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ABSTRACT

Immigrant Enclave Theory (IET) investigates the concentration and localisation of immigrants in a specific geographic area. Some IET studies have highlighted the resilience of these communities and described such enclaves as sources of mutual support, collective political power and beneficial social relationships. Other studies have examined the influence of IET on immigrant entrepreneurial activity within these geographic areas, although some of these studies have highlighted IET as a contributor to low profit margin businesses due to over-representation of immigrant enterprises within the same sector and geographic locality. This article considers the potential for Transnational Diaspora Entrepreneurship (TDE) as an alternative approach to business development within immigrant enclaves and proposes a new model for the relationship between IET and TDE opportunity formation. For the contextualisation of the relationship between IET and TDE, the article explores immigrant enclave related theories and transnational diaspora entrepreneurship frameworks to draw out the relationship between IET and TDE.
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Introduction

People migrate from one country to another for various reasons ranging from war, unemployment, the chance of a better life, family reunification and the opportunity to pursue entrepreneurial opportunities (Hammar et al. 1997; Kingma 2007; Portes and Fernandez-Kelly 2015). In recent years, international immigration has been constantly rising and the number of migrants worldwide has continued to grow rapidly, reaching 244 million in 2015, up from 222 million in 2010 and 173 million in 2000. This substantial growth trend has caused immigration to become one of the most contentious political, economic and social issues of the twenty-first century (Honig 2020) and the focus of much attention amongst policymakers, governments and economic organisations around the world. Indeed, the 2016 Brexit referendum in the UK and the 2017 Presidential election in the USA were both events that generated substantial negative commentary surrounding the issue of immigration and caused significant reconsideration of the value of immigration to each country.
Schiller, Basch, and Blanc (1995) suggested that immigration was a process of cultural diffusion and that the concentration of foreign cultures within a geographical area in host countries will create market opportunities. Furthermore, Portes and Sensenbrenner (1993) argued that immigration into host countries can lead to the formation of an association of people of similar ethnic or immigration background in a specific locality, a concentration often referred to as an enclave. This geographical concentration of immigrants in a specific area provides much needed resources that aid immigrant and diaspora entrepreneurship start-ups. For example, in Canada, 17.5% of immigrants aged 18–69 were entrepreneurs compared with 14.4% of the Canadian-born population (Hou and Wang 2011). In the UK, immigrants are three times more likely to be entrepreneurial than people born in Britain, while in Ireland a higher percentage of migrants have recently started a business compared with the non-immigrant population (Jones et al. 2012). With this escalation in entrepreneurial activity by immigrants, the emergence of Transnational Diaspora Entrepreneurship (TDE) has also developed with expanded trade being initiated by immigrant entrepreneurs between their countries of origin and destination. Such a development is particularly noticeable in countries where immigration policies and economic development strategies are designed to maximise an immigrant’s contribution to a national economy (OECD 2017). The growth in TDE has also become progressively simpler as travel and internet access make connecting between countries so much easier than in times past.

Diaspora describes immigrants who are ‘forever’ settled in a country other than their country of origin, plus they have a cultural understanding of both their host and home country (Aikins and White 2011). Transnational on the other hand highlights the circular flow of immigrants (Portes and Fernández-Kelly 2015), undertaken by people who create social, political and economic activities that span the national business environments of their country of origin and country of residence (Riddle, Hrivnak, and Nielsen 2010). Thus, Transnational Diaspora Entrepreneurs (TDEs) are specialised intermediaries whose actions typically serve to reduce transaction costs and encourage interaction between potential buyers and sellers within an immigrant enclave and across countries (Khanna and Palepu 2010). Scholars such as Dunning (2005), Kuznetsov (2006), and Sørensen (2007) have suggested that the ideas, resources and employment opportunities created by TDEs create a profound impact on the economic and social development of their home countries. From this perspective, TDEs fill a structural vacuum (human exchange and interaction) that may have arisen between many emerging and developed market economies (North 1991; Portes and Fernández-Kelly 2015). Furthermore, Khanna and Palepu (2010) argued that TDEs overcome significant challenges in emerging markets and enable firms to succeed in multiple environments.

TDE has long been associated with remittance and economic adaptation by immigrants in their country of residency. However, TDE is now viewed as a process of cultural diffusion that creates political, social and economic relationships between nations (Efendić, Babić, and Rebmann 2014), and the embeddedness of cultures in COR (Liu et al. 2020). This work examines transnational entrepreneurship through the cross-border movement of people and explores the relationship between Immigrant Enclave Theory (IET) and Transnational Diaspora Entrepreneurship (TDE) through theories and frameworks. As Aldrich and Waldinger (1990) and Neuman (2016) found, IET can create clustering, localisation and concentration of immigrants in a specific geographic area, while also expanding the availability of home countries’ cultural resources in host
countries. Therefore, IET and TDE offer an exciting entrepreneurial opportunity for-mer scenario for specific government policies to be developed that may proactively support the growth of international trade through this intersectionality, once a greater understanding of this relationship can be developed. A new model is proposed that seeks to offer greater insight into the relationship between IET and TDE. To achieve this, this article explores IET and TDE through the lens of immigration theories and frameworks to provide a possible relationship between the two theories.

Understanding Immigrant Enclave Theory (IET)

Immigrant Enclave Theory has its origins in the theory of labour market segmentation that implies a split between a primary and a secondary labour market (Wilson and Portes 1980). The primary labour market principally refers to large monopolistic corporations (Edwards 1975; Taubman and Wachter 1986), while the secondary market is the preserve of small competitive businesses that involve minority workers, employers and entrepreneurs (Pfeffer and Cohen 1984; Taubman and Wachter 1986). In the secondary markets, the sharing of same group identity, plus cultural and bounded solidarity, generate trust that reduces behavioural uncertainty that is essential for start-up and venture survival. Furthermore, this sharing of group identity may also prevent large firms from entering the markets of immigrants (Aldrich and Waldinger 1990), although research has shown that it is the low profit margins of the sector make it less interesting for large firms (Aldrich and Waldinger 1990). As Wilson and Portes (1980), Portes and Bach (1985), Aldrich and Waldinger (1990), and Gilbertson and Gurak (1993) found, immigrant businesses are frequently more harmonised with the needs of an immigrant enclave than with requirements outside the enclave, because of their understanding of the presence of distinctive conditions (immigrant cultural resources) that encourage immigrant enclave markets.

IET has been defined in a variety of ways, making comparisons across studies difficult. One of the most commonly used theories is by Portes (1981) who suggested that an immigrant enclave is a distinct spatial location and the organisation of a variety of enterprises serving an immigrant community. Portes and Jensen (1989) defined enclaves as the spatial gathering of businesses owned and run by immigrants serving immigrant groups. Waldinger (1986) and Neuman (2016) suggested that immigrant enclave theory described the location of an immigrant within a specific geographical area. Portes and Jensen (1989) highlighted enclaves such as Miami, West Little River, and Hialeah (all in the USA) as relevant examples due to the high concentration of Cubans and Cuban-owned firms in those areas. Zhou and Logan (1989) identified New York City as an ethnic enclave for Chinese immigrants, although any city that contains a Chinatown location could also have been suggested. These definitions and examples present enclaves as the geographical concentration of immigrants in a certain location and therefore IET is a condition whereby immigrants are situated in a specific geographic area and use their cultural resources and networking to form a closely knitted community of people from the same ethnic or immigrant background. This work adopts the definition of enclaves offered by Marcuse (1997, 242) which stated:

An enclave is a spatially concentration area in which members of a particular population group, self-defined by ethnicity or religion or otherwise, congregate as a means of enhancing their economic, social and/or cultural development.
This definition portrays enclaves as an environment that provides an immigrant with their home cultural resources, a social field for immigrant activity and encouragement for the geographical location of an immigrant in a specific neighbourhood within host countries. Drawing from Bourdieu and Nîce’s (1977) Theory of Practice, IET can be described as a social field (enclave) that generates immigrant infrastructures (habitus) and immigrant cultural capital (capital). According to Walther (2014), IET describes an environment that creates an infinite amount of interactions (discussions, negotiations or conflict) and rules, which determine and condition an individual’s thoughts and behaviour amongst people of similar culture and immigration background.

A good example of a social field that generates immigrant infrastructures and capital for entrepreneurial start-ups is the concentration of Cuban Americans in Miami, which became noted for the occupation of localities that had been vacated by American-born people (Portes 1981). According to Waldinger (1986), such localities create environments whereby immigrants organise themselves into geographical, cultural, bounded communities where they trade exclusively or primarily with one another. Further, IET describes a scenario whereby through the utilisation of ethnic politics and ethnic mobilisation of resources, immigrants can combat cultural differences within their host countries (Portes and Manning 2012). Despres (1975) and Hechter (1977) described IET as a reactive formation on the part of the minority community to reaffirm its identity and interests in their own ethnic cultural element whilst located in their host countries.

IET portrays an environment where immigrants share an ethnic identity based on a common culture and cultural habits (Nagel and Olzak 1982; Berry et al. 2006; Chrysostome 2010). Furthermore, IET allows for an understanding of business development from which individual entrepreneurs can access typical immigrant resources such as (a) predisposing factors including cultural endowments and a sojourning orientation, and (b) modes of resource mobilisation such as ethnic social networks and access to co-ethnic labour (Light and Bonaich 1988; Boissevain et al. 1990, 132). It should be noted that Gold and Light (2000) and Riddle, Hrivnak, and Nielsen (2010) classified immigrant resources into two different groupings which were (a) tangible (e.g. financing), and (b) intangible (e.g. information, advice, guidance) resources. Although countries differ in numerous ways (such as in population densities, costs of living, educational opportunities, structural and institutional situations), immigrant resources are mostly similar in countries where there are immigrant enclaves (Birdseye and Hill 1995; Solano 2020). Thus, immigrant resources provide immigrant entrepreneurs with opportunities to convert their ideas and visions into rewarding ventures (Burt 1997). Hence, when an immigrant is starting an enterprise, resources are mostly about the benefits that allow an immigrant entrepreneur to use the resources that they do not own (e.g. immigrant network; human and social capital, and cultural resources). Frequently, this can be achieved through ethnic networks and building of trust within an enclave (Egbert 2009).

IET also explains the conditions through which immigrants gain market advantage and market protection (Waldinger 1986). For example, IET describes the importance of social and human capital in the immigrant entrepreneurial start-up process and with opportunity formation and recognition (Aldrich and Waldinger 1990). Further, as Granovetter (1992) suggested, networks are a way of understanding the embeddedness of entrepreneurial activity as networks provide a conceptualisation of the entrepreneurial process as a complex pluralistic pattern of interaction, exchange and the relationship between actors.
in a specified field. Social capital is a community characteristic that facilitates or inhibits the kind of innovation and risk-taking behaviour that is fundamental to entrepreneurship and it can be an endowment that can either be favourable or unfavourable to an immigrant entrepreneur (Westlund and Bolton 2003). Meanwhile, the human capital theory explains a situation whereby immigrants decide to go into entrepreneurial activity aided by skill gained through previous country knowledge (Sequeira and Rasheed 2006). Collectively these fundamentals of IET help to build understanding regarding how IET can create enclave resources in host countries, but unfortunately these resources and conditions can also frequently discourage transnational entrepreneurship and instead enhance opportunity formation solely within the confines of the enclave.

The findings by Portes and Manning (1986) on the Cuban Americans in Miami highlighted that immigrants are more likely to start a business when the culture of the home country is found within a specific geographical area in the host country. As found in the study of immigrant ventures in the UK, the presence of an ethnic minority community increases the number of ethnic businesses in a specific geographic area (Altinay and Altinay 2008). Furthermore, immigrant enclave ventures represented almost 6 per cent of the total SME population (approximately 218,000 businesses), employed almost a million people and generated revenues of over £58 billion for the UK economy. Table 1 below helps to describe the role of the enclave in promoting immigrant entrepreneurship.

Different empirical studies have confirmed these claims in Table 1 that an enclave provides immigrants with the environment, resources and infrastructures for venture development (Schiller, Basch, and Blanc 1995; Altinay and Altinay 2008; Neuman 2016). For example, the work by Altinay and Altinay (2008) suggests that the growth of both South Asian and Chinese entrepreneurship in the UK is a direct result of cultural factors (e.g. hard work, reliance on family labour and ethnic community networks) found within an immigrant enclave in the host country. Similarly, research on ventures by Indian immigrants by Metcalf, Modood, and Virdee (1996), Smallbone et al. (1999), Nwankwo (2005) and Altinay and Altinay (2008) suggest that cultural factors found within a specific geographical area are the principal reason behind successful Indian entrepreneurship in their host country. Finally, research by Portes and Sensenbrenner (1993) on immigrant enclaves of Cuban Americans in Miami highlighted that Cuban

| Immigrant enclave | The Role of enclave |
|-------------------|---------------------|
| New start-ups     | Account for 11 per cent of all new firms |
| Employment rate   | It is estimated that there are 100,000 ethnic minority-owned businesses in London employing around 500,000 people |
| Culture           | Diffusion of culture within a national context and creation of cultural resources, infrastructures and capital that impact on enclave entrepreneurial opportunity formation in host country |
| Economy           | Creation of immigrant’s economy and market niches. Engendering competition, creating employment and generating economic wealth and spending power |
| Environment       | Demographic increase, settlement, human capital, co-ethnic labour and co-ethnic customers, interactions, attitude, networking |
| Infrastructures   | Create start-ups resources, capital and infrastructures, that allow for future engagement with the enclave and native-born population. Evidence from the Cuban construction firms, show that the Cuban firms started within their enclave and later operated beyond the enclave to serve the native-born population |

Source: Compiled from articles by: Schiller, Basch, and Blanc 1995; Portes and Sensenbrenner 1993; Altinay and Altinay 2008; Neuman 2016
construction firms started within their enclave and later operated beyond the enclave to serve the native-born population. Collectively, these studies demonstrate that the presence of an enclave can create an opportunity that can transcend beyond the national and international context. Thus, it could be argued that the cultural resources, infrastructures, market, capital and environment that an enclave provides can create an entrepreneurial opportunity that drives diaspora transnationalism.

**Understanding Transnational Diaspora Entrepreneurship (TDE)**

Theoretically, diaspora and transnationalism often overlap and are sometimes used interchangeably, which makes defining diaspora and transnationalism a difficult task. Both concepts habitually involve using terminologies such as globalisation, cross-border, culture and integration/adaptation. Whilst each of these are important factors in defining diaspora and transnationalism, Bauböck and Faist (2010) argued that both diaspora and transnationalism occur within the limited social and geographic spaces of a specific environment. According to Levitt (2001), diaspora transnationalism is:

*A process of living within transnational social fields and the possibility of being exposed to a set of social expectations, cultural values and patterns of human interaction that are shaped by more than one social, economic and political system which enable one to engage in cross-border investment.*

This definition embraces the current manner of understanding diaspora transnationalism as the interaction of diaspora between home and host countries, incorporating the bridging of social, economic and political relationships (Levitt 2001; Bauböck and Faist 2010; Portes and Fernández-Kelly 2015). Therefore, the human interaction in TDE occurs because of ethnic network and cultural resources across the host and home countries. Networks within TDE consists of ties or relationships built on trustworthiness between the investor and the community. What this symbolises is that networks improve ties between the transnational diaspora and the home country. Although a network may be regarded as informal relations that a person has with others (Reese and Aldrich 1995), in the TDE set-up it can serve as a contract-enforcement mechanism that promotes information flows across international borders (Javorcik et al. 2011).

TDE describes entrepreneurial models that involve the commuting of resources between host and home countries (Goldring 1996; Guarnizo 1997). By concurrently engaging in two or more socially embedded environments, diaspora transnationalism creates, develops and deploys its resource base to exploit economic comparative advantages in both host and home countries (Thieme 2008). Following the suggestions by Oviatt and McDougall (2005) and Riddle, Harivnak, and Nielsen (2010), TDE is considered as an entrepreneurial activity resulting from the sentiment that diaspora attach to their home country and the motivation to give back experiences acquired in their host country. Therefore, the motivation driving diaspora entrepreneurship is often complex and may involve pecuniary and non-pecuniary investment motivations, including feelings of duty and obligation to contribute to the development of their country of origin (Gillespie et al. 1999; Riddle, Harivnak, and Nielsen 2010).

Overall, TDE is understood to be a process of living within transnational social spheres and the possibility of being exposed to a set of social expectations, cultural values, and
patterns of human interactions that are shaped by more than one social, economic and political system that allows a diaspora to engage in the cross-border activity (Gillespie et al. 1999; Bauböck and Faist 2010; Riddle, Harivnak, and Nielsen 2010; Portes and Fernández-Kelly 2015). The TDE concept conveys the idea of transnational populations living in a country of residence, while still maintaining economic, social and political relations with their country of origin (Debass and Ardovino 2009). Following the work of scholars such as Gillespie et al. (1999), Levitt (2001), Riddle, Harivnak, and Nielsen (2010), Bauböck and Faist (2010), Aikins and White (2011) and Portes and Fernández-Kelly (2015), this article defines TDE as those settled ethnic minority groups of migrant origins residing and acting in their country of residence, but maintaining strong sentimental, entrepreneurial and material links with their country of origin.

Understanding entrepreneurial opportunity formation for TDE

The desire to understand Entrepreneurial Opportunity Formation (EOF) has led to the question: where do opportunities come from (Shane 2003; Shane and Eckhardt 2003; Alvarez and Barney 2005; Alvarez and Barney 2007; Eckhardt and Ciuchta 2008; Alvarez and Parker 2009)? This discussion surrounding opportunity formation is embedded in a larger philosophy of scientific debate about realist and constructionist paradigms that have troubled organisational science scholars for many decades (Moldoveanu and Baum 2002). The core of the discussion lies between discovered realist opportunities and created evolutionary realist opportunities (Koppl and Minniti 2010). Recently, to avoid this discussion, scholars have begun to identify ways that apparent conflicts between realists and constructivists can be resolved. Two of the most commonly used concepts to describe entrepreneurial opportunity formation are the creation and discovery approaches.

The general perception regarding whether an opportunity is created or discovered is a manifestation of the individual/opportunity nexus approach. Kirzner (1997) argued that opportunities stem from imperfect knowledge, subject to the specific knowledge of time and place possessed by an entrepreneur. Shane and Eckhardt (2003) suggested that opportunities are there for the taking, but only for those who possess the qualities necessary to discover and exploit them. This suggestion has led to a debate asking if entrepreneurs have more cognitive skills than non-entrepreneurs. Furthermore, scholars such as Bandura (1991), Mills and Pawson (2006), and Pio and Dana (2014) have argued that entrepreneurs are individuals with the ability to take decisions and actions based on their beliefs about self, cultural disposition and how environmental factors affect their behaviour. As Ajzen identified, one’s salient beliefs are determinants of a person’s intentions and actions. What this suggests is that belief in one’s actions drives one’s own reality.

According to McMullen and Shepherd (2006), entrepreneurs are considered as possessing an accurate view of ‘reality’ as opposed to non-entrepreneurs. The realists assume that reality has an objective existence independent of individual perceptions (Popper and Popper 1979). According to Campbell (1974), the reality is independent of an individual’s perception that plays a role in the selection and editing of an individual’s beliefs and perceptions. Conversely, constructionists argue that reality is a social product based on the social interactions of individuals and does not have an existence independent of individual perception (Berger and Luckmann 1991). In the evolution of the field of entrepreneurship,
the realist perspective has dominated the constructionist and evolutionary realist approaches (Venkataraman 2003). However, this does not suggest that constructionist or evolutionary realist views are not important in opportunity formation, but it does offer an indication that individual beliefs and perceptions of ‘what is an opportunity’ form the main foundations for the exploitation of an opportunity (Gartner 1985; Aldrich and Kenworthy 1999; Baker and Nelson 2005).

Kirzner (1997) claimed that opportunity is discovered (exogenously recognised) when individuals seize opportunities when they are alerted to them. Santos and Eisenhardt (2005) believe that opportunity formation occurs only when an entrepreneur perceives new opportunities for the creation of value and the construction of a market around these opportunities. However, according to enclave theorists, individual traits (cultural, personal knowledge, actions, attitude and behaviour) and immigrant networking capabilities combine to create opportunities for immigrant start-ups (Waldinger 1986; Portes and Sensenbrenner 1993). Waldinger, Aldrich and Waldinger (1990) suggested that such opportunity formation is a result of a complex interplay between political/economic and socio-cultural factors, and that a stable political situation (e.g. regulations, immigrant-friendly policies, healthy economy, entrepreneurial policies) helps to create increased entrepreneurial opportunities for immigrants. Similarly, Portes and Fernández-Kelly (2015) argued that a stable economic activity in a host country creates a structural opportunity for immigrants, while Aldrich and Waldinger (1990) and Neuman (2016) emphasised that government policies regarding the assimilation of immigrants and their diaspora create opportunities in the immigrant sector. Therefore, many authors would contend that context is a critical factor for entrepreneurial opportunities for immigrants.

It is arguable that achievement is also a defining trait of entrepreneurs and therefore entrepreneurial opportunity formation is driven by one of three kinds of needs: (1) need to affiliate; (2) need to achieve; and (3) need to be powerful (Murray 1938, later developed by McClelland 1965). According to Hornaday and Aboud (1971) and Wasdani and Mathew (2014), the need for power is an unconscious motive that pushes entrepreneurs to venture into creating organisations. From this perspective, it could be argued that the need for achievement drives an entrepreneur to a better cognitive way of thinking than non-entrepreneurs. Thus, opportunity formation is a result of an individual’s ability to recognise an economic activity (old or new idea) and build a market around the found, discovered, or created product or service (Long and McMullan 1984; and Davidsson, Recker, and Von Briel 2017). This way of looking at opportunity formation suggests that opportunity can either be recognised, created or discovered, a discussion that has been challenged by many authors from a variety of theoretical perspectives (e.g. Sarasvathy and Dew 2005; Alvarez and Barney 2013; Guard and Giuliani, 2013).

Using the relational and temporal approach, Alvarez and Barney (2007) argued that opportunities are endogenously created, not discovered. Sarasvathy and Dew (2005), Guard and Giuliani (2013), and Alvarez and Barney (2013) were able to demonstrate that the process of opportunity recognition involves both creation and discovery, and that creation and discovery of opportunity occur simultaneously. According to the reality approach, unobservable opportunities exist independent of individual perception and therefore these opportunities can only be seen to be discovered (Kirzner 1973, 10). Thus, opportunities happen in an already existing reality and alert individuals are often
familiar with the norms and laws or ‘truth’ of this reality (Koppl and Minniti 2010). From this perspective, it could be argued that entrepreneurial opportunity formation occurs when an individual is in a position to recognise and interpret the external elements that aid opportunity formation within a given location.

Given this understanding of existing literature relating to IET, TDE and opportunity formation, Figure 1 below suggests that immigrant entrepreneurial opportunity formation is the result of an individual enabler (previous country, knowledge, motivation, self-efficacy, need for achievement, power, and affiliation, persistence, direction, intensity) interacting with an external enabler (environment, infrastructures, and resources). On an individual level, elements such as entrepreneurial motivation, direction, intensity and persistence help opportunity formation. In clear terms, a motivated entrepreneur should be willing to exert a certain level of effort (intensity) for a certain time (persistence) towards a specific goal (direction). Furthermore, the environment (the presence of ethnic infrastructure, stable political and economic condition) in which a person lives (at that point in time) helps the development of the entrepreneurial opportunity formation. This indicates that human behaviour can react to events (because of several forces differing in both direction and intent) which may trigger certain behavioural objectives that help individual opportunity formation. Figure 1 inserted below.

In line with the constructionist approach, individuals interpret a phenomenon, raw data or resources and give it a meaning that is different from another’s interpretation.

Figure 1. Mapping of opportunity formation in immigrant IET and TDE.
(Koppl and Minniti 2010). Hence, it is arguable that the way entrepreneurs interpret data and utilise resources gives them an advantage over non-entrepreneurs in terms of opportunity formation. According to Katz and Gartner (1988), individuals create realities and then mould their actions towards that reality. As such, opportunity formation lies in the ability of an individual to use the available resources (cultural, financial capital and previous country knowledge) to create opportunity (Davidsson 2016). Dimov (2010) argued that previous knowledge enhances one’s confidence and ability to do something, and not because one individual has more cognitive ability than another person. In this way, an entrepreneur ‘designs the future’ based on the environment and the resources available to the entrepreneur (Baker and Nelson 2005).

In an immigrant enclave scenario, opportunity formation is a result of cultural resources found within the immigrant enclave (Santos and Eisenhardt 2005). As Waldinger (1986) determined, enclave resources create an opportunity for immigrant start-ups. Aldrich and Waldinger (1990) and Waldinger et al. (1990) argued that the reliance of co-ethnic habits by immigrants creates markets that encourage diaspora entrepreneurship within a national framework. In the enclave, immigrant opportunity formation involves the ability of an individual to use the enclave resources to identify niches and create enclave markets around those niches (Evans 1989). Hence, Figure 1 above suggests that opportunity formation is a result of the availability of several factors within the enclave that aid immigrant entrepreneurs in their start-ups.

The relationship between IET and TDE can be described as a ‘Grand Theory’, an abstract and normative theory of human nature and conduct (Skinner 1996). IET and TDE describe human nature and conduct within the enclaves and how an immigrant is bounded by home country, shared cultural meanings and norms in the host country (Bourdieu and Nice 1977). From this perspective, the environment is an essential factor to IET and TDE opportunity formation. The suggestion is that both IET and TDE explain how culture, environmental factors, infrastructures, capital and rules function to create an environment through which immigrants conduct their entrepreneurial activity. The evidence suggests that being part of a migrant enclave offers significant predictors of entrepreneurship, and together with being part of a diaspora community, this has become a significant factor to exploring TDE (Aldrich and Waldinger 1990; Portes and Fernández-Kelly 2015). By drawing from the work by Peroni, Riillo, and Sarracino (2016), this paper argues that the relationship between IET and TDE is based upon the reliance of specific cultural alignments between the infrastructures, environments and resources in the home and host countries. Clearly, what this suggests is that diaspora draws from the interaction that an immigrant enclave creates in host countries to engage in transnational entrepreneurship.

**Discussion**

As discussed earlier in the article, the literature has suggested that IET is a situation whereby people of similar immigration experiences concentrate in a specific geographical location and form a community bounded by immigrant resources. Meanwhile, TDE has been described as a:
social realm of immigrants operating in complex, cross-national domains, with dual cultural, institutional, and economic features that facilitate various entrepreneurial strategies (Drori, Honig, and Wright 2009, 1).

Understanding these two concepts and from mapping the elements of enclave entrepreneurship opportunity formation in Figure 1 above, it could be argued that IET provides a social field for immigrant entrepreneurship in host countries, while TDE is the engagement of an immigrant in cross-border entrepreneurship activity. Furthermore, it could also be reasoned that IET provides the cultural resources for TDE. As Aldrich and Waldinger (1990) and Portes and Fernández-Kelly (2015) found, home country culture in host countries frequently provide the market niches needed for immigrant entrepreneurship. As such, enclaves and TDE are culturally related and IET creates the resources for entrepreneurship in host countries, while the cultural understanding of a home country by TDE also allows for transnational activity by the diaspora.

Culture and the need to associate with one’s ancestral home, as well as to be involved in entrepreneurial activity between home and host country, draw diaspora to their home countries in the same way that culture and national identity create immigrant entrepreneurial activity in host countries (Masurel et al. 2002). According to scholars such as Riddle and Marano (2008) and Riddle, Hrivnak, and Nielsen (2010), TDE occurs amongst those groups of entrepreneurs that avail of the cultural knowledge, social networking, electronic bulletin boards and other online venues of both host and home countries to engage in cross-border entrepreneurship. As such, diaspora transnationalism is a motivation of social recognition, friendliness, and receptiveness of the home country, as well as the integration of immigrants into their host countries (Nkongolo-Bakenda and Chrysostome 2013). According to Aldrich and Waldinger (1990), the enclave is a motivation of immigrant infrastructures and entrepreneurship environment in host countries. From this perspective, the relationship between IET and TDE arguably stems from the infrastructures and cultural resources that are available for start-ups and entrepreneurial activity in the host and home countries (Nkongolo-Bakenda and Chrysostome 2013).

The creation and discovery approaches suggest that an immigrant’s enclave (the association of immigrants in a specific geographic area) and the individual (immigrant entrepreneur) are two important elements in the formation of opportunity. Immigrant enclaves create the cultural resources (immigrant market niches, human and social capital, networking and financial capital) that aid opportunity recognition. Discovery occurs at the point an individual (immigrant entrepreneur) recognises the available resources and creates a market around the discovered opportunity. Similarly, the cultural resources found within an enclave create an opportunity for TDE activity that encourages TDEs to take-up transnationalism leading to interaction with their ancestral home. Thus, immigrant enclave resources and an individual are the external and individual ‘Enablers’ of opportunity formation in immigrant/TDE activity, which suggests that enclave resources provide immigrant entrepreneurial activity in host countries and encourage transnationalism by the diaspora. This creates a relationship or link between IET and TDE.

As found in this work, the formation of immigrant enclave opportunity rests on the availability of three main factors: (a) environment, (b) infrastructures, and (c) resources. These factors also provide TDE with the opportunity to convert ideas and vision into rewarding ventures (Burt 1997; Portes and Sensenbrenner 1993). Further, the location
and concentration of people of similar culture in a specific geographic area create enclave resources that encourage transitional entrepreneurship (Waldinger 1986). Thus, TDE describes diaspora entrepreneurial activity that spans between host and home country (Portes and Fernández-Kelly 2015). This cross-border entrepreneurial activity by diaspora is due to the increase in demand for immigrant markets caused by changes in the demographic conditions of immigrants and diaspora in host countries (Liebig and Sousa-Poza 2003). Thus, alterations in immigrants’ demographic characteristics in host countries create infrastructures, resources and environments that provide market niches for start-ups and transnational entrepreneurship.

As Kloosterman, Van Der Leun, and Rath (1999) found in their study of Muslim Islamic butchers in the Netherlands, increases in the demographic condition of immigrants in host countries provide enclave opportunities and start-ups. What this suggests is that any increase in immigrant population creates market niches, capital (human and financial) resources and entrepreneurial opportunities. Following the suggestion by Drori, Meyer, and Hwang (2006) that the presence of immigrants creates institutional and economic features that facilitate various entrepreneurial strategies, this article argues that demographic conditions provided by the high rate of immigrants in a host country create an opportunity for TDE. According to Dimov (2010), entrepreneurial activity is a dependent of the external and individual enabler. TDE is a motivation of the resources, infrastructure and environment that an enclave provides and the individual ability to recognise the opportunity that these elements offer within a specific geographical area create transnationalism diaspora entrepreneurship opportunities. An entrepreneur aims to serve the cultural niches of immigrants in the host country, motivated by the diaspora need to give back to their country of origin the experience acquired in the country of residency (Gillespie et al. 1999; Riddle, Harivnak, and Nielsen 2010).

The work by scholars such as Newland and Tanaka (2010) and Nkongolo-Bakenda and Chrysostome (2013) have highlighted that entrepreneurial policies such as stable economy conditions, supportive government policies and immigrant networks are important factors that encourage immigrant start-ups and influence transnational entrepreneurship. According to Newland and Tanaka (2010) and Nkongolo-Bakenda and Chrysostome (2013), good entrepreneurship policies eradicate start-up administrative formalities, provide essential infrastructures and increase immigrant socio-demographic conditions in host countries. According to Dimov (2010) and Davidsson (2016), these factors enable opportunity formation and transnational entrepreneurship when found in an economy. Additionally, it could be argued that an individual entrepreneur’s persistence, desire, need for achievement, power, affiliation and motivation, supported by an external enabler, form the main drivers to start-up opportunities and transnational entrepreneurship. As such, enclave demographic conditions, resources and entrepreneurial policies that encourage enclave opportunity formation, also influence transnational entrepreneurship opportunity formation.

Portes and Sensenbrenner (1993) argued that enclave resources and infrastructures can create start-up opportunity that aid venture development beyond an immigrant enclave. This article suggests that TDE opportunities are the consequence of an immigrant’s capital (cultural, human, social capital) and networking that was created through immigrant enclave bounded solidarity and potential market opportunity formation. According to scholars such as Aldrich and Waldinger (1990) and Neuman (2016), IET helps to
preserve an immigrant’s home country cultural identity and provides immigrant resources that play an essential role in immigrant enclave opportunity formation. Egbert (2009) suggested that an immigrant’s diaspora resources are mostly concerned with the benefits that entrepreneurs are offered by using resources that they do not own (i.e. immigrant network; human, social capital and cultural resources). Further, these resources allow for networking and building of trust within the enclave. Figure 2 below presents an amalgamation of these works into a new IET - TDE model that seeks to explain the relationship between the various elements.

According to the new model proposed in Figure 2, the pursuit of immigrant diaspora opportunity involves the ability of an individual entrepreneur to recognise and understand the capital, resources and infrastructures that are available from within their enclave and home country. Utilising these resources and building upon cultural interaction can lead to opportunity recognition for the entrepreneur. Dependent upon the nature of the opportunity, the support from enclave resources and the ability of the entrepreneur themselves, the opportunity can lead to (1) the birth of a new venture, (2) the opportunity is put on hold, or (3) it may be abandoned completely. Should it be pursued, then it can lead to TDE and business interaction between an immigrant’s home and the host country. This proposed model contributes to existing literature by explaining the relationship between IET and TDE. The paper also suggests that factors such as (1) good entrepreneurial policies, (2) positive immigrant demographic conditions, (3) environmental factors, resources and infrastructures, and (4) immigrant culture, all encourage immigrant enclave entrepreneurial activity and have an influence on diaspora involvement in transnational entrepreneurship. In conclusion, cultural factors allow for immigrant entrepreneurship start-ups, survival and transcending of entrepreneurship beyond the enclave environment. Aldrich
and Waldinger (1990) and Riddle, Harivnak, and Nielsen (2010) both propounded that enclave and diaspora entrepreneurship are aimed at serving the ethnic niche of fellow immigrants or co-ethnic groups, and can lead to the development of economic, social and political opportunities for immigrants in their host countries.

**Conclusion**

The theories explored in this work suggest that immigrant enclaves in host countries offer immigrants valuable cultural resources and provide the external (environmental factors) and individual enablers that encourage enclave opportunity formation. Following these theories, this article suggests that IET influences on TDE opportunity formation are dependent on the external and the individual enabler factors within the enclave (see Figure 2). The individual enablers are those attributes (persistence, desire, and need for achievements, power, affiliation, and motivation) that aid opportunity formation (Dimov 2010; Davidsson 2016). The external enablers can include: (1) environmental factors such as socio-cultural factors, regulations, immigration-friendly policies, healthy economy, entrepreneurial policies, immigrant group, demographical characteristics; (2) infrastructures such as Government support networks; and (3) enclave resources such as financial capital, human capital, social capital, trustworthiness, community support, previous knowledge and networks that create start-up opportunities, as well as opportunity for transnational entrepreneurship (Nkongolo-Bakenda and Chrysostome 2013). Overall, immigrant entrepreneurship involves an understanding of home country cultural knowledge and enclave activity that provides the interaction for immigrant entrepreneurship (Aldrich and Waldinger 1990; Portes and Sensenbrenner 1993). Thus, cultural interaction when found in host countries can influence TDE in the following ways:

- Creates a home country culture in host countries
- Makes available market and immigrant resources necessary for immigrant activity
- Forms immigrant infrastructures, identity, social field, social and human capital
- Develops trustworthiness and bounded solidarity
- Provides community interaction and networking

These elements form the core of entrepreneurship opportunity formation for immigrants in their home and host countries (Aldrich and Waldinger 1990; Portes and Sensenbrenner 1993). As such, the presence of these home country cultural elements put the diaspora in the position to travel between their home and host country, and to avail of resources in both locations. Furthermore, immigrant enclaves provide an immigrant market, demographic characteristics, human and social capital, as well as trust and bounded solidarity, for the exploration of TDE within a host country (Waldinger 1986; Berry 2008). Thus, the presence of these elements in host countries act as stimulants to diaspora transnational entrepreneurship or can equally disincentives diaspora connectivity with one’s ancestral home.

As evidenced in the literature, an understanding of their own home country cultural knowledge creates ease of adaptation for diaspora entrepreneurs engaging in transnational entrepreneurship and eliminates the adaptive processes that are undertaken by immigrants in an unfamiliar environment (Berry 2008; Bhatia and Ram
2009). As highlighted in Figure 2, enclave resources and demographic conditions in host countries provide diaspora with the opportunity to engage in transnational entrepreneurship. As suggested in various studies (e.g. Waldinger 1986; Aldrich and Waldinger 1990; Portes and Sensenbrenner 1993), immigrant markets mostly involve an understanding of ethnic preferences of the immigrant enclave customers. The understanding of immigrant preferences, the presence of immigrant demographic characteristics and the demand for the cultural goods that can only be supplied by people with similar cultural and immigration backgrounds, creates enclave markets and the need for the diaspora to engage in transnational entrepreneurship (Aldrich and Waldinger 1990; Neuman 2016). Thus, from the various theories explored in this work, it could be argued that the presence of IET resources in host countries encourages diaspora to undertake transnational entrepreneurship, plus IET protects enclave markets and makes immigrants and diaspora the main provider of transnational entrepreneurship.

An immigrant enclave provides the environment, resources and infrastructures that are pivotal to diaspora opportunity formation in the host country. Thus, TDE is dependent on the social-cultural resources and capital made available by the geographical concentration (enclave) of immigrants in a specific area in a host country. What this suggests is that the environment, resources and infrastructures that are found within the enclave create enclave market niches that can only be served by people with an immigrant’s cultural knowledge and understanding of immigrant taste (Portes and Sensenbrenner 1993; Neuman 2016). Arguably, the immigration of people of diverse culture into host countries create enclave economics that support TDE, while the shuttling between host and host country by diaspora aid enclave entrepreneurship and increases the economic development of host and home countries. Overall, immigrant enclaves create opportunities not only for enclave entrepreneurship, but also for transcending entrepreneurship beyond the enclave (Portes and Sensenbrenner 1993).

Despite, the opportunities that immigrant enclaves provide and the ability of immigrants and diaspora to support the economics of both host and home country, enclave and transnational diaspora entrepreneurship remains an issue of national divide. But TDE is currently proposed as a builder of economic, social and political life within many nations (Portes and Fernández-Kelly 2015). Therefore, future research should seek to identify ways of highlighting the importance of enclave and transnational diaspora entrepreneurship, reducing the negativity surrounding immigration, immigrant enclaves and TDE activity within the national context, and help create a greater understanding of the economic and social benefits of immigration within a national context.
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