

Mixed Embeddedness in Motion: Kurdish and Turkish Entrepreneurship in Germany and the UK

Mehmet Rauf Kesici* 

School of Business & Economics, Freie Universität Berlin (Germany)

Submitted: January 25, 2025 – Accepted: April 10, 2026 – Published: August 6, 2026

Abstract

Drawing on the case of Kurdish and Turkish migrants and their descendants in the Ruhr Region and London, this paper argues that the Mixed Embeddedness Approach (MEA) would benefit from a conceptual extension to include historical and transnational dimensions, in addition to its established focus on institutional and social embeddedness. Despite the different institutional and social contexts in Germany and the UK, the findings demonstrate that these groups have developed remarkably similar entrepreneurial patterns, resulting in analogous ethnic economies in both countries. This convergence is not coincidental but is instead shaped by historically contingent processes such as neoliberal restructuring, deindustrialization, economic crises, migrant unemployment, demographic concentration, and evolving migrant needs since the 1970s, which have reshaped opportunity structures over time. Furthermore, the entrepreneurs' transnational activities, including investments abroad, sourcing from external markets, and establishing cross-border customer relations and networks, have contributed to shaping this opportunity structure. Rather than treating transnationality and historical change as external or secondary factors, the paper argues for their integration into the MEA as constitutive dimensions of opportunity structures. In doing so, the paper frames MEA as not merely a combination of social networks and institutional contexts, but as a dynamic, processual framework attuned to historical transformations and transnational linkages. This historically contextualized MEA provides a more comprehensive perspective on ethnic/migrant entrepreneurship, opening new avenues for research and policy development in this area.

Keywords: Ethnic economy; Historical perspective; Migrant entrepreneurship; Mixed embeddedness; Transnational dimension.

*  rauf.kesici@fu-berlin.de

1 Introduction

This paper critically engages with the Mixed Embeddedness Approach (MEA) in the context of analyzing ethnic and migrant entrepreneurship, i.e. business activities undertaken by migrants and their descendants.¹ Based on a comparative qualitative study of Kurdish and Turkish entrepreneurs and their descendants in the Ruhr region (Ruhrgebiet) of Germany and London in the United Kingdom (UK), the paper examines how, despite their differing migration histories, ethnic backgrounds, religious affiliations and institutional contexts, these communities have established strikingly similar patterns of entrepreneurship and ethnic economies in both countries. Although the MEA (originally conceptualized by Kloosterman et al., 1999) remains a key analytical tool for studying migrant entrepreneurship, scholars have increasingly emphasized the importance of contextualizing this framework within dynamic socio-economic, historical and transnational environments (e.g., Barberis & Solano, 2018; Kloosterman & Rath, 2018; Wahlbeck, 2018). Building on these recent developments, this paper argues that historical entanglements, such as the processes of deindustrialization that occurred in Germany and the UK, alongside transnational linkages,² have significantly shaped the entrepreneurial trajectories of Kurdish and Turkish communities. However, these dimensions remain under-explored within empirical applications of the MEA.

In advancing a historically and transnationally informed interpretation of MEA, this study seeks to supplement, rather than contradict, existing formulations of the approach. It advocates the systematic integration of cross-border connections and historical trajectories into analyses of social, institutional and market contexts to gain a deeper understanding of ethnic/migrant entrepreneurship in diverse national settings. Grounded in empirical fieldwork, the research highlights how migrant entrepreneurs' presence across multiple temporal and spatial dimensions informs their business activities.

First, the paper reviews the literature on MEA and its recent reinterpretations, thereby establishing the theoretical framework. It then outlines the methodology of the study, after which it provides a comparative analysis of institutional contexts and market dynamics in Germany and the UK. Finally, it examines the distinctive forms of social embeddedness among Kurdish and Turkish entrepreneurs in both countries. Finally, the analysis concludes with a discussion of how historical and transnational perspectives can shed light on ethnic and migrant entrepreneurship, offering insights into the evolving scope of MEA.

2 Literature Review and Theoretical Concept: MEA as An Analytic Tool

The MEA (Kloosterman et al., 1999; Kloosterman, 2010) has served as a central framework for analyzing ethnic/migrant entrepreneurship, foregrounding the interplay between social networks, institutional environments, and market opportunities. Many studies have used the

1. I integrate the concepts of ethnic entrepreneurship (Waldinger et al., 1990) and immigrant entrepreneurship (Dheer, 2018; Kushnirovich, 2015) under the term “ethnic/migrant entrepreneurship” to encompass the entrepreneurial activities of both Kurdish and Turkish migrants as well as their descendants residing in Germany and the UK. Furthermore, I employ the term “migrant” as a broad category encompassing Kurdish and Turkish immigrants, individuals of undocumented status, refugees, asylum seekers, and similar groups.
2. Transnational entrepreneurship involves entrepreneurial activities conducted in a cross-national context by individuals engaged in multiple social and economic arenas (Drori et al., 2009), while international entrepreneurship entails the identification, pursuit, assessment, and utilization of opportunities across national borders to develop future products and services (Oviatt & McDougall, 2005). I draw upon these frameworks to investigate cross-border entrepreneurial linkages of Kurdish/Turkish migrants and their descendants.

MEA to examine migrant entrepreneurship in various contexts (Barrett & McEvoy, 2007; Cain & Spoonley, 2013; Edwards et al., 2016; Jones et al., 2014; Leung, 2002; Ram et al., 2017; Storti, 2014 & 2018; Wahlbeck, 2013). Entrepreneurs are conceptualized as embedded actors in this approach, navigating the constraints and opportunities of their environments in terms of regulation, the economy and society. The approach focuses on how entrepreneurs as active agents are embedded in social networks and broader social, economic, and political environments in the receiving country (Kloosterman, 2010). It examines how entrepreneurial activities intersect with changes in socio-cultural structures and urban economic transformation (Kloosterman et al., 1999). Factors such as human capital, social networks, institutional settings, and market dynamics influence entrepreneurial behaviors. Social embeddedness refers to migrants and their descendants' connections within their social networks, while institutional context pertains to the regulatory framework of their business environment (Solano, 2020). This institutional context, shaped by political and legal factors such as national laws, migration policies, and business regulations, plays a crucial role in influencing ethnic/migrant businesses in the destination economy (Barrett & McEvoy, 2007). In the process of incorporation, the type and function of migrant businesses are influenced by both the resources available to entrepreneurs and the opportunities present in their environment (Kloosterman, 2010).

Core to MEA is the notion of opportunity structure, a concept initially developed by Waldinger et al. (1990) that highlights how business opportunities are influenced by wider socio-economic and institutional factors. Kloosterman and Rath (2001) incorporated this perspective into MEA, emphasizing that entrepreneurial activities are influenced by market dynamics and external circumstances, depends on factors such as technological advancements, production costs, demand for goods, and institutional regulations. It dictates the timing, location, and extent of ethnic business activities (Kloosterman et al., 1999), analyzed across local/neighborhood, regional/urban, and national scales. Therefore, when comparing opportunity structures across different countries, it is essential to consider these various levels of analysis (Kloosterman & Rath, 2001).

Originally conceptualized for analyzing migrant entrepreneurship in urban areas, MEA has become closely associated with the socio-economic changes in cities, particularly those resulting from industrial restructuring, demographic changes driven by migration, and evolving urban economies (Kloosterman et al., 1999; Kloosterman & Rath, 2018). Urban spaces present a mix of opportunities and constraints; neighborhood-level processes such as residential segregation, ethnic clustering, gentrification and the creation of leisure and consumption spaces directly impact access to markets, customer bases and social networks. These urban dynamics affect the formation of ethnic economies and shape the opportunities available to migrant entrepreneurs. For example, the concentration of co-ethnic populations in certain urban districts can lead to the development of enclave-based businesses, while processes such as gentrification may either displace existing entrepreneurs or create new market opportunities (Hiebert, 2002). In this sense, the analytical strength of the MEA lies partly in its ability to capture how entrepreneurial activities are embedded within the evolving socio-economic landscapes of urban settings, providing a valuable perspective for understanding the cases of the Ruhr Region and London examined in this study.

MEA serves as a suitable foundation for exploring ethnic/migrant entrepreneurship, highlighting crucial elements within the entrepreneurial environment pivotal for initiating and progressing ventures. Kloosterman and Rath (2018) reaffirmed its dynamic nature, emphasizing its ability to adapt to socio-economic shifts and empirical findings. They describe MEA as a flexible, interactionist framework that considers changing opportunity structures

and the evolving composition of migrant populations, which are shaped by variations in human resources, financial capital and social networks. Storti (2014) also emphasizes this perspective, highlighting how migrant entrepreneurial groups emerge and become structured through dynamic interactions with institutional constraints and social ties within destination societies. This work emphasizes that embeddedness is a process rather than a fixed condition, influenced by entrepreneurs' continuous adaptation to changing market contexts. Building on this, Storti (2018) advocates closer integration between MEA and economic sociology from a neo-institutionalist standpoint, contending that migrant entrepreneurship exists within a complex web of socio-economic negotiations. These insights emphasize the importance of viewing MEA as a flexible and evolving framework that is responsive to historical change and transnational economic practices. In this sense, the range of contexts, including transnational entrepreneurial activities (Yamamura & Lassalle, 2022) and historical interactions (Antwi Bosiakoh, 2017 & 2019), has yet to be fully integrated into the MEA framework and requires further conceptual refinement. Similarly, my empirical investigation of Kurdish and Turkish migrants and their descendants in Germany and the UK revealed that a focus on transnational and historical aspects, as well as institutional and social contexts, better explains the origins and mechanisms behind the rise of ethnic and migrant entrepreneurship. This approach also sheds light on the process through which migrants in the UK replicate the entrepreneurial activities of their counterparts in Germany. There is also a need to enhance it in order to elucidate the transnational linkages among these individuals across these countries. This includes the route to the UK, which not only involves direct migration from Turkey, but also transit through Germany. My study thus combines two critiques of the MEA and provides new empirical insights from fieldwork investigations.

MEA recognizes socio-economic transformations, but explicit historical analyses have been relatively scarce. Peters (2002) criticized MEA for paying insufficient attention to historical contexts when explaining ethnic diversity in entrepreneurial concentrations. Similarly, Koning and Verver (2013) incorporated a historical dimension into the MEA in their study of second- and third-generation ethnic Chinese entrepreneurs in Thailand and argued that understanding the experiences and entrepreneurial decisions of these individuals necessitates contextualizing them within the broader framework of migration history and historical constructs of Thai nationalism. Antwi Bosiakoh (2017 & 2019) developed the concepts of "historical embeddedness" and "historicized mixed embeddedness", examining the economic activities of West African immigrants in Ghana. Together, these studies argue that historical trajectories, including migration patterns, state policies and socio-economic shifts, are crucial for understanding ethnic/migrant entrepreneurship.

Critique of the MEA's limited engagement with transnationalism has also gained prominence. Price and Chacko (2009) advocated for expanding MEA framework beyond neighborhood contexts to include transnational linkages, exemplified by their study on Bolivian migrants in the USA establishing transnational networks. Scholars such as Miera (2008), Bagwell (2018) and Wahlbeck (2018) have emphasized the significant impact of migrants' cross-border ties, including financial flows, networks and socio-cultural exchanges, on their entrepreneurial strategies. Solano (2016 & 2020) introduced the concept of "multifocality", demonstrating how entrepreneurs can navigate opportunities and networks across multiple locations simultaneously. Additionally, Solano et al. (2022), investigating Moroccan migrants in Amsterdam, proposed a model integrating multifocality with group behaviors to pursue entrepreneurial opportunities. Similarly recent contributions (e.g. Barberis & Solano, 2018; Yamamura & Lassalle, 2022) have further emphasized the importance of MEA recognizing the multi-level and

transnational nature of contemporary migrant entrepreneurship.

These two strands of critique (historical and transnational) highlight the need to expand MEA's analytical scope. Building on this foundation, I conceptualize the historical and transnational dimensions as integral to the structuring of institutional and social embeddedness, rather than as external variables. Historical processes that shape urban transformation, such as deindustrialization, neoliberal restructuring and changing migration regimes, actively reconfigure institutional frameworks, market dynamics and patterns of social embeddedness over time (Antwi Bosiakoh, 2017; Koning & Verver, 2013). Similarly, transnational linkages, such as cross-border business networks, financial flows and family-based economic exchanges, interact with institutional constraints and social networks in destination countries (Bagwell, 2018; Solano, 2016 & 2020; Yamamura & Lassalle, 2022). Therefore, opportunity structures are conditioned not only by national institutions and local social networks, but also by evolving transnational economic and historical contexts alongside migrants' embeddedness. The findings provide new empirical insights that broaden the applicability of MEA, reaffirming its flexibility while addressing conceptual gaps identified in recent scholarship.

3 Research Design, Fieldwork and Analytical Approach

This study comprises two field investigations: the first conducted over 12 months in London, UK (2014–2015), and the second over 36 months in the Ruhr Region, Germany (2017–2019). In London, the research focused on boroughs such as Enfield, Haringey, Hackney, and Islington, where a significant portion of the Kurdish, Turkish, and Turkish-Cypriot communities reside (London Datastore, 2015). Similarly, the Ruhr Region study concentrated on cities such as Duisburg, Dortmund, Gelsenkirchen, Essen, and Herne, where the Kurdish and Turkish populations are notably concentrated (Regionalstatistik Ruhr, 2018).

I selected London and the Ruhr Region as comparative case studies for four interconnected reasons.³ First, both areas have spatially concentrated ethnic enclaves and vibrant ethnic economies, particularly in the service sector (Kesici, 2020 & 2023). Second, both areas are urban-industrial settings that have been profoundly shaped by industrialisation, deindustrialisation and successive waves of labour migration, creating fertile ground for entrepreneurial activity. The Ruhr Region, historically Germany's industrial heartland, underwent significant socio-economic restructuring following the decline of heavy industries (Berger, 2019), while London's transformation into a global service economy has had a similar impact on local labour markets and urban space (Hamnett, 2004). Third, the differing national institutional frameworks and welfare systems of Germany and the UK provide an opportunity to examine how contrasting regulatory and socio-political environments shape migrant entrepreneurship (Kloosterman, 2010). Fourth, both contexts have significant Kurdish and Turkish populations whose entrepreneurial activities are embedded within local social networks and transnational linkages (Kesici, 2023).

Although the Ruhr is a region rather than a single city, it functions as an interconnected urban-industrial area that is historically and socio-economically cohesive. It is characterised by dense settlement patterns and distinct neighborhoods (Knapp et al., 2004) that are comparable to metropolitan London in many respects. Both regions have Kurdish and Turkish

3. Initially, I considered Berlin for comparative purposes. However, its division into two separate cities until 1989 complicates the longitudinal analysis of ethnic/migrant entrepreneurship, particularly with regard to opportunity structures and institutional continuity. The Ruhr Region, by contrast, provides a more coherent setting for examining historically embedded entrepreneurial trajectories in parallel with London.

entrepreneurial enclaves concentrated within urban neighborhoods, such as Green Lanes and Stoke Newington in London and Hochfeld and Marxloh in Duisburg, Nordmarkt-Süd in Dortmund, Altendorf and Altenessen in Essen and Bismarck Street in Gelsenkirchen (Kesici, 2023).

In these localities, I participated in migrant gatherings such as Newroz celebrations and Ramazan events and visited community centres, socio-cultural institutions, businesses, and residences, conducting informal interviews with individuals engaged in the ethnic economy and community organizations. Through these interactions, I listened attentively and documented their migration and work experiences. These visits and informal discussions facilitated the identification of participants for formal interviews and enhanced the depth of their outcomes. After preliminary investigation and field observations, I conducted a total of 60 semi-structured, in-depth interviews in London and 40 in the Ruhr Region, with gender balance. Recruitment methods included random sampling and outreach through organizations, cafes, workplaces, and community leaders, supplemented by occasional utilization of the snowball technique. The interviews delved deeply into the demographic profiles, migration history, social connections, entrepreneurial backgrounds, and current employment status of the participants. Despite implementing methodological strategies to mitigate bias, the study encountered limitations including difficulty in accessing certain groups or individuals, lack of standardized data, and constraints in time and resources. However, these limitations are considered to minimally impact the resulting findings.

In the UK, interviewees comprised 20 entrepreneurs, 24 workers, and 16 individuals not in paid employment, encompassing various statuses such as unemployed, retired, unpaid family workers, and homemakers. Additionally, 4 workers simultaneously held self-employed roles, while 5 had prior entrepreneurship experience. In Germany, interviews involved 13 entrepreneurs, 22 workers, and 5 individuals not in paid work. Also, 2 workers simultaneously held self-employed roles, while 2 had prior entrepreneurship experience. I conducted the semi-structured, in-depth interviews in Turkish, each lasting approximately 45 minutes, and translated the quotations from Turkish into English. Furthermore, I employed a hybrid approach incorporating thematic, narrative, and interpretive analytical methods for data analysis. As seen in Table A1 (Appendix), some entrepreneurs initially relocated to Germany, worked there, and then migrated to the UK. Most of the entrepreneurs interviewed in both countries exhibited transnational business ties, encompassing investments, customer relations, sourcing, and networks with Turkey and other countries. Furthermore, a significant portion of the entrepreneurs had prior factory employment, a feature less common among other interviewees.

4 Results: Institutional Frameworks, Social Embeddedness and Urban Market Dynamics

Although sharing certain resemblances, Germany and the UK possess distinct characteristics in the markets and institutional and social frameworks related to ethnic/migrant entrepreneurship.

4.1 Institutional Contexts and Urban Market Dynamics

Germany and the UK maintain distinct welfare state models, which significantly influence their institutional contexts and market dynamics. Germany adheres to a conservative welfare state

model, exemplified by the Bismarckian paradigm, wherein social insurance systems rely predominantly on contributions from employees and employers. In contrast, the UK follows the liberal welfare model, characterized by means-tested benefits and limited universal provision (Slaven et al., 2021). Germany's welfare system is intertwined with a corporatist industrial framework, fostering high levels of market control through regulatory mechanisms and institutional frameworks. Conversely, the UK's liberal welfare state entails minimal state intervention in markets, featuring voluntary relationships among social partners with limited government interference. Notably, government expenditure on social policy in the UK historically lags behind other European countries, as evidenced by lower healthcare expenditure relative to Germany from 1980 to 2013 (Harding & Pritchard, 2016).

These welfare regimes greatly influence the economic activities of Kurdish and Turkish entrepreneurs within urban markets. The more liberal market environment in the UK enables the reproduction of most ethnic/migrant businesses (Barrett & McEvoy, 2007), whereas the rigid regulatory framework, high taxes and discrimination in Germany act as a deterrent to entrepreneurship among these migrants. These countries also possess distinct vocational qualification systems that significantly influence ethnic/migrant entrepreneurship. Germany's system is structured, standardized, and closely aligned with industry requirements, emphasizing a dual training approach blending theoretical instruction in vocational schools with practical training in companies. In contrast, the UK's system lacks a unified structure, offering greater flexibility and a wider array of qualifications across various sectors. While accessing Germany's formalized vocational education system can prove challenging for migrants due to fragmented educational backgrounds, the UK's more adaptable system may facilitate migrants in acquiring qualifications relevant to their skills and experience. However, despite facing educational disparities, bureaucratic complexities, discrimination, and restricted sectoral opportunities in Germany (Haasler, 2020; Korber, 2019; Rusert & Stein, 2023), Kurdish and Turkish migrants and their descendants demonstrate greater resilience due to their longer history in the country:

Even if you are seen as a foreigner, you do not feel like one because you have a command of this place. You know the law, tax system, and language. You have everything, such as lawyers. So, you can do everything (Interview 7, aged 35, male, Duisburg).

This extended tenure has fostered stronger institutional embeddedness, affording them numerous advantages both within and outside the ethnic economy. Conversely, the shorter duration of Kurdish and Turkish presence in the UK has led to restricted language skills and system knowledge, consequently limiting their opportunities (Kesici, 2022).

4.2 Distinct Social Embeddedness of Migrants and Descendants

Social characteristics within ethnic/migrant communities in Germany and the UK, alongside institutional aspects and markets, shape the opportunity structure for ethnic/migrant entrepreneurship. However, the social embeddedness of Kurds and Turks in Germany, as well as Kurds, Turks, and Turkish Cypriots in the UK, unfolds differently and their divergent characteristics influence their social embeddedness paths.

The Kurdish/Turkish community represents the largest migrant (background) population in the Ruhr Region and Germany, yet it constitutes one of the smallest groups in London and the UK. They are not delineated as a separate entity in UK migration statistics. While their population in the Ruhr Region is less than one-tenth of the Kurdish/Turkish population in

Germany, around two-thirds of the Kurdish, Turkish, and Turkish-Cypriot community reside in London (Office, 2011; London Datastore, 2015; Regionalstatistik Ruhr, 2018; Statistisches Bundesamt, 2011). While constituting the largest migrant population in Germany offers these migrants extensive ethnic networks and support, it also exposes them to various challenges, including frequent racist targeting in the country (Adam, 2015). Many interviewees from the Ruhr Region recounted encounters with discrimination and racism during their social and economic activities, often unjustly linked to actions of other Muslim groups. In contrast, participants in the UK reported less discrimination and racism than those in Germany. However, being among the smallest migrant groups in the UK restricts the benefits derived from social networks.

The ethnic and religious identities of these individuals differ significantly between Germany and the UK, shaping the dynamics of social embeddedness paths within each community (Kesici, 2025). While the predominant identities among them in Germany are Turkish ethnicity and Sunni Islam, the community in the UK encompasses substantial Kurdish and Cypriot populations, as well as Alevi individuals, altering the ethnic and religious composition. In both countries, social and economic networks primarily operate along ethnic and religious lines. In the UK, migrants often gather through political and cultural associations and Cemevi, whereas in Germany, mosques and their surrounding areas, including associations and cafes, serve as the primary gathering areas for this community. Ethnic and religious backgrounds significantly influence group dynamics in both Germany and the UK, fostering close family ties, religious cooperation, and political activism. This solidarity is particularly pronounced in the UK due to the higher proportion of Kurds and Alevi people in this population. Within this community, mutual support extends to offering business advice and consultancy, as well as providing unpaid labor:

When establishing a business here, people usually give each other financial help. There is solidarity, for example in the Alevi community and among the Kurds themselves (Interview 25, aged 52, male, London).

As expressed in this quotation, an Alevi informant who owned a cafe in London volunteered his expertise to assist his friend in Hastings in setting up a cafe-restaurant. During two days in March 2015, he provided ample advice on how to organize the production chain, menu, interior design, and working hours, among other components and exchanged views on the suppliers and raw material procurement. When I asked why he did this for free, he answered: “We are Alevi friends and colleagues. This is a kind of solidarity” (Informal interview, male interviewee, aged around 45, London). These close networks, however, can lead to significant exploitation of workers, including the unpaid labor of women and younger generations, as well as self-exploitation among Kurdish and Alevi entrepreneurs. This exploitation is often considered as a response to intense market competition (Kesici, 2020).

4.3 Similar Ethnic Economies

Despite the variations in institutional and social contexts, Kurdish and Turkish entrepreneurs have established remarkably similar ethnic economies in the Ruhr Region and London. Both regions, each home to 200,000 migrants and their descendants (London Datastore, 2015; Regionalstatistik Ruhr, 2018), have seen a notable surge in entrepreneurial activities, a trend witnessed in Germany since the 1970s and in the UK since the 1980s. In Germany, about 10%

of economically active migrants are engaged in entrepreneurship, whereas in the UK, this figure rises to approximately 25% (Office for National Statistics, 2011; Statistisches Bundesamt, 2011). However, my field studies suggest that these official statistics may underestimate the actual rates of entrepreneurship among these communities, prompting a higher representation of entrepreneur interviewees in my research.

In both Germany and the UK, Kurdish and Turkish entrepreneurs primarily engage in the service sector within their ethnic economies, while also participating in the construction sector, often functioning as subcontractors. These enterprises encompass a range of businesses including restaurants, takeaways, tea houses, cafes, travel agencies, jewellery shops, import-export firms, taxi companies, cleaning firms, construction companies, grocery suppliers, and wholesalers, as well as retail businesses (comprising corner shops, kiosks, *Spätkaufs*, and off-licences), typically small to medium-sized and family-owned, with active involvement from the proprietors (Kesici, 2022; Kontos, 2007). These businesses have been intensified in some sectors and subsectors: Kurds and Turks in Germany dominate both entrepreneurial activities and employment within the cleaning industry, while in both Germany and the UK, the doner subsector exemplifies the ethnic enclave economy. This subsector demonstrates intense vertical and horizontal integration, facilitated by ethnic connections. For instance, doner factories owned by co-ethnic companies purchase semi-finished products, process them into doner spits, and distribute them to doner takeaway businesses, which then refine the product for retail sale. Ethnic/migrant enterprises strategically control various stages of this production chain along ethnic lines to maximize economic benefits (Kesici, 2020; Light & Gold, 2000). For example, an interviewee who had worked as the Italy coordinator in the marketing department of a doner production company explained the phenomenon as follows: “I think approximately 80% of the doner factories in Germany are owned by Kurds” (Interview 3, aged 46, male, Essen).

Over time, especially in Germany due to their longer presence, Kurdish and Turkish entrepreneurs have moved beyond traditional businesses to establish medium-sized enterprises, including media firms, entertainment businesses, insurance companies, driving schools, and even banks (Leung, 2007). Like the findings of Wilson and Portes (1980) regarding Cuban migrants in the US, the concentration and diversity of economic activities enable Kurdish and Turkish individuals to primarily engage within the confines of the ethnic enclave economies in both Germany and the UK.

Younger generations, educated in Germany and the UK, are diversifying into professions such as law, medicine, education, and IT specialization, which typically have higher entry barriers (Kontos, 2007), extending beyond the confines of ethnic economies. A notable example from Germany is BioNTech, a biotechnology enterprise founded by descendants of migrants from Turkey, which successfully developed a COVID-19 vaccine. However, many younger migrants still engage in businesses within ethnic economies due to challenges in securing employment in mainstream sectors, stemming from limited work-related skills, education, and language proficiency in both countries. These obstacles are often rooted in educational and workplace inequalities, leading to career discrimination (Kesici, 2016; Pütz et al., 2007).

5 Discussion: Historical Background and Transnational Aspects of Ethnic/Migrant Entrepreneurship

This study examines how Kurdish and Turkish migrants, and their descendants established strikingly similar patterns of ethnic/migrant entrepreneurship, as well as ethnic economies, in

the Ruhr Region and London. Despite differences in national institutional frameworks, welfare systems and migration policies, these entrepreneurs cultivated comparable business models and community-based economic structures. While MEA (Kloosterman et al., 1999; Kloosterman, 2010) remains valuable in highlighting how entrepreneurs navigate institutional and social contexts, the analysis reveals that it requires further elaboration to account for the historical processes and transnational connections that shape urban opportunity structures over time.

Recent theoretical contributions (Kloosterman & Rath, 2018; Solano et al., 2022; Wahlbeck, 2018) have emphasized that MEA should be treated as a dynamic and flexible framework rather than a static model. Building on this, this paper demonstrates that Kurdish and Turkish entrepreneurship is not only embedded in urban institutional and social contexts, as explored in the MEA tradition, but also in historical trajectories of urban transformation and transnational socio-economic linkages. In line with critical voices in the literature (Antwi Bosiakoh, 2017 & 2019; Koning & Verver, 2013; Miera, 2008; Solano, 2020), the findings highlight the necessity of a historically contextualized, transnationally expanded MEA.

5.1 Historical Processes and the Opportunity Structure in Urban Contexts

The original MEA framework emphasised how institutional constraints, welfare systems and socio-economic dynamics within destination societies shape migrant entrepreneurs' access to resources and markets. However, as recent studies (Antwi Bosiakoh, 2017 & 2019; Koning & Verver, 2013) have highlighted, these factors do not emerge in isolation, but rather result from long-term historical processes, including urban economic restructuring, welfare state reforms, and migration histories.

The opportunity structure of MEA for ethnic/migrant entrepreneurship in both Germany and the UK was historically influenced by the convergence of neoliberal restructuring, characterised by deindustrialisation and economic crises-induced unemployment.⁴ Similar to the phenomenon within marginalised urban economies observed by Wacquant et al. (2014) and Musterd et al. (2013), many Kurdish and Turkish migrants turned to self-employment as a survival strategy due to the collapse of heavy industry and an increase in precarious employment. For example, two self-employed migrants in the Ruhr Region described this situation as follows:

There was a very big company called Krupp in Rheinhausen, I don't know, it had closed down before we arrived... And when a person is unemployed, they inevitably come and establish a business (Interview 2, aged 48, male, Duisburg).

There are no factories left anyway. You'll either make something over a restaurant or something as a shopping business. There is no heavy industry left here (Interview 16, aged 50, male, Essen).

Ethnic economies emerged in response to structural unemployment and were facilitated by the spatial concentration of migrant communities, their sufficient start-up capital, and the burgeoning needs of migrants in urban neighbourhoods in the Ruhr Region and London. While the transition towards ethnic economies began as early as the late 1960s in West Germany, it

4. Amid neoliberal restructuring, industrial corporations increasingly replaced labor with capital and relocated production to lower-cost locations (Leung, 2007). Accordingly, Kurds and Turks, primarily employed as unskilled workers, were among the first to lose their jobs in these industrial sectors (Pütz et al., 2007).

gained momentum in the UK during the 1980s.⁵ This transformative process originated in and flourished in West Germany, subsequently proliferating across Europe, including the UK, often referred to as the “Doner Revolution” (Panayiotopoulos, 2010), as the food industry served as a major hub for the emergence of ethnic economies in these countries. Following the emergence of their first businesses in West Germany during the 1960s, subsequent chain migration from the 1970s onwards led to a significant increase in the Kurdish and Turkish population and the proliferation of businesses. The number of these self-employed migrants surged approximately tenfold from 1972 to 1985 (Waldinger et al., 1990), marking the self-sufficiency of their ethnic economy.

In the UK, the recession of the 1970s marked the decline of various industrial sectors due to competitive challenges faced by British industry. Unemployment surged notably, particularly after the conservative government came into power in 1979. Additionally, the collapse of the Soviet Bloc in the late 1980s led many textile companies to relocate to Eastern European countries, attracted by skilled yet inexpensive labour. This period of crisis and neoliberal restructuring, which included the decline of the textile industry (Strüder, 2003), resulted in widespread job losses for Kurdish, Turkish, and Turkish-Cypriot migrants, concentrated in vulnerable segments of the industrial sectors. In response to this transformation, following their counterparts in Germany, they turned to ethnic/migrant entrepreneurship around the 1980s in the UK (Barrett & McEvoy, 2007; Waldinger et al., 1990). For instance, a self-employed restaurant/café owner in London shared her experiences as follows:

I worked 13 years in a factory and 7 years as a supervisor in another factory. [...] At some point, the factories closed down, the textile was moved to Romania. After they closed down, we opened this place. I have been running this place with my husband for almost 12 years (Interview 15, aged 48, female, London).

As argued by Koning and Verver (2013) and Antwi Bosiakoh (2017 & 2019), historical patterns of migration, settlement and community formation have a profound impact on entrepreneurship within migrant communities. These patterns were fostered by their strengthened institutional, social and transnational embeddedness, including improvements in their legal and residency status; their involvement in import-export activities (Pécoud, 2002); their accumulation of capital from industrial sectors; and the length of time they had resided in both countries. In both countries, migrants who lost their jobs in the industrial sector could also rely on social networks, such as family and migrant organizations, to find alternative employment or set up small businesses within emerging ethnic economies. Although Kurdish and Turkish migrants encountered significant institutional barriers hindering their access to self-employment, particularly in Germany,⁶ they effectively navigated these structural constraints through various strategies. The way in which entrepreneurs adapt their shop opening hours is an example

5. In the Ruhr Region, although the transition period started earlier than in London, it lasted longer. This extended transition is evidenced by the fact that the region's last deep coal mine was operational until 2018 (Berger, 2019). During my field study in the Ruhr Region, I observed that a small number of migrants were still employed within industrial sectors, including iron/steel plants. Due to the protracted deindustrialization in Germany, job losses in industrial sectors occurred over an extended period.
6. A formal ‘master craftsman certification’ (Meisterbrief) and tertiary education were examples of the prerequisites to be allowed to work as a craftsperson in many trades (Leung, 2007; Pütz et al., 2007). Therefore, it was not possible for a migrant to be a craftsperson or self-employed professional without having passed through the educational system of Germany. Migrants without a formal certificate were only allowed to work in occupations that were classified as ‘similar to crafts’ since the code was revised in 2004 to ease the entry to some craft trades (Kontos, 2007).

of historical arrangements in institutional contexts. In practice, they adjusted store hours to adapt their preferences, resulting in later regulated shopping hours in both countries.⁷

Among the interviewees in this research, while some migrants initiated a business in these ethnic economies by leveraging skills acquired in Turkey,⁸ others acquired expertise in ethnic/migrant enterprises while working as employees, honed entrepreneurial skills, and subsequently established their own businesses. Furthermore, the primary capital needed to start businesses within these ethnic economies largely consists of savings accumulated by migrants during their employment in factories. As indicated in Table A1, many interviewees in both countries worked in factories and used their savings from this employment as start-up capital to establish their businesses.⁹ They also acquired crucial initial capital for businesses through familial assistance, loans from acquaintances, and community collaboration. Descendants educated in Germany, or the UK either sustained their families' enterprises or financed their new enterprises using the savings of previous generations. They initially entered sectors such as craftspersonship, taxi driving, hairdressing, shoemaking, cobbling, tailoring, and repair services, marking their initial embeddedness into market networks. This occurred as vacancies emerged in these sectors due to the departure or upward mobility of the existing population. As existing entrepreneurs vacated certain sectors due to diminished profitability and challenging working conditions (Kontos, 2007; Strüder, 2003), Kurdish and Turkish entrepreneurs capitalized on these vacancies to establish their presence:

Germans have left the construction industry, car repairing, hairdressing and all the outskirts/slum crafts. They left these to us. Germans do not do these jobs [...]. Our people deal with some of these jobs, and we do them better (Interview 37, aged 40, male, Essen).

These historical interactions shed light on the mechanisms through which Kurdish and Turkish migrants, and their descendants have established similar ethnic and migrant entrepreneurship and economies in Germany and the UK, despite the different institutional and social contexts. Therefore, this study enriches existing scholarship (Antwi Bosiakoh, 2017 & 2019; Koning & Verver, 2013; Peters, 2002) by conducting new field investigations and advocating a historically contextualised opportunity structure that incorporates transnational, institutional, and social dimensions.

5.2 Entrepreneurs and Their Transnational Linkages

In addition to historical processes, the opportunity structure of MEA for ethnic/migrant entrepreneurship among Kurdish and Turkish migrants and their descendants has been shaped

7. In Germany, shopping hour regulations, established in 1956, were amended in 1996 to extend weekday closing times until 8 pm (previously 6:30 pm) and Saturdays until 4 pm (previously 2 pm). Saturday closing hours were further extended to 8 pm in 2003 (DW, 2004). Similarly, in the UK, regulations from the 1950s prohibiting retail activities on Sundays and mandating early closures by 8 pm were lifted in 1994, allowing for extended shopping hours (Barrett & McEvoy, 2007).
8. For Kurdish and Turkish migrants, this entry into various sectors represented not only the utilization of employment opportunities but also the rediscovery or revitalization of artisanal skills, as many had previously engaged in similar occupations in their countries of origin (Kontos, 2007).
9. An illustration of this is provided by a cafe-restaurant owner (Interview 15, aged 48, female, London) who recounted working as a factory employee for 20 years. As the factories started closing or moving abroad, she and her partner, who also had factory employment experience, utilized their savings along with a bank loan to establish their business.

by their transnational connections, given that they are recognised as a prominent transnational community in Western Europe (Light, 2007; Pécoud, 2002).

As suggested by transnational entrepreneurship scholars (Bagwell, 2018; Solano, 2016 & 2020; Yamamura & Lassalle, 2022), entrepreneurial activities often extend beyond national borders, facilitated by cross-border networks, family ties, and market opportunities. The entrepreneurs in this study engaged in various transnational activities, such as forming cross-border networks, sourcing goods and services, and maintaining client relations across countries (also defined by Yamamura & Lassalle, 2022), as well as making investments abroad. These activities align with the concept of multifocal embeddedness (Solano, 2020), demonstrating how migrants are simultaneously embedded in the socio-economic contexts of destination societies, and in transnational networks that provide access to resources, labour, and markets. The interdependence between local urban economies and transnational linkages challenges conventional notions of bounded opportunity structures.

Investment abroad represents first aspect of the transnational engagement of Kurdish and Turkish entrepreneurs since, as illustrated in Table A1, a total of 16 entrepreneurs across Germany and the UK have been involved in investments abroad. Certain enterprises maintain franchise agreements with entities from abroad, while others opt to invest in enterprises or establish branch offices in Turkey or other countries:

I want to open many branches and work everywhere, not only in Germany but throughout Europe” (Interview 21, aged 45, male, Gelsenkirchen).

I invested in Turkey, and I still do. We utilize our savings there. I have brought some savings from Turkey to the UK, and I have also transferred some from here to there. So, there is a cross-border interaction (Interview 18, aged 49, male, London).

Sourcing activities constitute the second facet of the transnational involvement of these entrepreneurs. As depicted in Table A1, a collective of 13 entrepreneurs spanning Germany and the UK engage in the procurement of resources from overseas. They have established links with Turkey and various other countries to import crucial human resources, commodities, and services since the inception of ethnic economies up to the present:

For the past three decades, our restaurants have consistently sourced supplies from the same wholesaler based in Turkey. Some of our meat, fish, vegetables and food requirements are supplied from Turkey and some from the UK and other countries (Interview 45, aged 31, male, London).

Therefore, Turkey serves as a primary source of essential products, services, human resources, capital, and know-how for Kurdish and Turkish entrepreneurs in both Germany and the UK, while Germany also functions as a vital supplier for Kurdish and Turkish entrepreneurs in the UK. Some entrepreneurs finance their initial capital expenditures by either selling properties or obtaining loans from relatives based in Turkey. Furthermore, they engage family members brought from Turkey through the family reunification scheme as employees or unpaid family workers in ethnic economies:

My father and siblings were in Germany. My mother and I came later. Three months after my father brought me to Germany, we opened this supermarket as

a family business in 1993. There are three of us working here, but when things get busy, for example on weekends, six of us work together, including our wives (Interview 2, aged 48, male, Duisburg).

In addition to employing family members and relatives, their labour needs are met through exploitation of asylum seekers and undocumented migrants from Turkey, facilitated by social networks within the ethnic community:

The Turkish businessperson is aware that the Turkish refugee will not be able to find a job with decent working conditions in the market. They exploit these employees as much as they can (Interview 26, aged 43, male, London).

The third aspect of the transnational engagement of these entrepreneurs involves their relationships with customers across borders. Ethnic/migrant entrepreneurs are also positioned as intermediaries for local enterprises (Oviatt & McDougall, 2005) and customers between Turkey, Germany and the UK. As outlined in Table A1, a group of 17 entrepreneurs operating in both Germany and the UK participate in the sale of products or services to customers in other countries:

We were doing well in our doner production factory in Dortmund. We sold an average of 60-80 tons of doner per month. 20 tons were sent to Austria, 10-12 tons to Italy, 8-10 tons to France, and the rest were distributed within Germany (Interview 30, aged 62, male, Gelsenkirchen).

The cross-border networks of these entrepreneurs represent the last dimension of their transnational connections (Drori et al., 2009). Over the past 20 years of government in Turkey, economic ties between the Sunni Turkish community and Islamic capitalists in Europe, particularly in Germany, have strengthened considerably. As shown in Table A1, many entrepreneurs across Germany and the UK benefit from these economic networking channels, primarily through familial and relative connections: "I export automotive components from here to Turkey, necessitating a network of customers to facilitate this commerce" (Interview 48, aged 30, male, London).

I already have a big circle here... I know Turkey, France, Switzerland, Austria and all states of Germany, so I have a business circle in all of these places (Interview 13, aged 63, male, Essen).

Besides, Kurds and Alevi individuals in both countries forge transnational connections through their ethnic and religious affiliations. They participate in the cross-border networks, often using cheap travel and the internet, which enables them to acquire the resources, expertise, customers and information necessary to set up and operate their businesses (Drori et al., 2009):

I don't have a workplace. I work in health tourism online, where I facilitate connections between individuals in the UK and healthcare institutions in Turkey, earning a commission for my services (Interview 44, aged 30, male, London).

Furthermore, the migration trajectories of Kurdish and Turkish entrepreneurs often involved multi-stage journeys, particularly from Turkey to Germany, and later from Germany

to the UK. These trajectories, shaped by asylum policies, community networks, and urban settlement patterns, facilitated the transfer of economic capital, know-how, and social networks across borders. Germany's established Kurdish and Turkish ethnic economies served as a springboard for entrepreneurial ventures in the UK, exemplifying the transnational transfer of social and human capital (Drori et al., 2009). The route through Germany, where a self-sufficient ethnic economy had been established, provided these entrepreneurs with market insights, migrant expertise, and operational know-how, as well as the economic capital and human resources necessary to initiate businesses in the UK.

The UK, known for its relatively liberal policies compared to continental European countries, has historically been a preferred destination for Kurdish and Alevi individuals from Turkey (Kesici, 2021). The ongoing discrimination and racism faced by Kurds and Alevis in Turkey (Yonucu, 2022 & 2024) have forced many of these individuals to seek asylum in other countries, including Germany. However, even there, they often struggle to find a place where they can settle down. This stems from their discomfort in Germany, where the immigrant population is predominantly Sunni-Turkish, and the environment is less hospitable for Kurdish and Alevi individuals (Kesici, 2023). Furthermore, the predominantly Turkish Cypriot population in their ethnic enclave in the UK has shown them greater hospitality (Kesici, 2021; Strüder, 2003). As per my field study findings, 6 of the entrepreneur participants, along with certain parents of descendant participants, had previously worked in Germany before relocating to the UK:

My mother has two brothers in Germany. My parents came here with their encouragement. While Germany was not open to refugees at that time, the UK was more open. My parents went to Germany first, worked there and one of my mother's brothers drove them from Germany to here [the UK] by his car (Interview 59, aged 38, male, London).

These findings support the calls of Price & Chacko (2009), Solano et al. (2022) and Wahlbeck (2018) to expand the MEA framework to include multifocality, cross-border mobility and transnational social fields. Embedding transnational perspectives in the MEA framework provides a richer understanding of how urban ethnic economies are sustained and reproduced across national contexts.

6 Conclusion: Towards A Historically and Transnationally Expanded Mixed Embeddedness Approach

This paper examines the ethnic/migrant entrepreneurial activities of Kurdish and Turkish migrants and their descendants in Germany and the UK, exploring these dynamics through the lens of MEA (Kloosterman et al., 1999). The analysis reveals how distinct institutional contexts, market structures and welfare regimes in both countries, as well as the differing migration histories, ethnic and religious identities, and demographic profiles of migrants and their descendants, influence entrepreneurial activities. Despite these differences, the study reveals that comparable forms of entrepreneurship and ethnic economies have emerged among these groups within different national contexts.

While MEA has long served as a flexible and dynamic framework for analysing migrant entrepreneurship (Kloosterman & Rath, 2018), this study contends that institutional and social embeddedness alone do not sufficiently account for the parallel entrepreneurial trajectories

observed in Germany and the UK. Rather, the findings reveal that the opportunity structure envisaged by the MEA for Kurdish and Turkish entrepreneurship in Germany and the UK was historically influenced by factors such as neoliberal restructuring, deindustrialisation, economic crises, migrant unemployment, geographical concentration, access to sufficient start-up capital and evolving migrant needs during the 1970s and 1980s. Furthermore, the findings emphasise that this opportunity structure has been shaped by the transnational activities of these entrepreneurs, including investing in other countries, sourcing and importing from external markets, and establishing customer relations and networks abroad.

The aforementioned historical and transnational aspects have been investigated separately within the MEA literature. While some studies (Antwi Bosiakoh, 2017 & 2019; Koning & Verver, 2013; Peters, 2002) emphasize the importance of a historical perspective, others (Bagwell, 2018; Solano, 2016 & 2020; Yamamura & Lassalle, 2022) argue for the incorporation of transnational elements into MEA. However, this study demonstrates the necessity of combining these perspectives with the primary institutional and social contexts. Advocating for a historically and transnationally contextualized MEA, alongside its established institutional and social dimensions, it offers a more comprehensive analytical framework.

Moreover, this study affirms the ongoing importance of MEA as an evolving analytical tool that benefits from theoretical refinement, rather than as a static framework. Rather than dismissing MEA as superfluous, the study demonstrates that it can be conceptually strengthened by incorporating historically grounded and transnationally oriented perspectives. Furthermore, by introducing a processual dimension that considers how opportunity structures and embeddedness evolve over time and across borders, this paper enhances the analytical utility of MEA. Thus, the study proposes a historically contextualized, transnationally embedded MEA that remains responsive to the dynamic realities of migrant entrepreneurship in contemporary urban settings. Therefore, this approach aligns with recent reinterpretations of MEA (Kloosterman & Rath, 2018; Storti, 2018) and contributes empirically to its evolving scope. This refined conceptualization is intended to support future research seeking deeper insights into migrant/ethnic entrepreneurship, as well as assisting policymakers in designing more effective, context-sensitive interventions.

References

- Adam, H. (2015). Xenophobia, Asylum Seekers, and Immigration Policies in Germany. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 21(4), 446–464. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13537113.2015.1095528>
- Antwi Bosiakoh, T. (2017). *Mixed Embeddedness and Nigerian Immigrants' Informal Entrepreneurship in Ghana*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Macquarie University, Sydney.
- Antwi Bosiakoh, T. (2019). Historicized Mixed Embeddedness in West African Immigrants' Economic Activities in Ghana. *Journal of African Political Economy and Development*, 4(1), 22–50. <https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC-1d8735c7d2>
- Bagwell, S. (2018). From Mixed Embeddedness to Transnational Mixed Embeddedness. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 24(1), 104–120. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijeb-01-2017-0035>

- Barberis, E., & Solano, G. (2018). Mixed Embeddedness and Migrant Entrepreneurship: Hints on Past and Future Directions. An Introduction. *Sociologica*, 12(2), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1971-8853/8617>
- Barrett, G.A., & McEvoy, D. (2007). Temporal and Geographical Variations in Ethnic Minority Business: Thirty Years of Research in the United Kingdom. In L.P. Dana (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Ethnic Minority Entrepreneurship: A Co-evolutionary View on Resource Management* (pp. 337–359). Cheltenham/Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781847209962.00030>
- Berger, S. (2019). Industrial Heritage and the Ambiguities of Nostalgia for an Industrial Past in the Ruhr Valley, Germany. *Labor: Studies in Working-Class History*, 16(1), 37–64. <https://doi.org/10.1215/15476715-7269314>
- Cain, T., & Spoonley, P. (2013). Making It Work: The Mixed Embeddedness of Immigrant Entrepreneurs in New Zealand. *IZA Discussion Papers*, No. 7332. Bonn. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2250331>
- Dheer, R.J. (2018). Entrepreneurship by Immigrants: A Review of Existing Literature and Directions for Future Research. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 14, 555–614. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-018-0506-7>
- Drori, I., Honig, B., & Wright, M. (2009). Transnational Entrepreneurship: An Emergent Field of Study. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(5), 1001–1022. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2009.00332.x>
- DW (Deutsche Welle) (2004). High Court Rejects Liberalizing Store Hours. June 9. <https://www.dw.com/en/high-court-rejects-liberalizing-store-hours/a-1231041>. Accessed: 10 May 2022.
- Edwards, P., Ram, M., Jones, T., & Doldor, S. (2016). New Migrant Businesses and Their Workers: Developing, but Not Transforming, the Ethnic Economy. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 39(9), 1587–1617. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2015.1116702>
- Haasler, S.R. (2020). The German System of Vocational Education and Training: Challenges of Gender, Academisation and the Integration of Low-achieving Youth. *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research*, 26(1), 57–71. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1024258919898115>
- Hamnett, C. (2004). *Unequal City: London in the Global Arena*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203580240>
- Harding, A.J., & Pritchard, C. (2016). UK and Twenty Comparable Countries GDP-expenditure-on-health 1980–2013: The Historic and Continued Low Priority of UK Health-related Expenditure. *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*, 5(9), 519–523. <https://doi.org/10.15171/ijhpm.2016.93>
- Hiebert, D. (2002). Economic Associations of Immigrant Self-employment in Canada. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 8(1–2), 93–112. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13552550210423777>

- Jones, T., Ram, M., Edwards, P., Kiselinchev, A., & Muchenje, L. (2014). Mixed Embeddedness and New Migrant Enterprise in the UK. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 26(5–6), 500–520. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2014.950697>
- Kesici, M.R. (2016). Londra’da Türkiyeli Göçmenlerin Emek Piyasalarında Ayrımcılık Deneyim ve Algıları. *Göç Dergisi*, 3(2), 261–281. <https://doi.org/10.33182/gd.v3i2.582>
- Kesici, M.R. (2020). The Visibility of an Invisible Community’s Labour Exploitation in an Ethnic Economy: A Comparative Study on Kurdish Movers in the United Kingdom. *Migration Letters*, 17(3), 461–470. <https://doi.org/10.33182/ml.v17i3.844>
- Kesici, M.R. (2021). The History of Migration from Turkey to Western Europe: A Multi-theoretical Analysis of the Routes to Germany and the United Kingdom. *Border Crossing*, 11(2), 175–192. <https://doi.org/10.33182/bc.v11i2.1539>
- Kesici, M.R. (2022). Labour Market Segmentation within Ethnic Economies: The Ethnic Penalty for Invisible Kurdish Migrants in the United Kingdom. *Work, Employment and Society*, 36(2), 328–344. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09500170211034761>
- Kesici, M.R. (2023). Avrupa Emek Piyasalarında Kürt Diasporasının Konumu. In A. Işık, G. Kılıçaslan, B. Hiroğlu, K. Sağır & C. Kurt (Eds.), *Kürtler ve Cumhuriyet* (pp. 751–760). Ankara: Dipnot Publishing.
- Kesici, M.R. (2025). Economic Impact of Ethnic and Cultural Identities: The Role of Multiple and Hybrid Identities Among Kurdish and Turkish Migrants and Their Descendants in Germany. *Social Currents*, 12(4), 389–409. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23294965251356283>
- Kloosterman, R. (2010). Matching Opportunities with Resources: A Framework for Analysing (Migrant) Entrepreneurship from a Mixed Embeddedness Perspective. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 22(1), 25–45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08985620903220488>
- Kloosterman, R., & Rath, J. (2001). Immigrant Entrepreneurs in Advanced Economies: Mixed Embeddedness further Explored. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 27(2), 189–201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691830123940>
- Kloosterman, R., & Rath, J. (2018). Mixed Embeddedness Revisited: A Conclusion to the Symposium. *Sociologica*, 12(2), 103–114. <https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1971-8853/8625>
- Kloosterman, R., Van Der Leun, J., & Rath, J. (1999). Mixed Embeddedness: (In)formal Economic Activities and Immigrant Businesses in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 23(2), 252–266. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.00194>
- Knapp, W., Kunzmann, K.R., & Schmitt, P. (2004). A Cooperative Spatial Future for Rhein-Ruhr. *European Planning Studies*, 12(3), 323–349. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0965431042000195047>
- Koning, J., & Verver, M. (2013). Historicizing the “Ethnic” in Ethnic Entrepreneurship: The Case of the Ethnic Chinese in Bangkok. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 25(5–6), 325–348. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2012.729090>
- Kontos, M. (2007). Immigrant Entrepreneurs in Germany. In L.P. Dana (Ed.). *Handbook of Research on Ethnic Minority Entrepreneurship: A Co-evolutionary View on Resource Man-*

- agement (pp. 445–463). Cheltenham/Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781847209962.00037>
- Korber, M. (2019). Does Vocational Education Give a Labour Market Advantage over the Whole Career? A Comparison of the United Kingdom and Switzerland. *Social Inclusion*, 7(3), 202–223. <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v7i3.2030>
- Kushnirovich, N. (2015). Economic Integration of Immigrant Entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, 3(3), 9–27. <https://doi.org/10.15678/eber.2015.030302>
- Leung, M.W. (2002). From Four-course Peking Duck to Take-away Singapore Rice. An Inquiry into the Dynamics of the Ethnic Chinese Catering Business in Germany. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 8(1–2), 134–147. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13552550210423769>
- Leung, M.W. (2007). Migrant Entrepreneurship in Germany. In L.P. Dana (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Ethnic Minority Entrepreneurship: A Co-evolutionary View on Resource Management* (pp. 464–487). Cheltenham/Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781847209962.00038>
- Light, I. (2007). Global Entrepreneurship and Transnationalism. In L.P. Dana (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Ethnic Minority Entrepreneurship: A Co-evolutionary View on Resource Management* (pp. 3–15). Cheltenham/Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781847209962.00007>
- Light, I., & Gold, S.J. (2000). *Ethnic Economies*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- London Datastore (2015). *London Borough Profiles*. <http://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/london-borough-profiles>. Accessed 10 May 2015.
- Miera, F. (2008). Transnational Strategies of Polish Migrant Entrepreneurs in Trade and Small Business in Berlin. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 34(5), 753–770. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691830802106010>
- Musterd, S., Ostendorf, W., & Breebaart, M. (2013). *Multi-Ethnic Metropolis: Patterns and Policies* (2nd ed., E. de Haas, Trans.). Dordrecht: Springer Science & Business Media. (Original work published 1998).
- Office for National Statistics. (2011). Census 2011. Retrieved June 5, 2021, from <https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/2011census>
- Oviatt, B.M., & McDougall, P.P. (2005). Defining International Entrepreneurship and Modeling the Speed of Internationalization. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(5), 537–553. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2005.00097.x>
- Panayiotopoulos, P. (2010). *Ethnicity, Migration and Enterprise*. London: Palgrave-Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230290501>
- Pécoud, A. (2002). “Weltoffenheit schafft Jobs”: Turkish Entrepreneurship and Multiculturalism in Berlin. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 26(3), 494–507. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.00395>

- Peters, N. (2002). Mixed Embeddedness. Does It Really Explain Immigrant Enterprise in Western Australia (WA)? *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 8(1–2), 32–53. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13552550210423705>
- Price, M., & Chacko, E. (2009). The Mixed Embeddedness of Ethnic Entrepreneurs in a New Immigrant Gateway. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 7(3), 328–346. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15562940903150105>
- Pütz, R., Schreiber, V., & Welp, I. (2007). Ethnicity, Gender and Entrepreneurship: Turkish Entrepreneurs in Germany. In L.P. Dana (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Ethnic Minority Entrepreneurship: A Co-evolutionary View on Resource Management* (pp. 488–510). Cheltenham/Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781847209962.00039>
- Ram, M., Jones, T., & Villares-Varela, M. (2017). Migrant Entrepreneurship: Reflections on Research and Practice. *International Small Business Journal*, 35(1), 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242616678051>
- Regionalstatistik Ruhr (2018), Bevölkerung. <https://www.rvr.ruhr/daten-digitales/regionalstatistik/bevoelkerung/>. Accessed 11 June 2018.
- Rusert, K., & Stein, M. (2023). Chances and Discrimination in Dual Vocational Training of Refugees and Immigrants in Germany. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 75(1), 109–129. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13636820.2022.2148118>
- Slaven, M., Casella Colombeau, S., & Badenhoop, E. (2021). What Drives the Immigration-Welfare Policy Link? Comparing Germany, France and the United Kingdom. *Comparative Political Studies*, 54(5), 855–888. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414020957674>
- Solano, G. (2016). Multifocal Entrepreneurial Practices: The Case of Moroccan Import/Export Businesses in Milan. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 29(2), 176–198. <https://doi.org/10.1504/ijesb.2016.078698>
- Solano, G. (2020). The Mixed Embeddedness of Transnational Migrant Entrepreneurs: Moroccans in Amsterdam and Milan. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46(10), 2067–2085. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1559999>
- Solano, G., Schutjens, V., & Rath, J. (2022). Multifocality and Opportunity Structure: Towards a Mixed Embeddedness Model for Transnational Migrant Entrepreneurship. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 10(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-021-00270-0>
- Statistisches Bundesamt. (2011). *Zensus 2011*. Retrieved June 5, 2021, from <https://www.zensus2011.de>
- Storti, L. (2014). Being an Entrepreneur: Emergence and Structuring of Two Immigrant Entrepreneur Groups. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 26(7–8), 521–545. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2014.959067>
- Storti, L. (2018). Deepening the Liaison: Mixed Embeddedness and Economic Sociology. *Sociologica*, 12(2), 23–37. <https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1971-8853/8618>

- Strüder, I.R. (2003). Do Concepts of Ethnic Economies Explain Existing Minority Enterprises? The Turkish Speaking Economies in London. *Research Papers in Environment & Spatial Analysis Series, No. 88*. London: London School of Economics.
- Wacquant, L., Slater, T., & Pereira, V.B. (2014). Territorial Stigmatization in Action. *Environment and Planning A*, 46(6), 1270–1280. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a4606ge>
- Wahlbeck, O. (2013). Mixed Embeddedness and the Dynamic of Self-Employment among Turkish Immigrants in Finland. *Polish Sociological Review*, 184(4), 487–503. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24371564>
- Wahlbeck, O. (2018). Combining Mixed Embeddedness and Transnationalism: The Utilization of Social Resources among Turkish Migrant Entrepreneurs. *Sociologica*, 12(2), 73–86. <https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1971-8853/8623>
- Waldinger, R.D., Aldrich, H., & Ward, R. (1990). *Ethnic Entrepreneurs: Immigrant Business in Industrial Societies* Newbury Park, CA/London/New Delhi: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Wilson, K.L., & Portes, A. (1980). Immigrant Enclaves: An Enalysis of the Labor Market Experiences of Cubans in Miami. *American Journal of Sociology*, 86(2), 295–319. <https://doi.org/10.1086/227240>
- Yamamura, S., & Lassalle, P. (2022). Extending Mixed Embeddedness to a Multi-Dimensional Concept of Transnational Entrepreneurship. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 10(1), 14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-022-00288-y>
- Yonucu, D. (2022). *Police, Provocation, Politics: Counterinsurgency in Istanbul*. Ithaca, NY/London: Cornell University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7591/cornell/9781501762154.001.0001>
- Yonucu, D. (2024). Sectarianism as Racism: The Collective Punishment of Alevi Communities in Turkey. *Race & Class*, 65(3), 47–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03063968231205144>

Appendix

Table A1: Entrepreneurial Profiles and Transnational Engagements of Participants

Location and Interview Number	Occupation, Generation and Gender	Sector of Entrepreneurial Activity	Factory Work Experience	Migration Experience	Transnational Connections
DE*, 1	EP*, Descendant, M*	Catering, security, consultancy	No	No	Investment, sourcing
DE*, 2	EP*, Migrant, M*	Retail	No	Germany	Sourcing, networks
DE*, 3	EE*, Migrant, M*	Marketing, cleaning	Yes	Germany, Italy	Customers, networks
DE*, 5	EP*, Migrant, M*	Consultancy	Yes	Germany	Customers
DE*, 6	EP*, Migrant, M*	Health	No	Germany	Customers
DE*, 7	EP*, Migrant, M*	Tourism	Yes	Germany	Investment, customers, networks
DE*, 8	EP*, Descendant, F*	Catering	Yes	No	No
DE*, 13	EP*, Migrant, M*	Marketing	No	Germany	Customers, networks
DE*, 14	EE*, Descendant, F*	Garment	Yes	No	Sourcing
DE*, 18	WE*, Migrant, F*	Catering	No	Germany	No
DE*, 21	EP*, Migrant, M*	Gardening	Yes	Germany	Investment, customers
DE*, 25	EP*, Migrant, M*	Construction	Yes	Germany	No
DE*, 30	EP*, Migrant, M*	Food, garment	Yes	Germany	Sourcing, networks
DE*, 32	WE*, Descendant, F*	Consultancy	No	No	Customers
DE*, 37	EP*, Migrant, M*	Catering	No	Germany	Investment
DE*, 38	EP*, Migrant, F*	Hairdressing	Yes	Germany	No
DE*, 39	EP*, Migrant, M*	Photography, IT	Yes	Germany	Customers, networks
UK*, 1	WE*, Migrant, M*	Construction	Yes	UK, Germany	Investment
UK*, 3	EP*, Migrant, M*	Cleaning	Yes	UK	Investment
UK*, 7	EP*, Migrant, M*	Retail	Yes	UK	Sourcing
UK*, 15	EP*, Migrant, F*	Catering	Yes	UK	Sourcing
UK*, 16	EP*, Migrant, F*	Catering	No	UK	No

Location and Interview Number	Occupation, Generation and Gender	Sector of Entrepreneurial Activity	Factory Work Experience	Migration Experience	Transnational Connections
UK*, 17	EP*, Migrant, F*	Consultancy	Yes	UK, Germany	Sourcing, networks
UK*, 18	EP*, Migrant, M*	Manufacturing	Yes	UK	Investment, customers
UK*, 19	EP*, Migrant, M*	Consultancy	No	UK	Customers
UK*, 20	EP*, Migrant, M*	Construction	Yes	UK, Canada	Investment
UK*, 21	EP*, Migrant, F*	Consultancy	No	UK	No
UK*, 23	EP*, Migrant, M*	Catering	Yes	UK	Investment
UK*, 24	EP*, Migrant, F*	Retail	No	UK	Sourcing
UK*, 25	EP*, Migrant, M*	Catering	Yes	UK, Germany	Investment, sourcing
UK*, 26	EP*, Migrant, M*	Retail	No	UK	Investment, sourcing
UK*, 27	EE*, Migrant, M*	Catering	Yes	UK, Hungary	Investment, sourcing
UK*, 29	EE*, Migrant, F*	Media	No	UK	Customers, networks
UK*, 31	EE*, Descendant, M*	Cleaning	No	No	No
UK*, 42	EP*, Migrant, M*	Catering	No	UK, Cyprus	Investment
UK*, 43	EP*, Migrant, M*	Catering	No	UK, Germany	Networks
UK*, 44	WE*, Migrant, M*	Consultancy	No	UK	Customers, networks
UK*, 45	EP*, Descendant, M*	Catering, health, hairdressing, IT	No	Germany	Investment, sourcing, networks
UK*, 48	WE*, Migrant, M*	Retail	No	UK	Customers, networks
UK*, 49	EP*, Migrant, M*	Retail	Yes	UK, Germany	Investment, sourcing, networks
UK*, 51	EE*, Migrant, M*	Manufacturing, catering, retail	Yes	UK, Cyprus	Investment, customers, networks
UK*, 53	EP*, Descendant, M*	Consultancy	No	No	Customers
UK*, 54	EE*, Migrant, M*	Manufacturing	Yes	UK	No

Location and Interview Number	Occupation, Generation and Gender	Sector of Entrepreneurial Activity	Factory Work Experience	Migration Experience	Transnational Connections
UK*, 58	EP*, Descendant, F*	Consultancy, media	No	Cyprus, Turkey	Customers, networks
UK*, 59	EP*, Descendant, F*	Catering	Yes	No	Networks
UK*, 60	WE*, Descendant, F*	Consultancy	No	No	Customers

*: DE: Germany; EE: Experienced Entrepreneurship; EP: Entrepreneur; F: Female; M: Male; UK: United Kingdom; WE: Worker and Entrepreneur.

Mehmet Rauf Kesici – School of Business & Economics, Freie Universität Berlin (Germany)

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9849-6029> | ✉ rauf.kesici@fu-berlin.de

 <https://www.wiwiss.fu-berlin.de/en/fachbereich/vwl/schoeb/lehrstuhl/team/DFG-Researcher/index.html>

Mehmet Rauf Kesici is an Associate Professor of Social Policy and Labour Economics. He is Guest Researcher at the School of Business & Economics at Freie Universität Berlin in Germany. His research focuses on ethnic economies, ethnic and migrant entrepreneurship, forced migration, migrant and descendant labour, migrant identities and networks, and migration and integration policies. His work has been published in various journals such as *Work, Employment and Society* and *Social Currents*.