entrepreneurial activities through their collective effort within and outside their group. There is potential for future research to investigate the nature of collective entrepreneurship in the marginalised group.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, A. 1992. From causes to events: Notes on narrative positivism. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 20(4): 428–455.
- Agius Vallejo, J., & Canizales, S. L. 2016. Latino/a professionals as entrepreneurs: how race, class, and gender shape entrepreneurial incorporation. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 39(9): 1637–1656.
- Aldrich, H. E., & Baker, T. 2001. Learning and legitimacy: Entrepreneurial responses to constraints on the emergence of new populations and organizations. In C. B. Schoonhoven & E. Romanelli (Eds.), *The entrepreneurship dynamic: Origins of entrepreneurship and the evolution of industries*: 207–235. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Alinia, M. 2015. On Black Feminist Thought: thinking oppression and resistance through intersectional paradigm. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 38(13): 2334–2340.
- Benschop, Y., & Doorewaard, H. 2012. Gender subtext revisited. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 31(3): 225–235.
- Bjørnskov, C., & Foss, N. J. 2016. Institutions, entrepreneurship, and economic growth: what do we know and what do we still need to know? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 30(3): 292–315.
- Bradley, H. 2014. Class Descriptors or Class Relations? Thoughts Towards a Critique of Savage et al. *Sociology*, 48(3): 429–436.
- Bruni, A., Gherardi, S., & Poggio, B. 2004. Entrepreneur□mentality, gender and the study of women entrepreneurs. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17(3): 256–268.
- Bruton, G. D., Ireland, R. D., & Ketchen, D. J. 2012. Toward a Research Agenda on the Informal Economy. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 26(3): 1–11.
- Burgelman, R. A. 2011. Bridging history and reductionism: A key role for longitudinal qualitative research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 42(5): 591–601.
- Byrne, O., & Shepherd, D. A. 2015. Different strokes for different folks: Entrepreneurial narratives of emotion, cognition, and making sense of business failure. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 39(2): 375–405.
- Collins, P. H. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment* (Revised 10). New York: Routledge.
- Cranford, C. J., & Vosko, L. F. 2006. Conceptualizing precarious employment: Mapping wage work across social location and occupational context. In L. F. Vosko (Ed.), *Precarious employment: Understanding labour market insecurity in Canada*: 43–66. Montreal, CA: McGill-Queen's

University Press.

- Crenshaw, K. 1991. Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6): 1241–1299.
- da Costa, A. de S. M., & Silva Saraiva, L. A. 2012. Hegemonic discourses on entrepreneurship as an ideological mechanism for the reproduction of capital. *Organization*, 19(5): 587–614.
- Dadzie, K. Q., & Cho, Y. 1989. Determinants of minority business formation and survival: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 27(3): 56.
- Dau, L. A., & Cuervo-Cazurra, A. 2014a. To formalize or not to formalize: Entrepreneurship and pro-market institutions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29(5): 668–686.
- Dau, L. A., & Cuervo-Cazurra, A. 2014b. To formalize or not to formalize: Entrepreneurship and pro-market institutions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29(5): 668–686.
- De Castro, J. O., Khavul, S., & Bruton, G. D. 2014. Shades of grey: how do informal firms navigate between macro and meso institutional environments? *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 8(1): 75–94.
- Dill, B. T., & Zambrana, R. E. 2009. *Emerging intersectionality: race, class, and gender in theory, policy and practice*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Dowling, J., & Pfeffer, J. 1975. Organizational legitimacy: Social values and organizational behavior. *Pacific Sociological Review*, 18(1): 122–136.
- Dy, A. M., Marlow, S., & Martin, L. 2016. A Web of opportunity or the same old story? Women digital entrepreneurs and intersectionality theory. *Human Relations*, 70(3): 286–311.
- Elliot, J. 2005. *Using Narrative in Social Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ferreira, M. 2016. Informal versus precarious work in Colombia: Concept and operationalization. *Progress in Development Studies*, 16(2): 140–158.
- Fiss, O. M. 1976. Groups and the Equal Protection Clause. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 5(2): 107–177.
- Garud, R., Gehman, J., & Giuliani, A. P. 2014. Contextualizing entrepreneurial innovation: A narrative perspective. *Research Policy*, 43(7): 1177–1188.
- Gill, R. 2014. “If you”re struggling to survive day-to-day”: Class optimism and contradiction in entrepreneurial discourse. *Organization*, 21(1): 50–67.
- Gill, R., & Larson, G. S. 2014. Making the ideal (local) entrepreneur: Place and the regional development of high-tech entrepreneurial identity. *Human Relations*, 67(5): 519–542.
- Godfrey, P. C. 2011. Toward a theory of the informal economy. *Academy of Management Annals*, 5(1): 231–277.
- Gohmann, S. F. 2012. Institutions, Latent Entrepreneurship, and Self-Employment: An International Comparison. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*, 36(2): 295–321.
- Guha-Khasnobis, B., Kanbur, R., & Ostrom, E. 2006. *Linking the formal and informal economy: concepts and policies*. Oxford University Press.
- Gurtoo, A., & Williams, C. C. 2009. Entrepreneurship and the informal sector: some lessons from India. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 10(1): 55–62.
- Hall, J., Matos, S., Sheehan, L., & Silvestre, B. 2012. Entrepreneurship and innovation at the base of the pyramid: a recipe for inclusive growth or social exclusion? *Journal of Management Studies*,

- 49(4),(4): 785–812.
- Hopkins, V. 2016. Institutions, Incentives, and Policy Entrepreneurship. *Policy Studies Journal*, vol. 44: 332–348. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hunt, R., & Kiefer, K. 2012. Parity, paternalism and peonage in the informal economy: An empirical study of off-the-books loans. *Academy of Management Proceedings*.
- Jack, E. P., & Raturi, A. S. 2006. Lessons learned from methodological triangulation in management research. *Management Research News*, 29(6): 345–357.
- Johansson, A. 2004. Narrating the entrepreneur. *International Small Business Journal*, 22(3): 273–293.
- Karam, C. M., & Jamali, D. 2017. A Cross-Cultural and Feminist Perspective on CSR in Developing Countries: Uncovering Latent Power Dynamics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 142(3): 461–477.
- Karunakaran, A., & Balasubramaniam, V. 2012. Entrepreneurship within informal economies in rural India: A field study. *Academy of Management Conference, Boston*.
- Ketchen, D. J., Ireland, R. D., & Webb, J. W. 2014. Toward a research agenda for the informal economy: a survey of the Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal’s editorial board. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 8(1): 95–100.
- Khavul, S., Pérez-Nordtvedt, L., & Wood, E. 2010. Organizational entrainment and international new ventures from emerging markets. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(1): 104–119.
- Knight, M. 2016. Race-ing, Classing and Gendering Racialized Women’s Participation in Entrepreneurship. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 23(3): 310–327.
- Kolk, A., Rivera-Santos, M., & Rufin, C. 2013. Reviewing a Decade of Research on the “Base/Bottom of the Pyramid” (BOP) Concept. *Business & Society*, 53(3): 338–377.
- Langley, A., Smallman, C., Tsoukas, H., & Van de Ven, A. H. 2013. Process studies of change in organization and management: unveiling temporality, activity and flow. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(1): 1–13.
- Light, I. H., & Rosenstein, C. N. 1995. *Race, ethnicity, and entrepreneurship in urban America*. New York, USA: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Lloret, A. 2012. Opportunities for a sustainable informal economy: The case of Mexico. *Academy of Management Conference, Boston*.
- Mahalingam, R. 2007. Culture, power and psychology of marginality. In A. Fuligni (Ed.), *Contesting Stereotypes and Creating Identities: Social Categories, Social Identities, and Educational Participation*: 42 – 65. New York: Sage.
- Maloney, W. F. 2004. Informality revisited. *World Development*, 32(7): 1159–1178.
- McBride, A., Hebson, G., & Holgate, J. 2014. Intersectionality: are we taking enough notice in the field of work and employment relations? *Work, Employment and Society*, 29(2): 331–341.
- McCall, L. 2005. The Complexity of Intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 30(3): 1771–1800.
- McMullen, J. S. 2011. Delineating the domain of development entrepreneurship: a market-based approach to facilitating inclusive economic growth. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(1): 185–193.
- Medina, M. 2008. The informal recycling sector in developing countries: Organizing waste pickers to enhance their impact. (No. 10586). *The World Bank*.

- Mulinari, P., & Selberg, R. 2013. Intersectional directions in working life research-a proposal. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, 3(3): 81.
- Naples, N. A. 2009. Teaching Intersectionality Intersectionally. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 11(4): 566–577.
- Nichter, S., & Goldmark, L. 2009. Small firm growth in developing countries. *World Dev*, 37(9): 1453–1464.
- Ozanne, J. L., & Fischer, E. 2012. Sensitizing principles and practices central to social change methodologies. In D. G. Mick, S. Pettigrew, C. Pechmann, & K. L. Ozanne (Eds.), *Transformative consumer research for personal and collective well-being*: 89–106. New York, USA: Routledge.
- Richards, L. 2009. *Handling Qualitative Data: A Practical Guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rodriguez, J. K., Holvino, E., Fletcher, J. K., & Nkomo, S. M. 2016. The Theory and Praxis of Intersectionality in Work and Organisations: Where Do We Go From Here? *Gender, Work & Organization*, 23(3): 201–222.
- Rogerson, C. M. 2001. The waste sector and informal entrepreneurship in developing world cities. *Urban Forum*, 12(2): 247–259.
- Romero, M., & Valdez, Z. 2016. Introduction to the special issue: intersectionality and entrepreneurship. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 39(9): 1553–1565.
- RRA Think Tank. 2010. *The Colombian Waste Pickers' Body of Law: A Case of Sustained Public Interest Litigation to Prevent Impoverishment through Law and Policy*. New York, USA.
- Ruef, M., Aldrich, H. E., & Carter, N. M. 2003. The structure of founding teams: homophily, strong ties, and isolation among U.S. entrepreneurs. *American Socio-Logical Review*, 68(2): 195–222.
- Ruiz Castro, M., & Holvino, E. 2016. Applying Intersectionality in Organizations: Inequality Markers, Cultural Scripts and Advancement Practices in a Professional Service Firm. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 23(3): 328–347.
- Saatcioglu, B., & Corus, C. 2014. Poverty and Intersectionality: A Multidimensional Look into the Lives of the Impoverished. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 34(2): 122–132.
- Sarasvathy, S. D. 2004. The questions we ask and the questions we care about: reformulating some problems in entrepreneurship research. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19(5): 707–717.
- Savage, M., Devine, F., Cunningham, N., Taylor, M., Li, Y., et al. 2013. A New Model of Social Class? Findings from the BBC's Great British Class Survey Experiment. *Sociology*, 47(2): 219–250.
- Scott, W. R. 1995. *Institutions and organizations*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. 2000. The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1): 217–226.
- Siqueira, A. C. O., Webb, J. W., & Bruton, G. D. 2016. Informal entrepreneurship and industry conditions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 40(1): 177–200.
- Smith-Hunter, A. 2006. *Women entrepreneurs across racial lines: Issues of human capital, financial capital and network structures*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Tatli, A., & Özbilgin, M. F. 2012. An emic approach to intersectional study of diversity at work: a Bourdieuan framing. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 14(2): 180–200.
- Thai, M. T. T., & Turkina, E. 2014. Macro-level determinants of formal entrepreneurship versus informal entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29(4): 490–510.

- Valdez, Z. 2011a. *The new entrepreneurs: How race, class, and gender shape American enterprise*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Valdez, Z. 2011b. *The new entrepreneurs: How race, class, and gender shape American enterprise*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Valdez, Z. 2016. Intersectionality, the household economy, and ethnic entrepreneurship. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 39(9): 1618–1636.
- Verdaguer, M. E. 2009. *Class, ethnicity, gender and Latino entrepreneurship*. New York, USA: Routledge.
- Verduijn, K., & Essers, C. 2013. Questioning dominant entrepreneurship assumptions: the case of female ethnic minority entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 25(7/8): 612–630.
- Viswanathan, M., Sridharan, S., Ritchie, R., Venugopal, S., & Jung, K. 2012. Marketing Interactions in Subsistence Marketplaces: A Bottom-Up Approach to Designing Public Policy. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 31(2): 159–177.
- Walby, S., Armstrong, J., & Strid, S. 2012. Intersectionality: Multiple Inequalities in Social Theory. *Sociology*, 46(2): 224–240.
- Webb, J. W., Bruton, G. D., Tihanyi, L., & Ireland, R. D. 2013. Research on entrepreneurship in the informal economy: Framing a research agenda. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 28(5): 598–614.
- Webb, J. W., Ireland, R. D., & Ketchen, D. J. 2014. Toward a greater understanding of entrepreneurship and strategy in the informal economy. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 8(1): 1–15.
- Webb, J. W., Tihanyi, L., Ireland, R. D., & Sirmon, D. G. 2009. You say illegal, i say legitimate: Entrepreneurship in the informal economy. *Academy of Management Review*, 34(3): 492–510.
- Williams, C. C., & Gurtoo, A. 2013. Beyond entrepreneurs as heroic icons of capitalist society: a case study of street entrepreneurs in India. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 19(4): 421–437.
- Williams, C. C., & Nadin, S. 2012. Tackling the hidden enterprise culture: Government policies to support the formalization of informal entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 24(9–10): 895–915.
- Williams, C. C., & Shahid, M. S. 2016. Informal entrepreneurship and institutional theory: explaining the varying degrees of (in)formalization of entrepreneurs in Pakistan. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 28(1–2): 1–25.
- Windsong, E. A. 2018. Incorporating intersectionality into research design: an example using qualitative interviews. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 21(2): 135–147.
- Wingfield, A. H., & Taylor, T. 2016. Race, gender, and class in entrepreneurship: intersectional counterframes and black business owners. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 39(9): 1676–1696.
- World Economic Forum. 2015. *Leveraging Entrepreneurial Ambition and Innovation: A Global Perspective on Entrepreneurship, Competitiveness and Development*. World Economic Forum.
- Xheneti, M., Smallbone, D., & Welter, F. 2013. EU enlargement effects on cross-border informal entrepreneurial activities. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 20(3): 314–328.
- Young, I. M. 2002. *Inclusion and democracy*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Yuval-Davis, N. 2006. Intersectionality and Feminist Politics. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13(3): 193–209.

- Yuval-Davis, N. 2011. *The politics of belonging: Intersectional contestations*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Zahra, S. A., & Wright, M. 2011. Entrepreneurship's next act. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 25(4): 67–83.
- Zander, U., Zander, L., Gaffney, S., & Olsson, J. 2010. Intersectionality as a new perspective in international business research. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 26(4): 457–466.
- Zinn, M. B., & Dill, B. T. 1996. Theorizing Difference from Multiracial Feminism. *Feminist Studies*, 22(2): 321–331.

Table 1– Description of data sources used in narrative analysis

#	Data sources	Details
1	Interviews	<p>Five two-hour interviews to the founder and director of CIVISOL Foundation in 2017, who had been intimately involved in key facets of the case (2017 – English).</p> <p>Three interviews (video) conducted by journalist in news programmes as well as a TV show (Especiales Pirry) to the founder and director of CIVISOL Foundation (2009, 2012 and 2014 - Spanish)</p> <p>Twenty interviews (videos) conducted to waste pickers by CIVISOL Foundation (2012 – 2013 - Spanish) and journalist in the TV show (Especiales Pirry) (2009 - Spanish)</p>
2	Legal documents	<p><u>Action of protection of constitutional rights requested by two waste picker leaders to a Colombian judge (2003 - Spanish)</u></p> <p>This document includes the arguments provided directly by waste picker leaders highlighting their circumstances, practices, conditions and limitations of rights to participate in the formal economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rights to enjoy of an affirmative action for waste pickers’ inclusion in waste management • Right to a minimum subsistence level regarding work • Rights to livelihood and entrepreneurship <p><u>Legal arguments presented by CIVISOL to Colombian Constitutional Court that resulted in the T-291/09 ruling – (2009 – Spanish)</u></p> <p>This document provides all the arguments and analysis presented by CIVISOL to inform the Colombian Constitutional Court regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poverty levels of waste pickers • Responsibilities of governmental authorities in supporting waste pickers • Need for an integral legal order of social inclusion for waste pickers in Colombia • Capabilities of waste pickers as solidary entrepreneur actors • Inclusion of waste pickers into the formal economy <p><u>Colombian Constitutional Court Ruling T-291/09 (135 pages) – (2009 – Spanish)</u></p> <p>This is the official judgment provided by the Constitutional Court of Colombia protecting the waste pickers’ rights to work as entrepreneurs in the waste economy and formalising their trade as public service providers.</p> <p><u>Organisational statutes (article of ARCA association) – (2015 – Spanish)</u></p> <p>This document provides the list of statutes that governed the waste pickers association (ARCA³), including the field of action, creation, purpose, legal form, social purpose and juridical capacity. Additionally, it includes the guiding principles, structural organisation, strategic committees, governance, assembly, executive administrative councils, executive direction, integration, management and revision of the association's assets, termination, dissolution and liquidation. <u>Guiding principles:</u> Good faith, fairness, due process, sovereignty, autonomy, no self or individual interest, self-management, solidarity, respect, free association, union integration and division prohibition. <u>Structure and organisation:</u> Members, admission, rights and duties.</p>
3	Published cases and articles in newspapers	<p><u>rra (public law + social innovation) think tank, working document (2010 - English)</u></p> <p>The Colombian Waste Pickers’ Body of Law: A Case of Sustained Public Interest Litigation to Prevent Impoverishment through Law and Policy, working document, unpublished, New York, 2010</p> <p>This working document assembles the litigation history of Colombia’s waste pickers and the voluntary lawyers, who either individually or collectively as the CIVISOL Foundation for Systemic Change, have teamed with organized waste pickers to secure their rights to survival and development by formal insertion into the marketplace. As such, it provides further understanding on what rra argues is the “legal impoverishment of the poor” and</p>

³ ARCA (Association of waste pickers of Cali)

		<p>highlights the role of law-trained professionals in national policy reform and the Legal Empowerment of the Poor Agenda.</p> <p><u>News article from Adriana Ruiz-Restrepo in razonpublica.com ‘Waste pickers and waste: that obscure object of desire’ - (2013 – Spanish)</u></p> <p>The article highlights the current situation of waste pickers in Colombia after the T-291/09 ruling. It explains the balance of recycling in Colombia where the children of an ex-president, populist mayors, opportunistic multinationals, warehouse owners, industrialists and bureaucrats have won and waste pickers have lost everything: neither formalization nor autonomy.</p> <p><u>Newspaper article title in El Tiempo - ‘Clash between waste pickers: one block wants inclusion within the City sanitation system another block wants the deregulation of trash for competing in a free market of waste’ - (2017 - Spanish)</u></p> <p>The article describes the situation in Bogota before a new public tender for waste management and how the local government has decided to open the tender to open market. It also highlights the lack of collectiveness among waste pickers, and how there is a deep division within the waste picker associations that does not allow them to advance in the consolidation as companies providing public services.</p>
4	<p>CIVISOL website http://www.civisol.org/ https://sites.google.com/a/civisol.org/fundacion-civisol/</p>	<p>The website includes information about the Foundation (history, mission, vision, projects) as well as information about the project ‘trash is life’ which presents the case of waste pickers (Spanish).</p>

Table 2– Narratives reflecting the actions, context and impact of entrepreneurial practices in the months before, during and after the T291 ruling

Intersectionality domains	Period 1 Before T291 ruling	Period 2 During T291 ruling	Period 3 After T291 ruling
<p>Structural power</p> <p>How social institutions are organised to reproduce waste pickers subordination overtime that affect their entrepreneurial actions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste pickers were tacitly allowed or at least tolerated by the local authorities to access waste from streets and local landfills for more than forty years When local authorities decided to close the city landfill following an ‘environmental sanitation policy decision’, waste pickers rejected this and argued violation of right to work, to live, to access health and social security. Local authorities did not accept their responsibility towards the marginalised group because ‘there was not contractual or legal relationship between the parties’ as they were acting informally (waste collection and recycling). As they claimed ‘there are no constitutional or legal reasons that require the protection of the development of this economic activity exclusively by waste pickers’ (T-291 ruling). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> After receiving numerous legal ‘tutelas’ (Colombian legal action taken by individuals to demand protection of their constitutional rights) from waste pickers as well as a Amicus Curiae from a group of volunteer lawyers (CIVISOL), the Colombian Constitutional Court decided to review the case and accepted the T-291 ruling, recognising that local authorities were negligent and omitted their duty to provide special protection to a marginalised group. The ruling then demanded: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government institutions should abstain of promoting or executing policies/programs that can aggravate or perpetuate situations of exclusion, marginalisation or discrimination of disadvantaged groups in society (T-291 ruling) The constitution prohibits direct and indirect discrimination towards marginalised groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste pickers formed a solidarity organisation, ARCA (Association of waste pickers of Cali), to participate formally in the waste management market, as encouraged by the T-291 ruling with the support from the NGO CIVISOL. Today, the organisation is struggling to develop a business model that applies to their particular conditions and some of their members (owners) have decided to go back to informal practice. Although the T-291 ruling required legal authorities to respond to waste pickers by supporting their entrepreneurial practice and supporting their social and economic needs, they provided only temporary job opportunities (emergency jobs) to a small number of waste pickers (for only a few months after the ruling). Further actions related to tender participation and social and financial support were not assumed by any governmental authority
<p>Disciplinary power</p> <p>How the State and other institutions rely on bureaucracy and surveillance to regulate inequalities experienced by waste pickers when trying to entrepreneur?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Informal activity of recycling under inhuman conditions for waste pickers that provided minimum survival income was tacitly allowed Waste pickers lacked legal representation to participate on public tenders for the operation and exploitation of solid waste, sweeping and cleaning of roads and public areas, commercial management and other activities The recycling work carried out by waste pickers was classified as irregular by local authorities A set of actions taken by the local authorities for solid waste recycling has tended to exclude waste pickers from a lucrative economic activity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Colombian Constitutional Court recognised that local authorities not only engaged in discriminatory treatment by excluding waste pickers from the possibility of participating in a profitable economic activity, but they also omitted their duty to adopt positive measures, to compensate for the degree of marginalization to which they were forced after the closure of the landfill. The T-291 demanded local authorities to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make possible the real and effective participation of waste pickers in public tenders. The tender must meet inclusion standards and establish conditions for the recovery and use of waste, which allows waste pickers to participate effectively in this activity according to their specific conditions: <u>organizational capacity, lack of investment capital, and technical knowledge in a public contract</u>. This participation cannot be only as employees, but should contemplate the possibility that they can continue their performance as <u>waste entrepreneurs</u>. Provide permanent accompaniment to waste pickers in the technical aspects required for tender, and provide financial and organisational support to form associative or solidarity organisations. Ensure the effective enjoyment of waste pickers and their families’ constitutional rights to health, education, decent housing and food, social security system in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local authorities confirmed that ‘we are not considering the possibility for waste pickers to stay or enter the new landfills to separate the source of waste since their presence prevents the work of covering, compaction of garbage, formation of slopes and confinement of waste, generating delays in the operation and risks to health and life of those who perform this activity’ Opportunities and projects established by local authorities where linked mainly with temporary job provision but not with the opportunity to create enterprise actions Private companies competing in the waste management market followed their economic interest and influenced the decisions made by local authorities to open the market of waste and overwrite the ruling that protected waste pickers as a marginalised social group.

		health, access to education for children under age, and their inclusion in social programs on food and housing	
<p>Hegemonic power</p> <p>How cultural ideologies, stereotypes, images and representation do influence the ways waste pickers are viewed and depicted by the society that justify or support unequal practices in the structural and disciplinary domains?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A series of stereotypes predominated in Colombian society locating waste pickers in the lowest part of society and generating a vision that they are annoying, they smell bad, they tend to steal, they obstruct traffic and they pollute the city • Due to their extreme poverty condition and the surviving urgency, waste pickers' children were exposed to malnutrition and/or sexual abuse. This resulted in being persecuted by the law, discriminated by the society, harassed by police and made invisible by the press and media • Due to their lack of education and legal power, local authorities considered them naïve and took advantage of their 'good faith' to promise things that they never did 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptance by the court that they were a marginalised social group that needed further protection and should be given the possibility to entrepreneur • The ruling T-291 recognised officially the activity of waste pickers and attributed them as preferred operators of the public recycling service and solidarity economy entrepreneurs in 'autonomous' mode 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Society and local authorities' perception of waste pickers stayed the same after the ruling, perceiving them as informal, less capable and lacking leadership and autonomy
<p>Interpersonal power</p> <p>How everyday social interactions between individuals and groups are reinforcing inequalities experience by waste pickers when trying to entrepreneur?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-groups subject to further intersectionality (disable, elderly and children) were not provided any special treatment after the closing of the landfill • Women recyclers who were still nursing, and parents who had nowhere to leave their children, were forced to take their children to work, or had to leave them alone, taking care of each other between siblings, or entrusting them to a neighbour 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-group with further intersectionality (gender) received support on business creation projects for social development by local authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ruling strengthened and empowered waste pickers to pursue their entrepreneurial activity as a collective and solidarity group. However, external forces (private organisations interested in the waste market) implanted doubt and decentralisation in some members, resulting in desertion and internal conflicts

Table 3 - Intersectionality domains and their impact before, during and after the T291 ruling

Intersectionality domains	Period 1 Before T291 ruling	Period 2 During T291 ruling	Period 3 After T291 ruling
Structural power (institutional structures of society)	Power assumed mainly by local authorities. Waste pickers have no power influence due to their informality	Power assumed by governmental organisation – Colombian Constitutional Court	A new institutional structure created, ARCA (waste pickers association). However, structural power was assumed by local authorities, financial institutions, Constitutional Court, universities/supporting institutions and media.
Disciplinary power (practices that sustain bureaucratic hierarchies)	Bureaucratic practices followed by local authorities and society in general sustained waste picker's identity as an informal and irregular unemployed street worker without legal rights	Legal practices assumed by the Constitutional Court acknowledge waste pickers as a group with rights that needed to be taken into account in the socio-economic ecosystem of the waste economy	Bureaucratic practices followed by local authorities and private companies transformed waste pickers from a group with rights into a disadvantaged group that lack knowledge on how to deal with these bureaucratic barriers, with no power and knowledge that can help them to execute bureaucratic requirements to allow them to function effectively as a legit formal entity.
Hegemonic power (images, symbols and ideologies that shape consciousness)	Society, local authorities and media exercised hegemonic power over waste pickers by portraying their image as lower class citizens related with waste. This sustain social inequalities and further marginalisation.	The image portrayed by society, local authorities and media is acknowledged by the Constitutional Court and is used to justify their need for special protection as a marginalised social group	The same hegemonic power that affected waste pickers in Period 1 persisted in this period. Colombian society does not recognise the waste pickers new identity as formal entrepreneurs as it sits outside their own cultural ideology associated with this marginalised group. Media supports the interest of larger private organisations and waste pickers' self-image is being internalised and affected their own capabilities' perception as entrepreneurs. Further marginalisation for women, elderly, disable, and ex-convicts/ex-guerrilla members due to hegemonic powers.
Interpersonal power (patterns of interaction between individuals and groups)	Interaction among waste pickers was informal. Their interactions with local authorities and society reinforced their marginalised status	Waste pickers started to work together among themselves and with the CIVISOL foundation to guarantee the T-291 ruling and its implementation	Interactions with society and local authorities remained difficult with waste pickers due to their image. However, interactions among themselves is becoming stronger as they recognised their 'right to have rights' and the need to work together.