



Migrant entrepreneurs as cosmopolitan change agents: A Bourdieuan perspective on capital accumulation

Journal:	<i>Society and Business Review</i>
Manuscript ID	SBR-10-2015-0064.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Entrepreneurs, Government, Norms, Organizations, Sustainable Development, Globalization

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Review

Migrant entrepreneurs as cosmopolitan change agents:

A Bourdieuan perspective on capital accumulation

Structured Abstract

Purpose: The aim of this paper is to provide novel insights into how the cosmopolitan mind-set can be fostered at a time of globalization by considering a group of social actors that has received scant attention in the literature on institutional change, notably migrant entrepreneurs.

Design/methodology/approach: This is a conceptual study that draws on Bourdieu's theory of capital to develop a set of testable propositions as to how the economic, cultural, social and symbolic capital endowments of migrant entrepreneurs shape their agency in bringing about cosmopolitan transformation.

Findings: Together, migrant entrepreneurs endowed with higher levels of capital may act as institution reformers and promote the cosmopolitan mind-set by influencing the beliefs, incentives and behaviors of those embedded in more entrenched traditional institutions.

Research limitations/implications: Our conceptual framework deals with only one of the many agents that may help bring about cosmopolitan change and is particularly well suited to a Western European context.

Practical implications: This conceptual paper provides a number of testable propositions that can be central to an empirical investigation into how the levels of capital possessed by migrant entrepreneurs affect their engagement in cosmopolitan change.

Social implications: The findings help identify those individuals who are more likely to endorse the cosmopolitan movement. This implication may be of particular interest to policymakers concerned with conceiving ways of counteracting some of the negative

1
2
3 effects caused by globalization, as they need to identify and understand the social agents
4
5 who can take on the role of catalyzers of public reforms.
6

7 **Originality/value:** The novelty of this paper lies in the development of a set of propositions
8
9 that shows how divergent change toward a cosmopolitan vision might be engendered by
10
11 spatially dispersed actors endowed with varying degrees of economic, cultural, social
12
13 and symbolic capital.
14
15

16
17
18 **Keywords:** Cosmopolitanism, capital accumulation, migrant entrepreneurship, ethnic
19
20 minority, world citizenship, globalization
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction

As recent events such as the global economic meltdown and the migrant crisis in Europe vividly highlight, the world is becoming increasingly ‘flat’ (Friedman, 2005). The boundaries between countries are more blurred and indistinct than ever before, contributing toward a global economy in which, whatever occurs in one part of the world may affect individuals and/or organizations in other parts almost instantly (Maak, 2009). With the undisputed globalization of markets (Levitt, 1983), once-well-accepted dichotomies between ‘here’ and ‘there’, ‘us’ and ‘them’ or ‘rich’ and ‘poor’ are now called into question. For this reason, it comes as no surprise that over the last two decades we have witnessed a renewed interest in the cosmopolitan movement (Halsall, 2009).

‘Cosmopolitanism’ can be defined as “a willingness to engage with the Other” and a “stance of openness toward divergent cultural experiences” (Hannerz, 1990, p. 239). At the heart of the cosmopolitan ideology is the creation of “a fair, just, and inclusive global economic order” (Maak and Pless, 2009, p. 544), where ‘world citizenship’ is informed by principles of morality, liberty and diversity (Bayram, 2015). Although cosmopolitanism – or ‘cosmopolitanization’ – has been invoked by some of its proponents as a reasonable alternative to globalization (Beck, 2008), somewhat limited has been the attention paid by scholars to the enabling agents of ‘cosmopolitan change’.

Against this backdrop, the aim of this paper is to provide a novel insight into how the cosmopolitan mind-set can potentially thrive within the context of globalization.[1] In doing so, we focus on a group of organizational actors that has received little attention in the literature on institutional change, namely the migrant entrepreneurs. Two major features contribute to making this category of entrepreneurs a pertinent unit of analysis within the debate around cosmopolitan transformation. As entrepreneurs, these actors possess what has been labeled as the ‘spirit of entrepreneurship’ (Buchholz and Rosenthal, 2005), i.e. the

1
2
3 ability to envisage opportunities associated with a new product or service and to develop
4 creative solutions for a given problem. As a result, migrant entrepreneurs may be regarded as
5 'rule breakers', contributing to a change in the environment to which they move (De Clercq
6 and Voronov, 2009b). At the same time, these individuals often bring with them different
7 values, understandings and beliefs that may promote institutional change (Kraatz and Moore,
8 2002). By introducing certain cultural attributes in the hosting community, migrant
9 entrepreneurs may act as 'carriers' of cosmopolitan principles (Woodward et al., 2008).
10 Taken together, these traits suggest that migrant entrepreneurs display what Emirbayer and
11 Mische (1998) call 'projective agency' – the capacity to picture a particular future and to
12 work toward its achievement. As such, these organizational actors may be viewed as
13 'institutional entrepreneurs' (DiMaggio, 1988).[2]

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 In an attempt to shed light on the role of migrant entrepreneurs as agents of
29 cosmopolitan transformation, this study examines under what conditions these actors are
30 more likely to engage in institutional change. Drawing on Bourdieu's (1986, 1998) theory of
31 capital, we develop a conceptual framework that shows how the economic, cultural, social
32 and symbolic forms of capital accumulated and deployed by migrant entrepreneurs affect
33 their engagement in cosmopolitan change. As we will demonstrate, Bourdieu's (1986, 1998)
34 argument that individual practices are shaped by the interplay between the different forms of
35 capital is well suited to investigating how migrant entrepreneurs can contribute toward a
36 cosmopolitan mind-set.

37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 This paper makes a number of important contributions. First, our conceptual
48 framework suggests that there is scope for migrant entrepreneurs to play an important part in
49 engendering cosmopolitan transformation. Second, the findings of this article help identify
50 those actors among migrant entrepreneurs that may influence the diffusion of cosmopolitan
51 ideals, thereby providing policymakers with a better understanding of the agents which can
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 serve as catalyzers for cosmopolitan change. Third, our contribution could open up new and
4
5 stimulating research avenues into how a relatively small number of dispersed organizational
6
7 actors can, in fact, bring about cosmopolitan transformation.
8

9
10 The remainder of the manuscript is structured as follows. The next section reviews the
11
12 main approaches to cosmopolitanism, key debates and trends which have emerged within the
13
14 literature. The body of evidence on migrant entrepreneurship is also examined, where
15
16 particular emphasis is placed on the benefits that this type of migration may bring to the host
17
18 economy. The usefulness of Bourdieu's (1986, 1998) theory of capital for explaining actors'
19
20 engagement in social practices is discussed within this context. The third section develops a
21
22 set of testable propositions relating to how various forms of capital possessed by migrant
23
24 entrepreneurs can potentially contribute to cosmopolitan transformation. The fourth section
25
26 discusses the implications of our approach, together with its limitations, and offers
27
28 suggestions for future research. The final section concludes with a summary of our findings
29
30 and some reflections on how the cosmopolitan vision can be attained in today's globalizing
31
32 culture.
33
34
35
36

37 **Literature review**

38 *Cosmopolitanism – concept, debate, trends*

39
40 The term 'cosmopolitan' (from the Greek *kosmopolitês*, i.e. 'citizen of the world') can be
41
42 traced back to Diogenes of Sinope, one of the founding fathers of the Cynic movement in
43
44 Ancient Greece. When asked where he came from, Diogenes used to answer that he was "a
45
46 citizen of the world" (Laertius, 1972, Book VI, passage 63). Although world citizenship is at
47
48 the very heart of the cosmopolitan project, the contemporary literature uses the word
49
50 'cosmopolitanism' rather unsystematically, rendering it "an elusive concept with a number of
51
52 quite different connotations" (Beck and Grande, 2007, p. 71). Following its introduction in
53
54 the 1950s by Gouldner (1957) and Merton (1957), the concept of cosmopolitanism has
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 observed a renaissance in contemporary thought due to the emergence of global systems.
4
5 Broadly speaking, Janssens and Steyaert (2012) identify three major perspectives on
6
7 cosmopolitanism, notably political, cultural and social cosmopolitanism. *Political*
8
9 *cosmopolitanism* deals with matters of global governance, cosmopolitan democracy and
10
11 political agency in an interconnected world (Maak, 2009). Thus, it refers to world citizenship
12
13 as a vision toward harmony of humankind in an increasingly interconnected society (Held,
14
15 1995). *Cultural cosmopolitanism* places the spotlight on the diversity of cultures
16
17 characterizing the modern society and promotes a cultural figure that is capable of
18
19 appreciating such diversity (Appiah, 2006). *Social cosmopolitanism* attempts to go beyond a
20
21 merely cultural assessment of cosmopolitanism and is concerned with the social processes
22
23 through which cosmopolitanism is produced (Beck, 2004). In light of Beck's (2008) focus on
24
25 cosmopolitanization, the latter view of cosmopolitanism is of special relevance to our
26
27 analysis.
28
29
30

31
32 Perhaps as a result of the lack of agreement on what constitutes cosmopolitanism, the
33
34 debate around the topic has taken place in a variety of fields and considered somewhat
35
36 heterogeneous questions. Areas as diverse as consumer behavior (Cleveland *et al.*, 2009;
37
38 Zeugner-Roth *et al.*, 2015), human resource management (Froese *et al.*, 2013; Janssens and
39
40 Steyaert, 2012), climate change (Dobson, 2005), labor migration (Cohen, 2004) and
41
42 geographical mobility (Abrahamson, 1965) have been inquired. Theoretical contributions
43
44 have investigated the compatibility between cosmopolitanism and nationalism (Bowden,
45
46 2003; Nussbaum, 1996), the differences between 'cosmopolitans' and 'locals' (Gouldner,
47
48 1957; Hannerz, 1990) and the nature of the moral principles underpinning the cosmopolitan
49
50 project (Dallmayr, 2003; Waldron, 2010). Empirical work has provided evidence on the
51
52 implications of cosmopolitanism for organizational innovativeness (Robertson and Wind,
53
54 1983), the link between individual values and cosmopolitan allegiance (Bayram, 2015;
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Woodward *et al.*, 2008) and the role of cosmopolitanism in predicting job candidates'
4 expatriation willingness (Froese *et al.*, 2013).
5
6

7
8 Notwithstanding this wealth of evidence on cosmopolitanism and its application to
9 different macro contexts, it is only recently that cosmopolitanism from a micro perspective
10 has been inquired – particularly within the management field. This is surprising, since
11 individuals are recognized as the chief unit of moral concern in the cosmopolitan movement
12 (Brown and Held, 2010). We aim to extend this line of research by focusing our attention on
13 a specific category of ‘everyday’ or ‘ordinary’ cosmopolitans (Cohen, 2004), that is, migrant
14 entrepreneurs. By doing so, we attempt to account for some of the criticisms raised against
15 cosmopolitanism as an ‘option’ available only to an elite of executives, bureaucrats and
16 intellectuals.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 28 *Migrant entrepreneurs: a new generation of Diogenes?* 29

30 International migration represents one of the prominent features of a modern open society
31 (Gorter *et al.*, 1998). For many people, migration offers a possible way of attaining social
32 mobility (Cohen, 2004). The growing rate of self-employed immigrants within the labor
33 market is certainly one among the major effects of migration from a socio-economic
34 standpoint. Recent data by the Centre for Entrepreneurs (2014) shows that 17.2% of UK
35 immigrants have started their own company, as opposed to only 10.4% of people born in
36 Britain. The greater engagement of migrants in entrepreneurial activities has led to the
37 emergence of a new phenomenon known as ‘migrant entrepreneurship’. Once regarded as
38 rarely innovative, low value-added and only marginally profitable (Waldinger, 1996),
39 migrant entrepreneurship is now attracting greater attention where earlier migrant populations
40 have become embedded in society and new more recent migrants arrive into the host country.
41 Started originally in the US (Light, 1972; Waldinger *et al.*, 1990), the debate over the role of
42 migrant entrepreneurs in modern economies soon spread to Western Europe as well as other
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 countries. It currently encompasses topics such as ethnic minority entrepreneurship (de Vries
4
5 *et al.*, 2015), migrants' propensity to engage in new business creation (Levie, 2007) and first-
6
7 versus second-generation immigrant entrepreneurs (Beckers and Blumberg, 2013).
8

9
10 Central to the growing interest in migrant entrepreneurship are the considerable
11
12 benefits it may generate not only for ethnic groups in the urban population but, more
13
14 generally, for the host economy. By compensating structural imbalances in the host country's
15
16 labor market, migrant entrepreneurship is important in creating employment opportunities for
17
18 migrants and alleviating social tensions (Baycan-Levent and Nijkamp, 2009). Moreover,
19
20 there is somewhat robust evidence pointing to a positive relationship between the level of
21
22 entrepreneurship and the economic development of the host country (North and Trlin, 2004).
23
24 Through the establishment of a thriving entrepreneurial environment based on the cultural
25
26 diversity of its actors, migrant entrepreneurship may also benefit the economic
27
28 competitiveness of the host region. As Florida (2002) maintains, the location decisions of
29
30 creative people influence economic development via their impact on innovation levels,
31
32 business formation and job creation.
33
34
35

36
37 Despite the observation that migrant entrepreneurs may indeed contribute to the
38
39 economic and social well-being of the hosting community, there is a paucity of research
40
41 attempting to illustrate the role of these entrepreneurs in initiating institutional change. In
42
43 addition, whilst much of the literature on migrant entrepreneurship highlight human and
44
45 social capital as major determinants for entering into self-employment (Wilson *et al.*, 2007),
46
47 virtually no evidence exists on how different forms of capital accumulated and deployed by
48
49 migrant entrepreneurs affect their engagement in institutional transformation. Yet, the role of
50
51 migrants as change agents was already acknowledged by Plato (1873, pp. 338–339 – original
52
53 work written in 348 BC) more than 2000 years ago, when he noted that “the intercourse of
54
55 cities with one another is apt to create a confusion of manners; strangers are always
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 suggesting novelties to strangers”. The purpose of this paper is to fill this void by applying
4
5 Bourdieu’s (1986, 1998) theory of capital to studying the conduct of cosmopolitan change by
6
7 migrant entrepreneurs.
8

9
10
11 *Bourdieu’s theory of capital and migrant entrepreneurship*

12
13 Bourdieu (1977, 1990) places social practices, that is, socially shaped activities undertaken
14
15 by individual actors, at the core of his analysis. He conceives of individuals as agents who are
16
17 “socially constituted as active and acting in the field under consideration by the fact that they
18
19 possess the necessary properties to be effective, to produce effects” (Bourdieu and Wacquant,
20
21 1992, p. 107). By acknowledging the strategic nature of agents’ behavior, Bourdieu’s
22
23 approach allows for the role of individuals’ positions in the field as an important determinant
24
25 of human agency. These positions stem from and are shaped by agents’ access to a certain
26
27 amount and structure of capital (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992). Rejecting a narrow focus on
28
29 human capital, Bourdieu (1986, 1998) considers economic, cultural, social and symbolic
30
31 forms of capital.
32
33

34
35
36 Capital can present itself in three fundamental guises: as *economic capital*, which is
37
38 immediately and directly convertible into money and may be institutionalized in the
39
40 form of property rights; as *cultural capital*, which is convertible, on certain
41
42 conditions, into economic capital and may be institutionalized in the form of
43
44 educational qualifications; and as *social capital*, made up of social obligations
45
46 (‘connections’), which is convertible, in certain conditions, into economic capital and
47
48 may be institutionalized in the form of a title of nobility (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 47,
49
50 emphasis in original).
51

52
53 Bourdieu (1998) conceptualizes symbolic capital as the amalgam, as well as the
54
55 situated value, of the other forms of capital that agents possess.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Symbolic capital is any property (any form of capital whether physical, economic,
4 cultural or social) when it is perceived by social agents endowed with categories of
5 perception, which cause them to know it and to recognize it, to give it value. For
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Symbolic capital is any property (any form of capital whether physical, economic, cultural or social) when it is perceived by social agents endowed with categories of perception, which cause them to know it and to recognize it, to give it value. For example, the concept of honor in Mediterranean societies is a typical form of symbolic capital which exists only through repute, that is, through the representation that others have of it to the extent that they share a set of beliefs liable to cause them to perceive and appreciate certain patterns of conduct as honorable and dishonorable (Bourdieu, 1998, p. 47).

By adopting a broader perspective on capital which includes economic, cultural, social and symbolic elements, Bourdieu (1986, 1998) provides a relational approach for understanding capital accumulation and deployment (Wilson *et al.*, 2007). Key to Bourdieu's approach is the notion of 'conversion', i.e. the transformation of different types of capital into new ones. For instance, economic capital may be converted into cultural capital by means of an educational qualification, while cultural capital may offer the opportunity for increasing social capital to the extent that greater cultural knowledge allows access to a wider social network. It is this dynamic process of accumulation and deployment of capital in its various forms that frames human agency (Tatli and Özbilgin, 2009).

The usefulness of Bourdieu's contribution is reflected in the growing number of studies adopting his theoretical framework. Applications of his notion of capital can be found in relation to a multitude of research areas, such as self-initiated expatriation (Al Ariss and Syed, 2011), immigrant labor (Bauder, 2003) and residential mobility (Pettit, 1999). Despite some notable exceptions (e.g. De Clercq and Voronov, 2009a, 2009b; Drori *et al.*, 2006), somewhat more limited appears to be the use of Bourdieu's (1986; 1998) theory of capital within the entrepreneurship domain. Furthermore, we are not aware of any attempt to draw on the Bourdieuan perspective of capital to examining the contribution of migrant entrepreneurs in bringing about cosmopolitan transformation. We argue that a relational

1
2
3 approach is particularly appropriate for explaining individuals' engagement in cosmopolitan
4
5 change, in that it takes into account the agency of individual actors and how this is shaped by
6
7 the different forms of capital they possess. By determining the power of migrant
8
9 entrepreneurs within their social field, the capital accumulated and deployed by this class of
10
11 entrepreneurs may play a major part in influencing their ability to act as cosmopolitan change
12
13 agents.
14
15

16 All in all, the review of the literature presented above points to an important void in
17
18 the current state of knowledge, that is, the implications of the various forms of capital
19
20 possessed by migrant entrepreneurs for their ability to act as catalyzers of cosmopolitan
21
22 transformation. We aim to fill this void by putting forward a set of testable propositions on
23
24 the role played by this category of entrepreneurs in promoting cosmopolitan ideals.
25
26 Therefore, the key question – and the one addressed in this paper – becomes:
27
28
29

30 *RQ.* How does the capital endowment of migrant entrepreneurs influence their
31
32 engagement in cosmopolitan transformation?
33
34
35

36 **Conceptual framework for migrant entrepreneurs**

37 *Role of economic capital*

38
39 According to Bourdieu (1986, p. 54), “economic capital is at the root of all the other types of
40
41 capital”. Generally conceptualized as a synonym of ‘financial capital’, it includes monetary
42
43 income and other forms of financial assets. One of the most important features of economic
44
45 capital is its instrumental role in acquiring other types of capital. A typical example is
46
47 illustrated by the conversion of economic capital into cultural capital through a validation by
48
49 the education system in the form of an academic qualification (Bourdieu, 1986). It is quite
50
51 evident that the creation of economic capital is a critical aspect of the entrepreneurial process
52
53 (Karatas-Özkan, 2011). As for any other type of organization, ensuring that a sufficient
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 amount of financial resources is effectively accumulated and deployed is vital for
4 entrepreneurs. This observation appears to be especially true for migrant entrepreneurs, as
5 these may well include individuals with a limited wealth at their disposal who move to
6 another country in the quest for a brighter future. Among migrant entrepreneurs we may find
7 individuals who could not afford prolonged schooling, foreign language courses or
8 memberships to professional bodies, yet they migrated to the host economy with the hope of
9 starting their own business and achieving a better quality of life. In a Bourdieuan sense, these
10 migrants may lack the economic capital necessary to accumulate cultural, social and
11 symbolic capital. In addition, the limited financial assets available to some of these migrant
12 entrepreneurs may prevent them from travelling both within and outside of the host country
13 more frequently, thereby reducing their engagement with other people beyond their ethnic
14 community. In other words, these entrepreneurs may not have the financial means (i.e. the
15 power) for actively ‘consuming’ cultural differences (Thompson and Tambyah, 1999) and
16 being involved with other people in various places elsewhere (Hannerz, 1992). For this
17 reason, we posit that the stock of economic capital possessed by migrant entrepreneurs is a
18 key enabling condition for their ability to accrue other forms of capital and – as a result –
19 their participation in cosmopolitan transformation.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 *PI.* Migrant entrepreneurs endowed with higher economic capital will be more
42 likely to engage in cosmopolitan change.
43
44
45

46 *Role of cultural capital*

47
48 Cultural capital includes competences such as education, linguistic skills and understanding
49 of the host country’s culture (Al Ariss and Syed, 2011). Bourdieu (1986) contends that
50 cultural capital can take three forms, i.e. embodied, objectified and institutionalized. In the
51 *embodied* state, cultural capital refers to long-lasting dispositions of an agent’s mind and
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 body. *Objectified* cultural capital appears in the form of material goods that capture the main
4 cultural values within a given field (e.g. books, dictionaries and machines). In the
5 *institutionalized* form, cultural capital is represented by certifications and other credentials
6 that corroborate certain types of knowledge that are deemed of particular significance within
7 the relevant field. By virtue of its focus on values, norms and beliefs (Bourdieu, 1986),
8 cultural capital is fundamentally different from human capital. As De Clercq and Voronov
9 (2009a, pp. 404-405) submit, “cultural capital derives its value from entrepreneurs’ ability to
10 access and mobilize institutions and cultural products of a society”. The notion of cultural
11 capital is of special interest in relation to migrant entrepreneurship, as international migration
12 can lead to substantial shifts at the cultural level (Cohen, 2004). As people move to a new
13 country, “[t]hey learn the cultural ‘manners’ of their hosts” (Cohen, 2004, p. 148), that is,
14 their customs, gestures and habits. By deciding “on what gets in, and what will be kept out,
15 ignored, explicitly rejected” (Hannerz, 1992, p. 258), these actors may act as important
16 ‘carriers’ (or ‘gatekeepers’) of cosmopolitan values (Woodward *et al.*, 2008). At the same
17 time, the ability of migrant entrepreneurs to make their way into the hosting community may
18 be the product of their cultural competence, i.e. their skills of absorbing and managing a
19 particular system of meanings and meaningful forms (Hannerz, 1990).

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 The cultural capital possessed by this category of entrepreneurs may also shape their
42 openness to cultural differences and their willingness to embrace diversity (Hannerz, 1992;
43 Skrbis *et al.*, 2004). For instance, we may expect that a migrant entrepreneur who holds an
44 MBA from a leading business school would have already been exposed to a variety of
45 cultural influences and learnt to think about him/herself collectively, thereby bringing to the
46 host economy some of the core principles underpinning the cosmopolitan movement.
47 Therefore, our next proposition suggests that the contribution of migrant entrepreneurs to
48 fostering the cosmopolitan mind-set depends on their cultural capital.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 P2. Migrant entrepreneurs endowed with higher cultural capital will be more
4
5 likely to engage in cosmopolitan change.
6
7

8 *Role of social capital*

9

10 Social capital is the sum of resources embedded within a network of relationships of “mutual
11 acquaintance and recognition” (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 119). According to
12 Bourdieu (1986), the amount of social capital accumulated by an agent thus reflects the size
13 of his/her network and the volume of (economic, cultural and symbolic) capital possessed by
14 the actors with whom the individual is connected. As a result, the accumulation of social
15 capital is neither naturally nor socially given, but arises from “an unceasing effort of
16 sociability, a continuous series of exchanges in which recognition is endlessly affirmed and
17 reaffirmed” (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 52). The importance of social capital in entrepreneurial
18 processes is now widely acknowledged (Slotte-Kock and Coviello, 2010). Social networks
19 are construed as a linking device, a social platform that may serve as a springboard for
20 engendering change, sustaining growth and shaping the future (Anderson *et al.*, 2010).
21 Besides allowing individuals to capture resources held by others (Ozcan and Eisenhardt,
22 2009), networks operate as a governing mechanism to generate meanings and identities (Jack
23 *et al.*, 2008).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 The creation of effective networks of social relations is of greatest concern to migrant
43 entrepreneurs, as testified by the extensive use of ethnic-based networks to gain access to
44 different resources (Rauch, 2001). Notwithstanding the contribution of co-ethnic markets to
45 the survival of migrant entrepreneurs, researchers agree that these entrepreneurs need to
46 obtain access to mainstream markets if they are to ensure the long-term sustainability of their
47 businesses (Waldinger *et al.*, 1990). By extending their social networks beyond their co-
48 ethnic community, migrant entrepreneurs may develop a mind-set in which place becomes
49 increasingly less relevant (Halsall, 2009) and the world is conceived of as one network of
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 social relationships (Hannerz, 1990). This may be particularly true for migrant entrepreneurs
4
5 whose endowment of economic capital provides them with the power to build a social
6
7 network that spans beyond national boundaries, since they may have a better appreciation of
8
9 the value of diversity and a greater sense of belonging to a world community. As a
10
11 consequence, these individuals have the potential to take on the role of ‘champions’ in
12
13 orchestrating collective action among other entrepreneurs toward cosmopolitan
14
15 transformation. It follows from this observation that the extent to which migrant
16
17 entrepreneurs act as agents of cosmopolitan change reflects the amount of social capital they
18
19 possess.
20
21

22
23
24 *P3. Migrant entrepreneurs endowed with higher social capital will be more*
25
26 *likely to engage in cosmopolitan change.*
27

28 29 *Role of symbolic capital*

30
31 The notion of symbolic capital identifies the reflected power gained or inherited by individual
32
33 agents by way of their accumulation and deployment of any other form of capital (Bourdieu,
34
35 1998). As Everett (2002) maintains, symbolic capital embodies the ability to use and control
36
37 ‘soft’ resources such as language, writing and myth. Therefore, symbolic power can be
38
39 dispensed without words, through the adoption of physical symbols, gestures and behaviors.
40
41 Within the field of entrepreneurship, it has been suggested that capital in its symbolic form
42
43 encompasses the capacity to impose entrepreneurs’ interpretations on those of others
44
45 (Calhoun, 2003), the potential for wealth creation through a new venture (Beaver, 2003) or
46
47 the ability to establish legitimacy and credibility as an entrepreneur (Karatas-Özkan, 2011).
48
49 Bourdieu’s (1998) concept of symbolic capital offers an important lens for studying the
50
51 contribution of migrant entrepreneurs to the diffusion of cosmopolitanism. Given their
52
53 exposure to a community different from the one where they were born, migrant entrepreneurs
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 may experience continuous tensions between the values they bring into the host country and
4
5 the culture permeating the environment in which they are embedded. Accordingly, we argue
6
7 that the cosmopolitan identity of this group of migrants is shaped by a dynamic process of
8
9 self-discovery and self-enhancement in which their body plays a key role. As Molz (2006)
10
11 demonstrates with respect to round-the-world travelers, the body can become culturally
12
13 flexible through the use of certain clothes and accessories, thus moving through different
14
15 places in an adaptive manner. In this sense, migrant entrepreneurs may gain symbolic power
16
17 by incorporating elements of both the home- and host-country into their body language, thus
18
19 possibly influencing their ability to act as conduits for the transmission of cosmopolitan
20
21 ideals. As a result, our last proposition postulates that the role of migrant entrepreneurs in
22
23 bringing about cosmopolitan transformation may also be determined by their level of
24
25 symbolic capital.
26
27
28

29
30 *P4.* Migrant entrepreneurs endowed with higher symbolic capital will be more
31
32 likely to engage in cosmopolitan change.
33
34

35
36 [Insert Table I here]
37
38

39
40 Table I summarizes the propositions underpinning our conceptual framework. Taken
41
42 together, our findings show that the agency of migrant entrepreneurs in bringing about
43
44 cosmopolitan change is framed by the different forms of capital they possess. By shaping the
45
46 power of this group of migrants within their social field, the economic, cultural, social and
47
48 symbolic forms of capital accumulated and deployed by these agents act as a key enabling
49
50 condition for their engagement in cosmopolitan transformation. Therefore, we conclude that
51
52 the migrant entrepreneurs who are more likely to foster the cosmopolitan mind-set are those
53
54 endowed with larger financial assets, greater cultural competences, broader networks of
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 social relationships and a better ability to employ physical symbols, behaviors as well as
4
5 gestures.
6

8 **Discussion**

10 Our conceptual framework suggests that there is scope for the migrant entrepreneur to initiate
11 and sustain cosmopolitan change. Specifically, this individual's ability to act as a catalyzer of
12 cosmopolitan transformation is affected by the economic, cultural, social and symbolic
13 capital he/she possesses. For instance, we would expect a migrant entrepreneur with greater
14 financial resources, a longer period of education, wider social networks and a better ability to
15 incorporate elements of the home- and host-country into his/her body language to be more
16 likely to act as a catalyzer of cosmopolitan change.[3] This notwithstanding, the role that this
17 group of social agents may play in fostering the cosmopolitan mind-set could be more fully
18 grasped if one looks at its collective dimension (Battilana *et al.*, 2009). As some studies
19 indicate (e.g. Lounsbury and Crumley, 2007), the process of institutional change might be the
20 result of "unintended actions of ordinary actors who break with institutionalized practices
21 without being aware of doing so" (Battilana *et al.*, 2009, p. 89). Consistent with this view is
22 the observation that institutional transformation might be a collective phenomenon that
23 involves a multitude of spatially dispersed actors with varying types and levels of resources
24 (Lounsbury and Crumley, 2007). As a result, cosmopolitan change may not be ascribed to
25 any single migrant entrepreneur, but instead originate from a myriad of divergent actions by
26 this group of agents. Together, migrant entrepreneurs endowed with larger capital may act as
27 'institution reformers' (Riddle and Brinkerhoff, 2011) and promote the cosmopolitan mind-
28 set by influencing the incentives, beliefs and behaviors of those embedded in well-accepted
29 traditional institutions. In other words, migrant entrepreneurs might mobilize – either
30 consciously or unconsciously – their economic, cultural, social and symbolic capital to secure
31 endorsement by other agents and facilitate the attainment of cosmopolitan transformation.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 This paper provides an important contribution at the social dimension, that is, the
4 diffusion of cosmopolitan values at a time of a highly interconnected world. The primary
5 implication of our study is that migrant entrepreneurship can have an important part in
6 bringing about cosmopolitan change. By suggesting that migrant entrepreneurs' involvement
7 in cosmopolitan transformation may depend on their levels of capital, our findings help
8 identify those individuals who are more likely to endorse the cosmopolitan movement. This
9 implication may be of particular interest to policymakers concerned with devising ways of
10 balancing some of the adverse effects caused by globalization, as they need to identify and
11 understand the social actors who can contribute to the success of public reforms.
12 Entrepreneurial migration represents also a critical economic issue for governments, as
13 migrant entrepreneurship is important in creating employment opportunities for migrants and
14 alleviating social tensions (Baycan-Levent and Nijkamp, 2009). Therefore, it is key that
15 policymakers understand how location decisions of creative people affect the economic
16 competitiveness of the host country. To the extent that – for instance – varying degrees of
17 exposure to cultural influences and the corresponding ability to think collectively (i.e.
18 cultural capital) shape migrant entrepreneurs' creativity, our conceptual framework may
19 provide a useful tool for explaining the links between entrepreneurship, cosmopolitanism and
20 economic development. If supported by convincing evidence, this proposition would provide
21 governments with an additional reason for pursuing a cosmopolitan agenda.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 It is needless to stress that the conceptual framework developed in this article does not
46 imply that migrant entrepreneurs' actions are the only source of cosmopolitan transformation.
47 In fact, they may well not even be the major social actor on whose shoulders the success of
48 the cosmopolitan project stands. However, migrant entrepreneurship constitutes a somewhat
49 unique setting for studying how cosmopolitan change is enacted by spatially dispersed actors
50 endowed with different structures and kinds of resources. Moreover, this paper aims to show
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 how Bourdieu's (1986, 1998) notion of capital accumulation may shed light on the role of
4 migrant entrepreneurs in facilitating the transmission of cosmopolitan principles. Although
5 this represents only one (i.e. micro) level of analysis in Bourdieu's (1977, 1990) theory of
6 practice, we do not view the application of his general theory to the topic being examined as
7 the ultimate objective of this study. Nevertheless, the inclusion of the meso and macro levels
8 of analysis (Bourdieu, 1977, 1990) within a single framework could provide an interesting
9 lens for exploring *why* migrant entrepreneurs engage in cosmopolitan transformation. This is
10 a major endeavor we are currently working on. Furthermore, in light of the somewhat
11 considerable differences between the phenomenon of migrant entrepreneurship in Western
12 Europe vis-à-vis other countries around the world, our framework may be particularly well
13 suited to studying the role of migrant entrepreneurs in engendering cosmopolitan change in
14 Western European economies. This notwithstanding, we contend that some of the predictions
15 underpinning our framework may also be applicable to other developed countries (e.g. US).

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32 By offering novel insights into how the cosmopolitan mind-set can rise at a time of
33 globalization, this paper triggers a number of new questions that wait to be addressed. First
34 and foremost, our conceptual framework is explicated within the context of migrant
35 entrepreneurs. However, they are not the only actors whose agency is shaped by their stock of
36 capital, suggesting that the framework advanced in this article could be extended to other
37 types of entrepreneurs such as transnational entrepreneurs (e.g. how does the capital
38 endowment of transnational entrepreneurs affect their engagement in cosmopolitan change?).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 Second, we observe that a variety of reasons might prevent migrant entrepreneurs to
48 accumulate different forms of capital. For instance, structural factors such as social exclusion
49 and discrimination could present ethnic minority entrepreneurs with more challenges in
50 accruing capital – especially in its social and symbolic elements – compared to their non-
51 ethnic minority counterparts. A fruitful line of inquiry would thus be to examine the extent to
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 which difficulties in amassing capital lead to systematic differences in the cosmopolitan
4 behavior of ethnic minority and non-ethnic minority entrepreneurs (e.g. what implications do
5 constraints on capital accumulation have on the likelihood that different categories of migrant
6 entrepreneurs will foster cosmopolitanism?). Third, future research could move the analysis
7 one step further and explore the benefits that might arise for those migrant entrepreneurs that
8 take on the role of catalyzers of the cosmopolitan mind-set. A possibility could be to focus on
9 the moral dimension of cosmopolitanism and investigate whether embracing principles such
10 as mutual respect, openness to others and recognition of human rights has a bearing on the
11 financial performance of migrant entrepreneurs (e.g. how does engaging in cosmopolitan
12 transformation influence the financial performance of migrant entrepreneurs?).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 26 **Conclusion**

27
28 A major criticism that is often raised against cosmopolitanism is its – either explicit or
29 implicit – conceptualization as an alternative available only to an elite who have the
30 resources to travel, learn foreign languages and absorb other cultures (Cohen, 2004). In this
31 paper, we contribute to the debate over how the cosmopolitan mind-set can be enhanced in
32 today's globalized world by focusing on a group of cosmopolitans who are – by and large –
33 in no sense elite, i.e. migrant entrepreneurs.[4] Drawing on Bourdieu's (1986, 1998) theory
34 of capital, this study develops a set of testable propositions pointing to the enabling role of
35 migrant entrepreneurs' capital in cosmopolitan change.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Our findings suggest that the levels of economic, cultural, social and symbolic capital
47 with which these entrepreneurs are endowed draw the boundaries of their agency in bringing
48 about cosmopolitan transformation. The conceptual framework put forward in this paper
49 shows that migrant entrepreneurs who possess a greater amount of capital are more likely to
50 contribute to the diffusion of cosmopolitan principles such as mutual respect, awareness of
51 interdependence and shared understanding of different moralities at a time of an increasingly
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 interconnected world. By doing so, we respond to recent calls for devoting “additional effort
4
5 to trying to understand better how actors can initiate and implement divergent change”
6
7 (Battilana *et al.*, 2009, p. 96). As our previous discussion suggests, certain migration patterns
8
9 by self-employed individuals may also inhibit the process of institutional transformation. For
10
11 this reason, we would hope to see more research linking migration on the part of
12
13 entrepreneurs and divergent change within different institutional settings.
14
15

16
17 In today’s globalizing culture, thinking about us as part of a world community is
18
19 becoming increasingly important. As citizens of an interconnected world, no economic
20
21 downturn, migrant crisis or other event remains circumscribed within national borders.
22
23 Although we agree with the argument that cosmopolitanism will not change the world, it is
24
25 our belief that the cosmopolitan project is more than just a utopia or a current fashion. It is
26
27 about finding answers to some of the challenges raised by globalization, which is moving
28
29 society toward a single worldview where the few are deciding the fates of many other people
30
31 across the planet. For this cosmopolitan vision to be realized, it is vital that individuals who
32
33 share this sense of urgency for a cosmopolitan transformation join their efforts and indeed act
34
35 as active agents of cosmopolitan change. Whether entrepreneurs, corporate managers,
36
37 government officials or academics, each of us play a part in changing the current order and
38
39 creating a more just, inclusive and ultimately peaceful world. To use the ironic words of Irish
40
41 dramatist George Bernard Shaw, “[t]he only man I know who behaves sensibly is my tailor;
42
43 he takes my measurements anew each time he sees me. The rest go on with their old
44
45 measurements and expect me to fit them”.
46
47
48

49 50 **References**

51
52 Abrahamson, M. (1965), “Cosmopolitanism, dependence-identification, and geographical
53
54 mobility”, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 98-106.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Al Ariss, A. and Syed, J. (2011), “Capital mobilization of skilled migrants: a relational
4 perspective”, *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 286-304.
5
6
7 Anderson, A.R., Drakopoulou Dodd, S. and Jack, S. (2010), “Network practices and
8 entrepreneurial growth”, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp.
9 121-133.
10
11
12
13 Appiah, K.A. (2006), *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*, W. W. Norton &
14 Company, New York.
15
16
17
18 Battilana, J., Leca, B. and Boxenbaum, E. (2009), “How actors change institutions: towards a
19 theory of institutional entrepreneurship”, *Academy of Management Annals*, Vol. 3 No.
20 1, pp. 65-107.
21
22
23
24
25 Bauder, H. (2003), “«Brain abuse», or the devaluation of immigrant labour in Canada”,
26
27 *Antipode*, Vol. 35 No. 4, pp. 699-717.
28
29
30 Baycan-Levent, T. and Nijkamp, P. (2009), “Characteristics of migrant entrepreneurship in
31 Europe”, *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 375-397.
32
33
34 Bayram, A.B. (2015), “What drives modern Diogenes? Individual values and cosmopolitan
35 allegiance”, *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 21 No. 2, pp. 451-479.
36
37
38 Beaver, G. (2003), “Small firms: owners and entrepreneurs”, *Strategic Change*, Vol. 12 No.
39 4, pp. 177–183.
40
41
42
43 Beck, U. (2004), “Cosmopolitical realism: on the distinction between cosmopolitanism in
44 philosophy and the social sciences”, *Global Networks*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 131–156.
45
46
47 Beck, U. (2008), “Reframing power in the globalized world”, *Organization Studies*, Vol. 29
48 No. 5, pp. 793-804.
49
50
51
52 Beck, U. and Grande, E. (2007), “Cosmopolitanism: Europe’s way out of crisis”, *European*
53 *Journal of Social Theory*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 67–85.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Beckers, P. and Blumberg, B.F. (2013), “Immigrant entrepreneurship on the move: a
4
5 longitudinal analysis of first- and second-generation immigrant entrepreneurship in
6
7 the Netherlands”, *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, Vol. 25 No. 7-8, pp.
8
9 654-691.
10
- 11 Bourdieu, P. (1977), *Outline of a theory of practice*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
12
- 13 Bourdieu, P. (1986), “The forms of capital”, in Richardson, J.G. (Ed), *Handbook of theory*
14
15 *and research for the sociology of education*, Greenwood Press, New York, pp. 241–
16
17 258.
18
19
- 20 Bourdieu, P. (1990), *The logic of practice*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
21
- 22 Bourdieu, P. (1998), *Practical reason: on the theory of action*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
23
- 24 Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (1992), *An invitation to reflexive sociology*, Polity Press,
25
26 Cambridge.
27
28
- 29 Bowden, B. (2003), “Nationalism and cosmopolitanism: irreconcilable differences or
30
31 possible bedfellows?”, *National Identities*, Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 235–249.
32
33
- 34 Brown, G.W. and Held, D. (2010), “Editor’s introduction”, in Brown, G.W. and Held, D.
35
36 (Eds), *The cosmopolitan reader*, Polity Press, Malden, MA, pp. 1–15.
37
38
- 39 Buchholz, R.A. and Rosenthal, S.B. (2005), “The spirit of entrepreneurship and the qualities
40
41 of moral decision making: toward a unifying framework”, *Journal of Business Ethics*,
42
43 Vol. 60 No. 3, pp. 307-315.
44
- 45 Calhoun, C. (2003), “Pierre Bourdieu”, in Ritzer, G. (Ed), *The Blackwell companion to major*
46
47 *contemporary social theorists*, Blackwell, Malden, MA, pp. 274– 309.
48
- 49 Cleveland, M., Laroche, M. and Papadopoulos, N. (2009), “Cosmopolitanism, consumer
50
51 ethnocentrism, and materialism: an eight-country study of antecedents and outcomes”,
52
53 *Journal of International Marketing*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 116-146.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Cohen, R. (2004), “Chinese cockle-pickers, the transnational turn and everyday
4 cosmopolitanism: reflections on the new global migrants”, *Labour, Capital and*
5 *Society*, Vol. 37 No. 1-2, pp. 130-149.
6
7
8
9
10 Dallmayr, F. (2003), “Cosmopolitanism: moral and political”, *Political Theory*, Vol. 31 No.
11 3, pp. 421–442.
12
13
14 De Clercq, D. and Voronov, M. (2009a), “The role of cultural and symbolic capital in
15 entrepreneurs’ ability to meet expectations about conformity and innovation”, *Journal*
16 *of Small Business Management*, Vol. 47 No. 3, pp. 398-420.
17
18
19
20 De Clercq, D. and Voronov, M. (2009b), “The role of domination in newcomers’ legitimation
21 as entrepreneurs”, *Organization*, Vol. 16 No. 6, pp. 799-827.
22
23
24
25 de Vries, H.P., Hamilton, R.H. and Voges, K. (2015), “Antecedents of ethnic minority
26 entrepreneurship in New Zealand: an intergroup comparison”, *Journal of Small*
27 *Business Management*, Vol. 53 No. S1, pp. 95-114.
28
29
30
31
32 DiMaggio, P. (1988), “Interest and agency in institutional theory”, in Zucker, L. (Ed),
33 *Institutional patterns and culture*, Ballinger, Cambridge, MA, pp. 3–22.
34
35
36
37 Dobson, A. (2005), “Globalisation, cosmopolitanism and the environment”, *International*
38 *Relations*, Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 259-273.
39
40
41 Drori, I, Honig, B. and Ginsberg, A. (2006), “Transnational entrepreneurship: toward a
42 unifying theoretical framework”, *Academy of Management Annual Meeting*
43 *Proceedings*, pp. Q1-Q6.
44
45
46
47 Emirbayer, M. and Mische, A. (1998), “What is agency?”, *American Journal of Sociology*,
48 Vol. 103 No. 4, pp. 962-1023.
49
50
51
52 Everett, J. (2002), “Organizational research and the praxeology of Pierre Bourdieu”,
53 *Organizational Research Methods*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 56–80.
54
55
56
57 Florida, R. (2002), *The rise of the creative class*, Basic Books, New York.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Friedman, T. (2005), *The world is flat: A brief history of the globalized world in the 21st*
4
5 *Century*, Allen Lane, London.
6
7 Froese, F.J., Jommersbach, S. and Klautzsch, E. (2013), “Cosmopolitan career choices: a
8
9 cross-cultural study of job candidates’ expatriation willingness”, *International*
10
11 *Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 24 No. 17, pp. 3247-3261.
12
13
14 Gorter, C., Nijkamp, P. and Poot, J. (1998), *Crossing borders: Regional and urban*
15
16 *perspectives on international migration*, Ashgate, Aldershot, UK.
17
18 Gouldner, A.W. (1957), “Cosmopolitans and locals: toward an analysis of latent social roles:
19
20 I”, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp. 281-306.
21
22
23 Halsall, R. (2009), “The discourse of corporate cosmopolitanism”, *British Journal of*
24
25 *Management*, Vol. 20 No. S1, pp. S136-S148.
26
27
28 Hannerz, U. (1990), “Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture”, *Theory, Culture and*
29
30 *Society*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 237-251.
31
32
33 Hannerz, U. (1992), *Cultural complexity: Studies in the social organization of meaning*,
34
35 Columbia University Press, New York.
36
37 Held, D. (1995), *Democracy and the global order: From the modern state to cosmopolitan*
38
39 *governance*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
40
41
42 Jack, S., Drakopoulou Dodd, S. and Anderson, A.R. (2008), “Change and the development of
43
44 entrepreneurial networks over time: a processual perspective”, *Entrepreneurship and*
45
46 *Regional Development*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp.125-159.
47
48
49 Janssens, M. and Steyaert, C. (2012), “Towards an ethical research agenda for international
50
51 HRM: the possibilities of a plural cosmopolitan framework”, *Journal of Business*
52
53 *Ethics*, Vol. 111 No. 1, pp. 61-72.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Karatas-Özkan, M. (2011), "Understanding relational qualities of entrepreneurial learning:
4 towards a multi-layered approach", *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*,
5 Vol. 23 No. 9-10, pp. 877-906.
6
7
8
9
10 Kraatz, M.S. and Moore, J.H. (2002), "Executive migration and institutional change",
11 *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 45 No. 1, pp. 120-143.
12
13
14 Laertius, D. (1972), *Lives of eminent philosophers*, available at:
15 [http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0258%3A](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0258%3Abook%3D6%3Achapter%3D2)
16 [book%3D6%3Achapter%3D2](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0258%3Abook%3D6%3Achapter%3D2) (accessed 20 November 2015).
17
18
19
20
21 Levie, J. (2007), "Immigration, in-migration, ethnicity and entrepreneurship in the United
22 Kingdom", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 28 No. 2-3, pp. 143-169.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Levitt, T. (1983), "The globalization of markets", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 61 No. 3,
pp. 92-102.
- Light, I. (1972), *Ethnic enterprises in America*, University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- Lounsbury, M. and Crumley, E.T. (2007), "New practice creation: an institutional perspective
on innovation", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 28 No. 7, pp. 993-1012.
- Maak, T. (2009), "The cosmopolitical corporation", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 84 No.
S3, pp. 361-372.
- Maak, T. and Pless, N.M. (2009), "Business leaders as citizens of the world. Advancing
humanism on a global scale", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 88 No. 3, pp. 537-550.
- Merton, R.K. (1957), *Social Theory and Social Structure*, Free Press, New York.
- Molz, J.G. (2006), "Cosmopolitan bodies: fit to travel and travelling to fit", *Body and
Society*, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 1-21.
- North, N. and Trlin, A.G. (2004), *Immigrants in business: A study of self-employed
immigrants and their businesses in New Zealand*, New Settlers Programme,
Palmerston North, NZ.

- 1
2
3 Nussbaum, M.C. (1996), "Patriotism and cosmopolitanism", in Nussbaum, M.C. and Cohen,
4
5 J. (Eds), *For love of country?*, Beacon Press, Boston, MA, pp. 2–17.
6
7 Ozcan, P. and Eisenhardt, K.M. (2009), "Origin of alliance portfolios: entrepreneurs, network
8
9 strategies, and firm performance", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 52 No. 2,
10
11 pp. 246—279.
12
13
14 Pettit, B. (1999), "Cultural capital and residential mobility: a model of impersistence in
15
16 place", *Poetics*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 177-199.
17
18
19 Plato (1873), "Laws", in Jowett, B. (Ed), *The dialogues of Plato*, Scribner, Armstrong, and
20
21 Co., New York, pp. 1-480.
22
23
24 Rauch, J.E. (2001), "Business and social networks in international trade", *Journal of*
25
26 *Economic Literature*, Vol. 39 No. 4, pp. 1177–1203.
27
28
29 Riddle, L. and Brinkerhoff, J. (2011), "Diaspora entrepreneurs as institutional change agents:
30
31 the case of Thamel.com", *International Business Review*, Vol. 20 No. 6, pp. 670-680.
32
33
34 Robertson, T.S. and Wind, Y. (1983), "Organizational cosmopolitanism and innovativeness",
35
36 *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 332-338.
37
38
39 Skrbis, Z., Kendall, G. and Woodward, I. (2004), "Locating cosmopolitanism: Between
40
41 humanist ideal and grounded social category", *Theory, Culture and Society*, Vol. 21
42
43 No. 6, pp. 115-136.
44
45
46 Slotte-Kock, S. and Coviello, N. (2010), "Entrepreneurship research on network processes: a
47
48 review and ways forward", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp.
49
50 31-57.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 Tatli, A. and Özbilgin, M.F. (2009), "Understanding diversity managers' role in
organizational change: towards a conceptual framework", *Canadian Journal of*
Administrative Sciences, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 244-258.

- 1
2
3 Thompson, C.J. and Tambyah, S.K. (1999), "Trying to be cosmopolitan", *Journal of*
4
5 *Consumer Research*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 214-241.
6
7 Waldinger, R. (1996), *Still the promised city? African-Americans and new immigrants in*
8
9 *postindustrial New York*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
10
11 Waldinger, R., Aldrich, H. and Ward, R. (1990), *Ethnic entrepreneurs: Immigrant business*
12
13 *in industrial societies*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA.
14
15
16 Waldron, J. (2010), "What is cosmopolitan?", in Brown, G.W. and Held, D. (Eds), *The*
17
18 *cosmopolitan reader*, Polity Press, Malden, MA, pp. 163–176.
19
20
21 Wilson, F., Kickul, J. and Marlino, D. (2007), "Gender, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and
22
23 entrepreneurial career intentions: implications for entrepreneurship education",
24
25 *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 31 No. 3, pp. 387–406.
26
27
28 Woodward, I., Skrbis, Z. and Bean, C. (2008), "Attitudes towards globalization and
29
30 cosmopolitanism: cultural diversity, personal consumption and the national
31
32 economy", *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 59 No. 2, pp. 207-226.
33
34 Zeugner-Roth, K.P., Zabkar, V. and Diamantopoulos, A. (2015), "Consumer ethnocentrism,
35
36 national identity, and consumer cosmopolitanism as drivers of consumer behavior: a
37
38 social identity theory perspective", *Journal of International Marketing*, Vol. 23 No. 2,
39
40 pp. 25-54.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table I. Migrant entrepreneurs as cosmopolitan change agents: conceptual framework

Concept	Proposition
Economic capital	<i>P1.</i> Migrant entrepreneurs endowed with higher economic capital will be more likely to engage in cosmopolitan change.
Cultural capital	<i>P2.</i> Migrant entrepreneurs endowed with higher cultural capital will be more likely to engage in cosmopolitan change.
Social capital	<i>P3.</i> Migrant entrepreneurs endowed with higher social capital will be more likely to engage in cosmopolitan change.
Symbolic capital	<i>P4.</i> Migrant entrepreneurs endowed with higher symbolic capital will be more likely to engage in cosmopolitan change.

¹ In this paper, we use terms such as ‘cosmopolitan change’, ‘cosmopolitan project’ and ‘cosmopolitan mind-set’ interchangeably to denote social phenomena characterized by the endorsement of cosmopolitan principles.

² According to DiMaggio (1988, p. 14, emphasis in original), “[n]ew institutions arise when organized actors with sufficient resources (*institutional entrepreneurs*) see in them an opportunity to realize interests that they value highly”.

³ At the same time, we acknowledge that the ability of migrant entrepreneurs to engage in cosmopolitan transformation may well depend upon the market conditions within the host country.

⁴ As noted in relation to our first proposition, the group of migrant entrepreneurs may include individuals who could not afford prolonged schooling, foreign language courses or memberships to professional bodies, yet they moved to another country in search of a better future.