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Structured Abstract

Purpose: The aim of this paper is to provide novel insights into how the cosmopolitan mindset 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
effects caused by globalization, as they need to identify and understand the social agents
who can take on the role of catalysts of public reforms.

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

**Keywords:** Cosmopolitanism, capital accumulation, migrant entrepreneurship, ethnic
minority, world citizenship, globalization
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 interested 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
ability to envisage opportunities associated with a new product or service and to develop
creative solutions for a given problem. As a result, migrant entrepreneurs may be regarded as
‘rule breakers’, contributing to a change in the environment to which they move (De Clercq
and Voronov, 2009b). At the same time, these individuals often bring with them different
values, understandings and beliefs that may promote institutional change (Kraatz and Moore,
2002). By introducing certain cultural attributes in the hosting community, migrant
entrepreneurs may act as ‘carriers’ of cosmopolitan principles (Woodward et al., 2008).
Taken together, these traits suggest that migrant entrepreneurs display what Emirbayer and
Mische (1998) call ‘projective agency’ – the capacity to picture a particular future and to
work toward its achievement. As such, these organizational actors may be viewed as
‘institutional entrepreneurs’ (DiMaggio, 1988).[2]

In an attempt to shed light on the role of migrant entrepreneurs as agents of
cosmopolitan transformation, this study examines under what conditions these actors are
more likely to engage in institutional change. Drawing on Bourdieu’s (1986, 1998) theory of
capital, we develop a conceptual framework that shows how the economic, cultural, social
and symbolic forms of capital accumulated and deployed by migrant entrepreneurs affect
their engagement in cosmopolitan change. As we will demonstrate, Bourdieu’s (1986, 1998)
argument that individual practices are shaped by the interplay between the different forms of
capital is well suited to investigating how migrant entrepreneurs can contribute toward a
cosmopolitan mind-set.

This paper makes a number of important contributions. First, our conceptual
framework suggests that there is scope for migrant entrepreneurs to play an important part in
engendering cosmopolitan transformation. Second, the findings of this article help identify
those actors among migrant entrepreneurs that may influence the diffusion of cosmopolitan
ideals, thereby providing policymakers with a better understanding of the agents which can
serve as catalyzers for cosmopolitan change. Third, our contribution could open up new and
stimulating research avenues into how a relatively small number of dispersed organizational
actors can, in fact, bring about cosmopolitan transformation.

The remainder of the manuscript is structured as follows. The next section reviews the
main approaches to cosmopolitanism, key debates and trends which have emerged within the
literature. The body of evidence on migrant entrepreneurship is also examined, where
particular emphasis is placed on the benefits that this type of migration may bring to the host
economy. The usefulness of Bourdieu’s (1986, 1998) theory of capital for explaining actors’
engagement in social practices is discussed within this context. The third section develops a
set of testable propositions relating to how various forms of capital possessed by migrant
entrepreneurs can potentially contribute to cosmopolitan transformation. The fourth section
discusses the implications of our approach, together with its limitations, and offers
suggestions for future research. The final section concludes with a summary of our findings
and some reflections on how the cosmopolitan vision can be attained in today’s globalizing
culture.

Literature review

Cosmopolitanism – concept, debate, trends

The term ‘cosmopolitan’ (from the Greek kosmopolités, i.e. ‘citizen of the world’) can be
traced back to Diogenes of Sinope, one of the founding fathers of the Cynic movement in
Ancient Greece. When asked where he came from, Diogenes used to answer that he was “a
citizen of the world” (Laertius, 1972, Book VI, passage 63). Although world citizenship is at
the very heart of the cosmopolitan project, the contemporary literature uses the word
‘cosmopolitanism’ rather unsystematically, rendering it “an elusive concept with a number of
quite different connotations” (Beck and Grande, 2007, p. 71). Following its introduction in
the 1950s by Gouldner (1957) and Merton (1957), the concept of cosmopolitanism has
observed a renaissance in contemporary thought due to the emergence of global systems. Broadly speaking, Janssens and Steyaert (2012) identify three major perspectives on cosmopolitanism, notably political, cultural and social cosmopolitanism. Political cosmopolitanism deals with matters of global governance, cosmopolitan democracy and political agency in an interconnected world (Maak, 2009). Thus, it refers to world citizenship as a vision toward harmony of humankind in an increasingly interconnected society (Held, 1995). Cultural cosmopolitanism places the spotlight on the diversity of cultures characterizing the modern society and promotes a cultural figure that is capable of appreciating such diversity (Appiah, 2006). Social cosmopolitanism attempts to go beyond a merely cultural assessment of cosmopolitanism and is concerned with the social processes through which cosmopolitanism is produced (Beck, 2004). In light of Beck’s (2008) focus on cosmopolitanization, the latter view of cosmopolitanism is of special relevance to our analysis.

Perhaps as a result of the lack of agreement on what constitutes cosmopolitanism, the debate around the topic has taken place in a variety of fields and considered somewhat heterogeneous questions. Areas as diverse as consumer behavior (Cleveland et al., 2009; Zeugner-Roth et al., 2015), human resource management (Froese et al., 2013; Janssens and Steyaert, 2012), climate change (Dobson, 2005), labor migration (Cohen, 2004) and geographical mobility (Abrahamson, 1965) have been inquired. Theoretical contributions have investigated the compatibility between cosmopolitanism and nationalism (Bowden, 2003; Nussbaum, 1996), the differences between ‘cosmopolitans’ and ‘locals’ (Gouldner, 1957; Hannerz, 1990) and the nature of the moral principles underpinning the cosmopolitan project (Dallmayr, 2003; Waldron, 2010). Empirical work has provided evidence on the implications of cosmopolitanism for organizational innovativeness (Robertson and Wind, 1983), the link between individual values and cosmopolitan allegiance (Bayram, 2015;
Woodward et al., 2008) and the role of cosmopolitanism in predicting job candidates’ expatriation willingness (Froese et al., 2013).

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

Migrant entrepreneurs: a new generation of Diogenes?

International migration represents one of the prominent features of a modern open society (Gorter et al., 1998). For many people, migration offers a possible way of attaining social mobility (Cohen, 2004). The growing rate of self-employed immigrants within the labor market is certainly one among the major effects of migration from a socio-economic standpoint. Recent data by the Centre for Entrepreneurs (2014) shows that 17.2% of UK immigrants have started their own company, as opposed to only 10.4% of people born in Britain. The greater engagement of migrants in entrepreneurial activities has led to the emergence of a new phenomenon known as ‘migrant entrepreneurship’. Once regarded as rarely innovative, low value-added and only marginally profitable (Waldinger, 1996), migrant entrepreneurship is now attracting greater attention where earlier migrant populations have become embedded in society and new more recent migrants arrive into the host country. Started originally in the US (Light, 1972; Waldinger et al., 1990), the debate over the role of migrant entrepreneurs in modern economies soon spread to Western Europe as well as other
For Peer Review

It currently encompasses topics such as ethnic minority entrepreneurship (de Vries et al., 2015), migrants’ propensity to engage in new business creation (Levie, 2007) and first-versus second-generation immigrant entrepreneurs (Beckers and Blumberg, 2013).

Central to the growing interest in migrant entrepreneurship are the considerable benefits it may generate not only for ethnic groups in the urban population but, more generally, for the host economy. By compensating structural imbalances in the host country’s labor market, migrant entrepreneurship is important in creating employment opportunities for migrants and alleviating social tensions (Baycan-Levent and Nijkamp, 2009). Moreover, there is somewhat robust evidence pointing to a positive relationship between the level of entrepreneurship and the economic development of the host country (North and Trln, 2004). Through the establishment of a thriving entrepreneurial environment based on the cultural diversity of its actors, migrant entrepreneurship may also benefit the economic competitiveness of the host region. As Florida (2002) maintains, the location decisions of creative people influence economic development via their impact on innovation levels, business formation and job creation.

Despite the observation that migrant entrepreneurs may indeed contribute to the economic and social well-being of the hosting community, there is a paucity of research attempting to illustrate the role of these entrepreneurs in initiating institutional change. In addition, whilst much of the literature on migrant entrepreneurship highlight human and social capital as major determinants for entering into self-employment (Wilson et al., 2007), virtually no evidence exists on how different forms of capital accumulated and deployed by migrant entrepreneurs affect their engagement in institutional transformation. Yet, the role of migrants as change agents was already acknowledged by Plato (1873, pp. 338–339 – original work written in 348 BC) more than 2000 years ago, when he noted that “the intercourse of cities with one another is apt to create a confusion of manners; strangers are always
suggesting novelties to strangers”. The purpose of this paper is to fill this void by applying Bourdieu’s (1986, 1998) theory of capital to studying the conduct of cosmopolitan change by migrant entrepreneurs.

**Bourdieu’s theory of capital and migrant entrepreneurship**

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

Capital can present itself in three fundamental guises: as **economic capital**, which is immediately and directly convertible into money and may be institutionalized in the form of property rights; as **cultural capital**, which is convertible, on certain conditions, into economic capital and may be institutionalized in the form of educational qualifications; and as **social capital**, made up of social obligations (‘connections’), which is convertible, in certain conditions, into economic capital and may be institutionalized in the form of a title of nobility (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 47, emphasis in original).

Bourdieu (1998) conceptualizes symbolic capital as the amalgam, as well as the situated value, of the other forms of capital that agents possess.
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
approach is particularly appropriate for explaining individuals’ engagement in cosmopolitan change, in that it takes into account the agency of individual actors and how this is shaped by the different forms of capital they possess. By determining the power of migrant entrepreneurs within their social field, the capital accumulated and deployed by this class of entrepreneurs may play a major part in influencing their ability to act as cosmopolitan change agents.

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

\[ RQ \text{. How does the capital endowment of migrant entrepreneurs influence their engagement in cosmopolitan transformation?} \]

Conceptual framework for migrant entrepreneurs

Role of economic capital

According to Bourdieu (1986, p. 54), “economic capital is at the root of all the other types of capital”. Generally conceptualized as a synonym of ‘financial capital’, it includes monetary income and other forms of financial assets. One of the most important features of economic capital is its instrumental role in acquiring other types of capital. A typical example is illustrated by the conversion of economic capital into cultural capital through a validation by the education system in the form of an academic qualification (Bourdieu, 1986). It is quite evident that the creation of economic capital is a critical aspect of the entrepreneurial process (Karatas-Özkan, 2011). As for any other type of organization, ensuring that a sufficient
amount of financial resources is effectively accumulated and deployed is vital for entrepreneurs. This observation appears to be especially true for migrant entrepreneurs, as these may well include individuals with a limited wealth at their disposal who move to another country in the quest for a brighter future. Among migrant entrepreneurs we may find individuals who could not afford prolonged schooling, foreign language courses or memberships to professional bodies, yet they migrated to the host economy with the hope of starting their own business and achieving a better quality of life. In a Bourdieuan sense, these migrants may lack the economic capital necessary to accumulate cultural, social and symbolic capital. In addition, the limited financial assets available to some of these migrant entrepreneurs may prevent them from travelling both within and outside of the host country more frequently, thereby reducing their engagement with other people beyond their ethnic community. In other words, these entrepreneurs may not have the financial means (i.e. the power) for actively ‘consuming’ cultural differences (Thompson and Tambyah, 1999) and being involved with other people in various places elsewhere (Hannerz, 1992). For this reason, we posit that the stock of economic capital possessed by migrant entrepreneurs is a key enabling condition for their ability to accrue other forms of capital and – as a result – their participation in cosmopolitan transformation.

P1. Migrant entrepreneurs endowed with higher economic capital will be more likely to engage in cosmopolitan change.

Role of cultural capital

Cultural capital includes competences such as education, linguistic skills and understanding of the host country’s culture (Al Ariss and Syed, 2011). Bourdieu (1986) contends that cultural capital can take three forms, i.e. embodied, objectified and institutionalized. In the embodied state, cultural capital refers to long-lasting dispositions of an agent’s mind and
body. *Objectified* cultural capital appears in the form of material goods that capture the main cultural values within a given field (e.g. books, dictionaries and machines). In the *institutionalized* form, cultural capital is represented by certifications and other credentials that corroborate certain types of knowledge that are deemed of particular significance within the relevant field. By virtue of its focus on values, norms and beliefs (Bourdieu, 1986), cultural capital is fundamentally different from human capital. As De Clercq and Voronov (2009a, pp. 404-405) submit, “cultural capital derives its value from entrepreneurs’ ability to access and mobilize institutions and cultural products of a society”. The notion of cultural capital is of special interest in relation to migrant entrepreneurship, as international migration can lead to substantial shifts at the cultural level (Cohen, 2004). As people move to a new country, “[t]hey learn the cultural ‘manners’ of their hosts” (Cohen, 2004, p. 148), that is, their customs, gestures and habits. By deciding “on what gets in, and what will be kept out, ignored, explicitly rejected” (Hannerz, 1992, p. 258), these actors may act as important ‘carriers’ (or ‘gatekeepers’) of cosmopolitan values (Woodward *et al*., 2008). At the same time, the ability of migrant entrepreneurs to make their way into the hosting community may be the product of their cultural competence, i.e. their skills of absorbing and managing a particular system of meanings and meaningful forms (Hannerz, 1990).

The cultural capital possessed by this category of entrepreneurs may also shape their openness to cultural differences and their willingness to embrace diversity (Hannerz, 1992; Skrbis *et al*., 2004). For instance, we may expect that a migrant entrepreneur who holds an MBA from a leading business school would have already been exposed to a variety of cultural influences and learnt to think about him/herself collectively, thereby bringing to the host economy some of the core principles underpinning the cosmopolitan movement. Therefore, our next proposition suggests that the contribution of migrant entrepreneurs to fostering the cosmopolitan mind-set depends on their cultural capital.
P2. Migrant entrepreneurs endowed with higher cultural capital will be more likely to engage in cosmopolitan change.

Role of social capital

Social capital is the sum of resources embedded within a network of relationships of “mutual acquaintance and recognition” (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 119). According to Bourdieu (1986), the amount of social capital accumulated by an agent thus reflects the size of his/her network and the volume of (economic, cultural and symbolic) capital possessed by the actors with whom the individual is connected. As a result, the accumulation of social capital is neither naturally nor socially given, but arises from “an unceasing effort of sociability, a continuous series of exchanges in which recognition is endlessly affirmed and reaffirmed” (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 52). The importance of social capital in entrepreneurial processes is now widely acknowledged (Slotte-Kock and Coviello, 2010). Social networks are construed as a linking device, a social platform that may serve as a springboard for engendering change, sustaining growth and shaping the future (Anderson et al., 2010). Besides allowing individuals to capture resources held by others (Ozcan and Eisenhardt, 2009), networks operate as a governing mechanism to generate meanings and identities (Jack et al., 2008).

The creation of effective networks of social relations is of greatest concern to migrant entrepreneurs, as testified by the extensive use of ethnic-based networks to gain access to different resources (Rauch, 2001). Notwithstanding the contribution of co-ethnic markets to the survival of migrant entrepreneurs, researchers agree that these entrepreneurs need to obtain access to mainstream markets if they are to ensure the long-term sustainability of their businesses (Waldinger et al., 1990). By extending their social networks beyond their co-ethnic community, migrant entrepreneurs may develop a mind-set in which place becomes increasingly less relevant (Halsall, 2009) and the world is conceived of as one network of
social relationships (Hannerz, 1990). This may be particularly true for migrant entrepreneurs whose endowment of economic capital provides them with the power to build a social network that spans beyond national boundaries, since they may have a better appreciation of the value of diversity and a greater sense of belonging to a world community. As a consequence, these individuals have the potential to take on the role of ‘champions’ in orchestrating collective action among other entrepreneurs toward cosmopolitan transformation. It follows from this observation that the extent to which migrant entrepreneurs act as agents of cosmopolitan change reflects the amount of social capital they possess.

P3. Migrant entrepreneurs endowed with higher social capital will be more likely to engage in cosmopolitan change.

Role of symbolic capital

The notion of symbolic capital identifies the reflected power gained or inherited by individual agents by way of their accumulation and deployment of any other form of capital (Bourdieu, 1998). As Everett (2002) maintains, symbolic capital embodies the ability to use and control ‘soft’ resources such as language, writing and myth. Therefore, symbolic power can be dispensed without words, through the adoption of physical symbols, gestures and behaviors. Within the field of entrepreneurship, it has been suggested that capital in its symbolic form encompasses the capacity to impose entrepreneurs’ interpretations on those of others (Calhoun, 2003), the potential for wealth creation through a new venture (Beaver, 2003) or the ability to establish legitimacy and credibility as an entrepreneur (Karatas-Özkan, 2011). Bourdieu’s (1998) concept of symbolic capital offers an important lens for studying the contribution of migrant entrepreneurs to the diffusion of cosmopolitanism. Given their exposure to a community different from the one where they were born, migrant entrepreneurs
may experience continuous tensions between the values they bring into the host country and
the culture permeating the environment in which they are embedded. Accordingly, we argue
that the cosmopolitan identity of this group of migrants is shaped by a dynamic process of
self-discovery and self-enhancement in which their body plays a key role. As Molz (2006)
demonstrates with respect to round-the-world travelers, the body can become culturally
flexible through the use of certain clothes and accessories, thus moving through different
places in an adaptive manner. In this sense, migrant entrepreneurs may gain symbolic power
by incorporating elements of both the home- and host-country into their body language, thus
possibly influencing their ability to act as conduits for the transmission of cosmopolitan
ideals. As a result, our last proposition postulates that the role of migrant entrepreneurs in
bringing about cosmopolitan transformation may also be determined by their level of
symbolic capital.

\[P4.\text{ Migrant entrepreneurs endowed with higher symbolic capital will be more}\]
\[\text{likely to engage in cosmopolitan change.}\]

[Insert Table I here]

Table I summarizes the propositions underpinning our conceptual framework. Taken
together, our findings show that the agency of migrant entrepreneurs in bringing about
cosmopolitan change is framed by the different forms of capital they possess. By shaping the
power of this group of migrants within their social field, the economic, cultural, social and
symbolic forms of capital accumulated and deployed by these agents act as a key enabling
condition for their engagement in cosmopolitan transformation. Therefore, we conclude that
the migrant entrepreneurs who are more likely to foster the cosmopolitan mind-set are those
endowed with larger financial assets, greater cultural competences, broader networks of
social relationships and a better ability to employ physical symbols, behaviors as well as gestures.

Discussion

Our conceptual framework suggests that there is scope for the migrant entrepreneur to initiate and sustain cosmopolitan change. Specifically, this individual’s ability to act as a catalyzer of cosmopolitan transformation is affected by the economic, cultural, social and symbolic capital he/she possesses. For instance, we would expect a migrant entrepreneur with greater financial resources, a longer period of education, wider social networks and a better ability to incorporate elements of the home- and host-country into his/her body language to be more likely to act as a catalyzer of cosmopolitan change.[3] This notwithstanding, the role that this group of social agents may play in fostering the cosmopolitan mind-set could be more fully grasped if one looks at its collective dimension (Battilana et al., 2009). As some studies indicate (e.g. Lounsbury and Crumley, 2007), the process of institutional change might be the result of “unintended actions of ordinary actors who break with institutionalized practices without being aware of doing so” (Battilana et al., 2009, p. 89). Consistent with this view is the observation that institutional transformation might be a collective phenomenon that involves a multitude of spatially dispersed actors with varying types and levels of resources (Lounsbury and Crumley, 2007). As a result, cosmopolitan change may not be ascribed to any single migrant entrepreneur, but instead originate from a myriad of divergent actions by this group of agents. Together, migrant entrepreneurs endowed with larger capital may act as ‘institution reformers’ (Riddle and Brinkerhoff, 2011) and promote the cosmopolitan mind-set by influencing the incentives, beliefs and behaviors of those embedded in well-accepted traditional institutions. In other words, migrant entrepreneurs might mobilize – either consciously or unconsciously – their economic, cultural, social and symbolic capital to secure endorsement by other agents and facilitate the attainment of cosmopolitan transformation.
This paper provides an important contribution at the social dimension, that is, the diffusion of cosmopolitan values at a time of a highly interconnected world. The primary implication of our study is that migrant entrepreneurship can have an important part in bringing about cosmopolitan change. By suggesting that migrant entrepreneurs’ involvement in cosmopolitan transformation may depend on their levels of capital, our 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 devising ways of balancing some of the adverse effects caused by globalization, as they need to identify and understand the social actors who can contribute to the success of public reforms. Entrepreneurial migration represents also a critical economic issue for governments, as migrant entrepreneurship is important in creating employment opportunities for migrants and alleviating social tensions (Baycan-Levent and Nijkamp, 2009). Therefore, it is key that policymakers understand how location decisions of creative people affect the economic competitiveness of the host country. To the extent that – for instance – varying degrees of exposure to cultural influences and the corresponding ability to think collectively (i.e. cultural capital) shape migrant entrepreneurs’ creativity, our conceptual framework may provide a useful tool for explaining the links between entrepreneurship, cosmopolitanism and economic development. If supported by convincing evidence, this proposition would provide governments with an additional reason for pursuing a cosmopolitan agenda.

It is needless to stress that the conceptual framework developed in this article does not imply that migrant entrepreneurs’ actions are the only source of cosmopolitan transformation. In fact, they may well not even be the major social actor on whose shoulders the success of the cosmopolitan project stands. However, migrant entrepreneurship constitutes a somewhat unique setting for studying how cosmopolitan change is enacted by spatially dispersed actors endowed with different structures and kinds of resources. Moreover, this paper aims to show
how Bourdieu’s (1986, 1998) notion of capital accumulation may shed light on the role of migrant entrepreneurs in facilitating the transmission of cosmopolitan principles. Although this represents only one (i.e. micro) level of analysis in Bourdieu’s (1977, 1990) theory of practice, we do not view the application of his general theory to the topic being examined as the ultimate objective of this study. Nevertheless, the inclusion of the meso and macro levels of analysis (Bourdieu, 1977, 1990) within a single framework could provide an interesting lens for exploring why migrant entrepreneurs engage in cosmopolitan transformation. This is a major endeavor we are currently working on. Furthermore, in light of the somewhat considerable differences between the phenomenon of migrant entrepreneurship in Western Europe vis-à-vis other countries around the world, our framework may be particularly well suited to studying the role of migrant entrepreneurs in engendering cosmopolitan change in Western European economies. This notwithstanding, we contend that some of the predictions underpinning our framework may also be applicable to other developed countries (e.g. US).

By offering novel insights into how the cosmopolitan mind-set can rise at a time of globalization, this paper triggers a number of new questions that wait to be addressed. First and foremost, our conceptual framework is explicated within the context of migrant entrepreneurs. However, they are not the only actors whose agency is shaped by their stock of capital, suggesting that the framework advanced in this article could be extended to other types of entrepreneurs such as transnational entrepreneurs (e.g. how does the capital endowment of transnational entrepreneurs affect their engagement in cosmopolitan change?). Second, we observe that a variety of reasons might prevent migrant entrepreneurs to accumulate different forms of capital. For instance, structural factors such as social exclusion and discrimination could present ethnic minority entrepreneurs with more challenges in accruing capital – especially in its social and symbolic elements – compared to their non-ethnic minority counterparts. A fruitful line of inquiry would thus be to examine the extent to
which difficulties in amassing capital lead to systematic differences in the cosmopolitan behavior of ethnic minority and non-ethnic minority entrepreneurs (e.g. what implications do constraints on capital accumulation have on the likelihood that different categories of migrant entrepreneurs will foster cosmopolitanism?). Third, future research could move the analysis one step further and explore the benefits that might arise for those migrant entrepreneurs that take on the role of catalyzers of the cosmopolitan mind-set. A possibility could be to focus on the moral dimension of cosmopolitanism and investigate whether embracing principles such as mutual respect, openness to others and recognition of human rights has a bearing on the financial performance of migrant entrepreneurs (e.g. how does engaging in cosmopolitan transformation influence the financial performance of migrant entrepreneurs?).

Conclusion

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

Our findings suggest that the levels of economic, cultural, social and symbolic capital with which these entrepreneurs are endowed draw the boundaries of their agency in bringing about cosmopolitan transformation. The conceptual framework put forward in this paper shows that migrant entrepreneurs who possess a greater amount of capital are more likely to contribute to the diffusion of cosmopolitan principles such as mutual respect, awareness of interdependence and shared understanding of different moralities at a time of an increasingly
interconnected world. By doing so, we respond to recent calls for devoting “additional effort to trying to understand better how actors can initiate and implement divergent change” (Battilana et al., 2009, p. 96). As our previous discussion suggests, certain migration patterns by self-employed individuals may also inhibit the process of institutional transformation. For this reason, we would hope to see more research linking migration on the part of entrepreneurs and divergent change within different institutional settings.

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

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

1 In this paper, we use terms such as ‘cosmopolitan change’, ‘cosmopolitan project’ and ‘cosmopolitan mindset’ 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.