VRIJE UNIVERSITEIT AMSTERDAM

VU Research Portal

Opportunity Structures from an Intersectional Perspective

Essers, Caroline; Verduyn, Karen; Ozasir Kacar, Sibel

published in
The Palgrave Handbook of Minority Entrepreneurship
2021

DOI (link to publisher)
10.1007/978-3-030-66603-3_5

document version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

document license
Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act

Link to publication in VU Research Portal

citation for published version (APA)
Essers, C., Verduyn, K., & Ozasir Kacar, S. (2021). Opportunity Structures from an Intersectional Perspective. In T. Cooney (Ed.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Minority Entrepreneurship* (pp. 87-115). Palgrave / MacMillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-66603-3_5

General rights
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy
If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:
vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

Download date: 27. Jan. 2022

Opportunity Structures from an Intersectional Perspective

Sibel Ozasir Kacar, Karen Verduijn, and Caroline Essers

Introduction

Much of the work in the entrepreneurship field has focused on either the nature of the entrepreneur by adopting person-centric perspectives (Baron 2008), or the characteristics and existence of entrepreneurial opportunities (Eckhardt and Shane 2003). Opportunity structures, which can be likened to Johns' (2006) understanding of the external environment as situational opportunities and constraints, are mostly considered as given, and their influences are underestimated (Ahl 2006, p. 605). It is important to understand opportunity structures in a specific context since, in the absence of opportunity structures, the venture and its future are seen to depend mainly on the entrepreneur (Ahl 2006). Entrepreneurs are held responsible for overcoming the constraining impacts of opportunity structures by enhancing their entrepreneurial and language skillsets, self-funding or

S. O. Kacar (✉) · C. Essers
Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands
e-mail: s.ozasirkacar@fm.ru.nl

C. Essers
e-mail: c.essers@fm.ru.nl

K. Verduijn
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
e-mail: karen.verduijn@vu.nl

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2021

T. M. Cooney (ed.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Minority Entrepreneurship*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-66603-3_5

obtaining managerial experience (OECD 2014). Entrepreneurship literature rarely discusses whether opportunity structures are available, or easily accessible, which results in certain groups of people, especially those with minority attributes (such as gender, youth, seniority, ethnic minority, unemployment or disability) being put into disadvantageous positions or even excluded. Government support and institutional incentives are not questioned with respect to a minority perspective or, in some cases, with regard to sectoral, regional or class differences. For instance, an age limit for a credit guarantee fund or a requirement of having an occupational diploma, certificate or experience for a government fund might exclude seniors above that age limit, homemakers, young people or ethnic migrants without the necessary qualifications from using these funds.

The major theoretical perspectives on opportunity structures consider them as objective, predominantly material rules and resources, which are the same for everyone (Archer 1995, 2000; Mole and Mole 2010). Critically, these theoretical perspectives overlook the intersections with social diversity categories such as gender, ethnicity and class (Jones et al. 2014; Carter et al. 2015; Ram et al. 2017) because they tend to make international comparisons across countries (Tseng 2004). This study questions this major assumption and studies opportunity structures in interaction with these social diversity categories (Rath 2001; Ram and Jones 2008; Jones et al. 2014) to understand when, how, why and by whom entrepreneurship is being done. Altogether, the answers to these questions provide the means for forming an understanding of entrepreneurship, which considers contextual dynamics (Steyaert and Katz 2004; Welter 2011) as well as the entrepreneurship potential of that region or country. Questioning opportunity structures with respect to social diversity categories could be reflected, for instance, on studies regarding ethnic enclaves, transnational entrepreneurship, sectoral clustering or minority entrepreneurship.

This chapter evaluates opportunity structures from an intersectional approach (Crenshaw 1989). It provides theoretical insights by shifting the emphasis from the agency to the structure, especially in women and migrant entrepreneurship studies. Instead of analysing whether and how (migrant) women use their agency, this study focuses on the opportunity structures that lead (migrant) women to act in a particular manner. This research increases scholarly and policy awareness regarding the impact of opportunity structures on the existence and characteristics of 'doing entrepreneurship', as well as the importance of an intersectional analysis of opportunity structures. The aim is to provide a better understanding of the ways opportunity structures operate by studying how representatives of financial organisations, local

government entrepreneurship support organisations, (ethnic) business associations, lobbying agencies, tax and trade offices, women platforms, migration institutes, entrepreneurship federations and the media make sense of opportunity structures with respect to social diversity categories such as gender and ethnicity. While the chapter focuses on opportunity structures relevant for (migrant) women entrepreneurs, the insights are also relevant for 'other' minority entrepreneurs such as seniors, youth or people with disabilities.

Intersectionality theory has proven to be a fruitful approach, particularly within women's studies (Walby et al. 2012). Utilising intersectionality theory (Crenshaw 1989) better reveals the enabling and constraining impacts of opportunity structures on minority entrepreneurs in general and migrant and women entrepreneurs in particular. Opportunity structures are highly gendered and ethnocentric (Ahl 2006; Ghorashi 2010). Specifically, political decisions influence and are influenced by social and cultural interpretations of gender, ethnicity and class (Acar and Altunok 2013; Verduijn and Essers 2013), and class positions are (re)produced by opportunity structures. The intersectional perspective reveals unequal practices, but also enriches the understanding of demarcation and discrimination between and within social groups or sexes. Conducting an intersectional analysis of opportunity structures in relation to gender, ethnicity and class, challenges distinctions and dominance, and forces an explanation that goes beyond alternative interpretations of depoliticised cultural differences. This chapter first reviews the relevant literature on opportunity structures in the fields of migrant and women entrepreneurship, and then provides background information regarding the policy and social environment in two countries (Turkey and the Netherlands). The methodology section then explains the empirical data collection and analysis methods. Next, the discussion of opportunity structures interacting with gender, ethnicity and class in both countries is elaborated further. Finally, this chapter concludes by detailing the problematic parts of the prevailing understanding of opportunity structures and reflecting on some policy recommendations, as well as directions for future research.

Opportunity Structures in the Field of Migrant and Women Entrepreneurship

Mainstream entrepreneurship literature generally takes opportunity structures for granted and researchers underrate their influences on the entrepreneurship potential of minority entrepreneurs, particularly migrant women

entrepreneurs (Welter 2011, p. 174). However, some studies consider opportunity structures from an interactionist or an embeddedness approach (Aldrich and Waldinger 1990; Kloosterman et al. 1999; Kloosterman and Rath 2001, 2003; Kloosterman 2010). This section outlines how opportunity structures are theorised in the literature on migrant and women entrepreneurship. In the migrant entrepreneurship field, researchers tend to focus on migrants' business entry decisions and opportunity structures are seen as one of the factors affecting their entrepreneurship decisions. Aldrich and Waldinger (1990) were the first to use the term 'opportunity structure' in this field. They presented a general framework based on opportunity structures, group characteristics and emergent strategies to understand various approaches explaining migrant entrepreneurship (Aldrich and Waldinger 1990, p. 112). They stated that migrant entrepreneurship cannot be explained merely by the ethnocultural characteristics of the owners (Rusinovic 2006) and they emphasised opportunity structures (Aldrich and Waldinger 1990). With an interactionist approach, opportunity structures are conceptualised as the demand side and group characteristics as the supply side, interacting together to give rise to migrant entrepreneurship. Opportunity structures are seen as market conditions (ethnic consumer products and non-ethnic/open markets) and ease of access to ownership (business vacancies, competition for vacancies and government policies) (Kloosterman and Rath 2001).

Borrowing the concept of embeddedness from Granovetter (1985), further studies evaluate opportunity structures with an eye to how migrant entrepreneurs are embedded within their social networks and the social environment of their country of settlement. The embeddedness perspective on opportunity structures dominates the migrant entrepreneurship literature. Referring to the research initiated by Esping-Andersen (1999) on the effects of labour market's institutional framework, the politico-institutional aspect is included in the model, which is then formulated as the mixed embeddedness approach by Kloosterman et al. (1999). The mixed embeddedness approach defines opportunity structures as different sets of openings into markets characterised by human capital (accessibility) and growth potential (Kloosterman 2010). According to the mixed embeddedness approach, migrant entrepreneurs are not only embedded in social networks/environments, but also the socio-economic and politico-institutional environment of the receiving country (Kloosterman et al. 1999). In this approach, government regulations are thoroughly analysed (Tseng 2004), whereas in the interactionist approach, this receives limited attention. This may be because the interactionist theory was developed in the USA and UK, which both have deregulated economies that remove or reduce certain government regulations,

especially to improve business relations and increase competition. The mixed embeddedness approach was developed by scholars situated in European countries such as the Netherlands with stronger state regulations on businesses (Tseng 2004). The mixed embeddedness approach provides insights into how institutional frameworks impact opportunity structures (Kloosterman 2010). The approach also looks at the economic activities of migrant entrepreneurs that influence the urban economic structure, for instance, through informal economies (Kloosterman et al. 1999). The mixed embeddedness approach acknowledges changes in opportunity structures through urban economic activities and institutional drivers; however, there is little room for entrepreneurs to challenge and change opportunity structures themselves (Tseng 2004). First, for the mixed embeddedness approach, the analysis is mostly done at the meso (network) and macro (institutional) levels, leaving the micro (entrepreneur)-level understudied (Apitzsch 2003, p. 168). Second, for this approach, only entrepreneurs engaging in innovative behaviour can change opportunity structures (Kloosterman and Rath 2001, p. 192).

In addition to individuals' limited influence on opportunity structures, the mixed embeddedness approach also limits the scope of opportunity structures. It considers opportunity structures as 'the demand side' and group characteristics as 'the supply side' of migrant entrepreneurship and puts more effort into the analysis of the demand side while regarding the supply side as less significant (Tseng 2004, p. 525). Group characteristics such as class and ethnic resources are not discussed in-depth and their impacts on opportunity structures are disregarded (Tseng 2004). Gender has also received very little attention in the mixed embeddedness approach (Ram and Jones 2008; Jones et al. 2014; Carter et al. 2015; Ram et al. 2017). This stems from the shift of emphasis from internal processes (cultural approach, ethnic networks, social capital, class and ethnic resources) to the external (political, institutional and economic) environment (Tseng 2004).

Significantly, the main theories of opportunity structures (the interactionist and the mixed embeddedness theories) underemphasise the interaction of opportunity structures with the social diversity categories of gender, ethnicity and class (Tseng 2004; Jones et al. 2014; Carter et al. 2015). In the literature, there are only a handful of studies discussing opportunity structures combined with the intersectionality approach (Humbert and Essers 2012; Valdez 2016; Villares-Varela et al. 2017; Ozasir-Kacar and Essers 2019). Most studies on opportunity structures tend to neglect gender and ethnicity because of the comparatively smaller number of migrant women enterprises in urban societies (Lewis 2006) or argue that having an ethnicity perspective

in studying opportunity structures would not suffice to account for differences between countries (Kloosterman and Rath 2003). Furthermore, only a small number of researchers consider class paradigms in migrant studies. This is because of the "close relations of minority researchers with policymakers, which creates a political climate where ethno-cultural processes are overstated, while political and economic processes are underplayed" (Rath 2001, p. 153).

In the women entrepreneurship literature, studies either ignore opportunity structures and push the individual drawbacks of women entrepreneurs into the discussion for areas of development (Ahl 2006) or fail to reflect on ethnic- and class-based complexities intersectionally (Ozasir-Kacar and Essers 2019; Villares-Varela and Essers 2019). This creates a clear need for an analysis of the structural environment in relation to the social diversity categories.

Intersectionality is extensively used for analysing subjects' experiences of identity and oppression (Nash 2008) by underlying the multidimensionality of these experiences (Crenshaw 1989). The intersectional approach helps to understand how to conceptualise and theorise the relationship between different social groups and the intersections of multiple inequalities (Walby et al. 2012). In the entrepreneurship field in conversation with the Giddens' theory of structuration (1984), it is acknowledged that structural forces often reproduce a given social group's intersectional positioning (Romero and Valdez 2016, p. 1554). For instance, in the context of weak community and negative societal reception, including racism and discrimination, African-American entrepreneurs in the USA faced structural problems, which reduced their socio-economic and entrepreneurial progress (Silverman 2000). On the other hand, favourable government policies that included loans and subsidies and a geographically concentrated ethnic economy helped Cuban refugee entrepreneurs to participate in society and achieve business success (Waldinger et al. 2006). In the structural context, individuals are positioned differently within hierarchically organised social groups, which intersect with diversity categories such as ethnicity, disability, age, gender, sexual orientation and religion. Groups at the intersection of two or more of these diversity categories are left out of focus in both academic literature and government policies (Walby et al. 2012). From this perspective, an intersectional approach recognises that opportunity structures are related to multiple dimensions and modalities of social relations and subject formations (McCall 2008) and therefore can produce multiple inequalities.

Contextualising Opportunity Structures in the Netherlands and Turkey

This section briefly contextualises opportunity structures in the Netherlands and Turkey, plus it details why these country contexts yield valuable insights to increase the understanding of opportunity structures in relation to a specific group of people—Turkish (migrant) women entrepreneurs. This study classifies opportunity structures into the following three types:

- Social opportunity structures: social, cultural (ethnic), and religious norms, practices and resources governing gender, family and business relations, and social discourse on (migrant) women;
- Political opportunity structures: policies and political discourses on Turkish (migrant) women and (migrant) women entrepreneurship;
- Institutional opportunity structures: rules and regulations on women's business development and (ethnic) business relations.

In the remainder of this section, these opportunity structures are discussed within the contexts of the Netherlands and Turkey.

The Netherlands is one of the main countries hosting Turkish migrants in Europe. The Turkish community is the biggest migrant community in the Netherlands with more than 400,000 residents. After introducing several models of migrant inclusion (Vasta 2007), Dutch policy has moved away from state protection to an ideology of self-sufficiency and responsibility (Blok Report Netherlands 2004). Each individual undergoes the process of their upward mobility without receiving any political and institutional positive discrimination attributed to their ethnicity, class or gender. The state protection is regarded as: first, making people feel offended because being protected might mean being weak; and second, leading people to stay as passive welfare state clients because they lose their motivation to work (Koopmans 2006). However, this implies that each person must face opportunity structures and find ways to exploit them on their own. With this policy change, diversity quotas were removed and state funds for the development and networking of ethnic migrants were cut (Blok Report Netherlands 2004). Consequently, each person must take responsibility and action against the constraints and discriminatory opportunity structures, especially in the labour market (Guiraudon et al. 2005; ECRI Report 2013; Verduijn and Essers 2013). Turkish (Muslim) women, in particular, became (and still are) political and social targets (Verduijn and Essers 2013) regarding the discussions on multiculturalism (Ghorashi 2003) and they are victimised to

prove that they have to be integrated or even assimilated into Dutch society (Ghorashi 2010). They are considered key to cultural change within the family. Therefore, integration and emancipation programmes are designed to make these women learn the language, adapt to Dutch customs, study Dutch history, participate in employment and embrace Dutch identity (Ghorashi 2010).

Policy attempts have been made in previous integration systems to eliminate prejudices and discrimination against ethnic migrants through anti-discrimination and equal employment opportunity laws (Entzinger 2003; Blok Report Netherlands 2004). Second- and third-generation Turkish migrant women generally attain a better status in society with a better command of Dutch language, education and labour market positions than first-generation migrant women (Rusinovic 2006). However, both political and societal discourses in the Netherlands in the last two decades reflect a neoconservative ideology with more restrictive policies (fines imposed on migrants who fail to integrate after five years) and provocative language against migrant people both in politics and popular media (Vasta 2007). Migrant women also face patriarchal norms and practices, especially within their ethnic community. Concerning the traditional gender roles, women entrepreneurs must take care of their kids and the household, while also running their businesses. The social control mechanism that enforces the traditional gender roles weighs more heavily on women than men according to the patriarchal social and cultural norms and practices within the Turkish migrant community (Essers and Benschop 2007).

The same neoconservative ideology takes place in Turkey in the policies, decisions, discourses, laws and norms regarding women and family relations, which consequently impact how gender is articulated and practiced (Acar and Altunok 2013). Especially during the second term in office of the Justice and Development Party (2007–2012), patriarchal and moral notions and values became apparent in the regulations of social and cultural domains and even political and international relations (Öniş 2012; Acar and Altunok 2013). The secular part of Turkish society is discomforted by the Turkish government's conservative Islamist social ideologies because they believe that the Turkish government controls the visibility of women in public with the traditional form of femininity and associated gender roles and that it jeopardises gender equality (Özkazanc-Pan 2015). For most of its female followers, the ruling political party aims to stand for a collective religious identity that is represented by the personal freedom of wearing religious clothing, which was previously marginalised in the public sphere (Göl 2009). On the contrary,

the post-Kemalist secular political discourse on gender focuses on masculine connotations of power, freedom and work, but still charges women with taking care of the kids and the household (Bilgin 2004). Turkish women, in short, face a complex political environment. It comprises of a blend of secular and Islamist gendered social ideologies that are proposed within the public sphere, plus patriarchal social and cultural norms and practices in the private sphere, together with a history of secular modernity (Göl 2009).

Concerning sustaining gender equality (or gender justice as Islamists frame it), both secular and Islamic discourses will only maintain or even strengthen patriarchal arrangements, unless they acknowledge these patriarchal norms and practices as opportunity structures perpetuating gender inequality or injustice (Özkazanc-Pan 2015). In practice, Turkish women find ways to tackle these patriarchal norms and values to sustain their democratic rights and pursue individual development (Kandiyoti 2005). Entrepreneurship is promoted for women empowerment by increasing women's employment and participation in society (Calas et al. 2009). However, it is debatable whether entrepreneurship can change constraining opportunity structures (Al-Dajani and Marlow 2013). For instance, through gendered institutional opportunity structures that have a male-breadwinner model (Pfau-Effinger 2004) and a newly reformed pension system (Elveren 2013), the entrepreneurship supports institutions that have been fostered by the liberal economic development policies of the Turkish government will only reinforce existing patriarchal attitudes towards women (Arat 2010). Guided by neoliberal economic tenets, entrepreneurship is also promoted in the Netherlands "*as having emancipatory and elevating powers for Turkish migrant women*" (Verduijn and Essers 2013, p. 613). Entrepreneurship is presented as a tool for upward social mobility for Turkish migrant women and hence for obtaining equality and inclusion (Rath and Kloosterman 2000); however, studies highlight that it might not be able to achieve this all the time (Verduijn and Essers 2013). The promotion of entrepreneurial activities for Turkish women in both countries is a laudable objective, but whether entrepreneurship becomes a bureaucratic apparatus for supporting and promoting gender and/or migrant equality and inclusion is debatable.

Methodology

This study explores opportunity structures and how they intersect with gender, ethnicity and class in the Netherlands and Turkey. This was done by conducting semi-structured interviews with representatives of a wide range

of organisations to assess various opportunity structures. It has already been established that opportunity structures are socially constructed and subject to change over time. However, opportunity structures can be assessed through organisations for two reasons. First, opportunity structures are constructed by the tenacious collective actions of a group of people, where these shared decisions turn into rules, laws, regulations, customs, traditions or norms (Hooghe 2005). Second, it takes a substantial amount of time for opportunity structures to change (Archer 1995). Thus, organisations, which are surrounded by collective decisions, practices, ideas, norms, rules and regulations, can be used to assess opportunity structures at a point in time through interviews with their representatives.

The empirical data for this study were collected in Turkey and the Netherlands. Both countries offer dynamic and intermingled social milieus, share a complex social and political environment regarding (migrant) women and thus provide a useful context to study opportunity structures as they intersect with gender, ethnicity and class. This study focuses on opportunity structures for Turkish (migrant) women entrepreneurs because "*Turkish women are usually and typically marginalised within the dominant entrepreneurship discourse*" (Verduijn and Essers 2013, p. 613). The organisations interviewed for this study were tax and trade offices, (ethnic) business associations, banks, women platforms, local government agencies, entrepreneurship support institutions, a migration institute, and radio and TV programmers (see Table 1). This study used purposive heterogeneous sampling (Patton 2002). First, two Turkish women entrepreneurs from both countries were asked to produce a list of organisations relevant to their initiatives. An extensive Internet search was then performed and a list of 40 possible organisations was created, then each of these was approached for an interview. Ten organisations from Turkey and 11 from the Netherlands accepted the invitation. The first author of this chapter prepared a set of 20 questions to guide the interview (Johnstone 2007). In general, the representatives of the organisations tended to explain their personal experiences instead of their organisation's practices, processes and regulations. However, the set of questions helped the interviewer to ensure that the interview stayed on topic. The interviews were held at the main buildings of the organisations and lasted between 30 and 150 min. Except for four of the interviews, they were all digitally recorded and transcribed. The exceptions were due to the restrictions on recorded speech that are placed on state officers in Turkey. The interviewer took detailed notes for these interviews.

Table 1 Interviewees included in this study

Name[a]	Sex (M/F)	Institution	Ethnic origin/Country
Kagan	M	Dutch Bank	Turkish—NL
Feride	F	Chamber of Commerce	Turkish—NL
Selin	F	House of Entrepreneurs	Turkish—NL
Sukru	M	Turkish Business Association	Turkish—NL
Saadet	F	Women Platform	Turkish—NL
Abdullah	M	Migration Institute	Turkish—NL
Elsa	F	Tax Office	Dutch—NL
Emily	F	Business Federation of SME's	Dutch—NL
Tuba	F	Office of Commerce	Turkish—NL
Emile	M	Lobbying Agency	Dutch—NL
Justin	M	Radio Station	Dutch—NL
Martin	M	Turkish Bank	Turkish—TR
Derya	F	Chamber of Commerce	Turkish—TR
Emel	F	Entrepreneur Support Unit	Turkish—TR
Ipek	F	Business Federation	Turkish—TR
Duygu	F	Women Entrepreneurs' Association	Turkish—TR
Selim	M	Tax Office	Turkish—TR
Zehra	F	Women Status Office	Turkish—TR
Belgin	F	Association of Young Entrepreneurs	Turkish—TR
Kemal	M	Entrepreneur Education Centre	Turkish—TR
Ahmet	M	Entrepreneurship TV Program	Turkish—TR

[a]Names are pseudonym, created by the first author

The analysis of the interviews was conducted in three steps. Initially, the first author read all the interview transcripts and, through deductive coding (Fereday and Muir-Cochrane 2006), noted the parts of the texts where interviewees talked about the three categories of opportunity structures—social, political and institutional. These three categories of opportunity structures were the overarching themes in this study. The paragraphs of the whole interview transcripts were grouped into these three categories of opportunity structures (Corley and Gioia 2004). This step comprised the content analysis, where the emphasis was more on what was said, rather than how it was said (Neuendorf 2016). In the second step, these paragraphs were re-read and critically analysed to explore how the opportunity structures intersect with gender, ethnicity and class. By adopting a discursive approach

(Phillips and Hardy 2002), this step also analysed how the representatives of the organisations explained their organisational operations, practices, norms and regulations, and whether there were exclusionary perceptions or positive discrimination in practising these opportunity structures concerning Turkish women entrepreneurs. For the third step, the authors utilised axial coding (Strauss and Corbin 1990) to conduct a comparative analysis and noted the similarities and differences in how each opportunity structure intersected with gender, ethnicity and class in Turkey and the Netherlands. Additionally, through a reflexive approach (Essers 2009), the dynamic relationship between the interviewer and the interviewee was explored and noted (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2000). The fact that the interviewer was a veiled Turkish female professional that migrated to the Netherlands as an expatriate and the interviewees were a mixture of professional Turkish women, Turkish men, Turkish migrant women, Turkish migrant men, Dutch women and Dutch men (see Table 1) helped in performing a reflexive analysis by considering their relationships with the interviewer concerning gender, ethnicity and class (both separately and intersectionally). The interviewees either sympathised with the interviewer, wanted to receive her help for their projects and used her as an audience in their ethnicity related concerns, or they confronted her with defensive arguments and an unfriendly interview atmosphere and tried to avoid her by deflecting her questions, giving short answers and interrupting the interview with personal or work-related issues. The interviewer's veil might have made the reactions more ascendant and prominent because of the societal and political discourses on the headscarf in both countries. However, the interviewer's university affiliation might have provided credibility to the interviewer and directed the interview more professionally.

Opportunity Structures with an Intersectional Lens

This section presents the social, political and institutional opportunity structures and discusses how each opportunity structure intersects with gender, ethnicity and class.

1. *Social opportunity structure*

In the Netherlands, the representatives of the organisations with a Turkish background, who are familiar with the norms and practices of the Turkish community, emphasised the cultural distance between the Turkish and Dutch

cultures, plus most Dutch peoples' lack of appreciation for cultural diversity. These interviewees considered both cultures influential, as Turkish migrants, especially second- and third-generation migrants, are exposed to both local and ethnic community cultures (Essers and Benschop 2007). They specified that Turkish migrants are part of a hybrid culture, which resembles neither Turkish culture in Turkey nor the Dutch culture in the Netherlands, but instead combines practices from both cultures. Consequently, Turkish migrants are considered as *gurbetci* (emigrant in a negative connotation) in Turkey and as *allochtone* (immigrant as a foreigner or non-native) in the Netherlands. Furthermore, the interviewees also specified how the ethnic community culture in the Netherlands is more conservative than the Turkish culture in Turkey. This is because Turkish migrants perceive that there are substantial cultural and religious differences between their culture and the Dutch culture. Therefore, they live in a narrower social circle and stick to their values, enforcing them on their kids to preserve them from outside values and lifestyles that they deem inappropriate. This social and cultural control mechanism affects Turkish migrant women more than men due to the traditional gender roles and patriarchy. Regarding the influences of the traditional gender roles and patriarchy on Turkish migrant women entrepreneurs, the representatives of the Chamber of Commerce, a women's platform and an ethnic business association criticised Turkish women for working both inside and outside the home. Specifically, they criticised them for not letting their husbands take responsibility for the home and the kids, which consequently leads to strengthened traditional gender roles and patriarchal practices. The representatives of these organisations perceive Turkish migrant women entrepreneurs as consciously or unconsciously accepting the patriarchal norms and practices imposed by their culture. However, new generations of Turkish migrant women entrepreneurs face fewer social and cultural controls because Turkish migrant culture tends to change and it evolves more to the Dutch culture. This is illustrated by the following statement by the representative of the Chamber of Commerce:

> This comes from our culture, but here it is much [more] conservative [than Turkey]. If a woman accepts to work inside and outside, this starts from her then. Our women do not want to challenge this; they just accept and take all the responsibility. But we all have kids to take care of, and cleaning, cooking, etc. These take a lot of time and energy like a full-time job. These should be taken care of by both parents, or a woman entrepreneur should be able to go on a business trip without any discussion with her husband. But we live in another era now. Third-generation migrants are not 100% Dutch, but maybe 80%. They are educated by the Dutch system. They do not have such concerns. Social control mechanisms do not apply for them.

On the other hand, the representatives of organisations with a Dutch background, such as the head of the Dutch SME Association and the entrepreneurship radio programmer, perceived Dutch culture as comparatively superior and demanded that migrants adapt (Arends-Tóth and Van de Vijver 2003). This is similar to the ideas of Stolcke (1995), with cultural fundamentalism depending on the notion of a homogeneous, static, coherent and rooted culture. The representatives of the women's platform and the ethnic business association summarised the situation for Turkish migrant women as that they are asked by their community to maintain their ethnic culture especially in the private domain, plus they are also obliged to adapt to the mainstream culture in the public domain to survive socially and financially. Thus, Turkish migrant women face tensions from the demands placed on them by their ethnic Turkish community and the requirements from Dutch society due to the perceived religious and cultural differences between the two cultures.

The representative of the Chamber of Commerce also perceived being raised in two cultures as problematic, particularly in social life in the Netherlands where contradictions appear and people are restricted (Arends-Tóth and Van de Vijver 2003). The representative also noted the discriminatory practices in Dutch society:

> They [Dutch authorities] do not want to provide opportunities for the foreigner. The foreigners, who achieved a certain position, left their cultures behind, even forgot their language. A Turkish woman who gets married to a Dutchman is accepted much more easily.

The representatives interviewed for this study also considered social class as a very influential factor such that higher social status outpaces the impact of ethnicity on the inclusion of migrants. For them, when a Turkish migrant woman entrepreneur has a higher economic and social status, her ethnicity is not considered negatively; rather, her entrepreneurial connection with Turkey through her ethnic ties is perceived positively. In contrast, lower-class Turkish women are viewed as more likely to be excluded and to experience heavier cultural contradictions.

In Turkey, the major discussion point about social opportunity structures regarding women entrepreneurs is the traditional gender roles and patriarchy. The interviewees pointed at a change in perception regarding women's employment, especially in big cities, because of urban life and mentality (Koray et al. 1999). However, the interviewees also explained the prevailing traditional gender roles (Karatas-Ozkan et al. 2010), difficulties in achieving a work–life balance (Ufuk and Özgen 2001) and the lack of institutional

support for childcare and elderly care (Yazici 2008) as the main difficulties that women entrepreneurs face in Turkey. The representatives proclaimed that women "can" work outside of home and that they still work at home. The fact that women work at home displays prevalent traditional gender roles and the expression of whether women "can" work attests to the existence of patriarchy (Kabeer 2005), albeit latently. The representative of a business federation stated:

> Everyone has one job; women entrepreneurs have three. They have to run their businesses, take care of the kids and their husband. The last one is the toughest!

As per the quote above, women entrepreneurs become inured and simply play within the limits of patriarchal practices. Patriarchal practices are very much embedded in traditional gender roles. In the case of Turkey, the husband rather than any other male figure is considered the person to enforce patriarchy on women (Bruni et al. 2004):

> The biggest obstacle for a woman entrepreneur is her husband. Men see it as their right to hinder a woman's freedom when the woman needs to attend trade fairs, has business trips, or dinners with other men. That's why a lot of women entrepreneurs are getting divorced lately. Maybe these divorces become exemplars that women try to speak up and take action.

Additionally, according to the representatives, the social image of Turkish women entrepreneurs also changes with the influence of social class. Women entrepreneurs with higher education and economic standards face less influence regarding patriarchy and they take shared parenting responsibilities or have nannies and maids for looking after the kids and the household chores.

2. *Political opportunity structure*

In the Netherlands, except for the representative of the lobbying agency, the interviewees belonging to the Dutch majority were hesitant to talk about politics. The Dutch lobbying agent and the interviewees with a Turkish background expressed how their organisations perceive the political environment relating to Turkish (migrant) women entrepreneurs. According to them, the political focus in the Netherlands is on gender equality (Mills et al. 2008). Regarding the various ethnicities and religions, they perceive that there is a less tolerant political approach (Siebers 2010), plus discrimination in the labour market and education (Schriemer 2004; Koopmans 2006), especially towards Muslim Turks and Moroccans (Essers and Benschop 2007). They

evaluated that politicians use the cultural distance between two cultures as a tool in political discussions about the social and economic integration of migrants and in policy building and implementation (Montreuil and Bourhis 2001). They referred to a shift in the politics from multiculturalism towards integration and assimilation (Prins and Slijper 2002; Vasta 2007) through revoking migrant quotas and cutting government funds for the institutions that organise activities and conduct research about migrants. The representative of the lobbying agency stressed the ideology of forming a "typical" citizen in the whole country and expressed this as:

> In Holland, there is also an implicit kind of assimilation. That is the idea. They do not say it out loud in this way, but everybody should become a 'typical' middle-class citizen.

The representative of the Migration Institute also summarised the political discourse on Turkish migrant women as exclusionary with the diverse categories of religion, ethnicity and gender in the Netherlands:

> Here in politics and society, they [Turkish migrant women] are seen as Muslim first, then Turkish, and then women, and they have to get through all of these.

In most of the interviews in Turkey, it was stated that women entrepreneurs are seen as mothers, sisters and daughters. The replacement of the Ministry of Women and Family with the Ministry of Family and Social Policies illustrates this ideology on a political level by equating women to the family (Özkazanc-Pan 2015). The representatives highlighted that there is a political focus in Turkey on increasing women's employment, which is rather low among OECD countries (KSGM 2014). As a tool for increasing women's employment and economic development, women entrepreneurship is politically promoted. The representatives of the organisations responded favourably to the political impetus towards women entrepreneurship without questioning the emancipatory outcomes as women entrepreneurship sustains traditional gender roles by providing flexible working hours to enable women to continue to have the responsibility of conducting household chores and looking after the children with the possibility of earning (some) money (Toksöz 2011). Apart from this, the interviewees refused to talk about politics and political disputes in and around Turkey. The respondents' hesitation in bringing politics into the discussions indicates that these topics are highly sensitive among Turkish people. This supports Keyman's (2014) observation concerning Turkish society as highly politicised and polarised along religious, secular and ethnic lines.

Mostly the representatives in both countries were not comfortable discussing politics and political opportunity structures with a veiled Turkish interviewer, and they were reluctant to express their perceptions. Additionally, they did not want to involve their organisations in politics and they did not comment on the political influence on migrant women entrepreneurship in general and on the operations of their organisations in particular. However, they all agreed on the fact that Turkish women entrepreneurs must and do follow politics and political incidents closely to foresee policy changes in the industries in which they operate.

3. *Institutional opportunity structure*

In the Netherlands and Turkey, local and national governments strengthen existing entrepreneurs and stimulate new initiatives (Verduijn and Essers 2013). They support entrepreneurs (both financially and non-financially) through programmes such as training sessions, seminars, workshops, panels, debates, conferences, expert meetings, network events, mentoring, coaching, contests, campaigns, awards, fairs and business trips. In the Netherlands, public institutions mostly provide non-financial support programmes. There are very few financial support instruments for entrepreneurs, such as the income tax exemption legislation for entrepreneurs earning less than €6000 in a year. Almost all the non-financial support programmes in Netherlands, even the ones provided by ethnic business associations, are held in Dutch and charge an attendance fee. The representatives of tax and trade offices emphasised that comparatively smaller numbers of Turkish migrant women entrepreneurs attend their events, which is largely because Dutch is the official language of their programmes. The Amsterdam office of the Chamber of Commerce also noted that the focus of the Dutch government had been mostly on the sectors with better growth potential:

> Here we have chosen some of the sectors that the Dutch are successful at, such as fashion and design. These have priority on our agenda because we can benefit from these sectors more.

Additionally, in Netherlands, local municipalities support entrepreneurs through institutions called the House of Entrepreneurs (*Ondernemershuis*) in different cities. These institutions provide office space, networks and consulting on issues such as administration, tax and personnel. The representative of this institution expressed their tasks as:

> We provide information, seminars and workshops to our taxpayers. They can find all the information online as well, but our clients are mostly Turks and Moroccans. They are not comfortable with the Dutch language or computers, or the Internet. Young, educated people find their own way. Here [in the Netherlands] there is, as we call 'drempelvrees' [threshold fear], they [migrants, such as Turks or Moroccans] are afraid to go to a Dutch institution. We don't have that. They come and ask their questions.

The representative of House of Entrepreneurs interviewed for this study described their clients as all the taxpayers of that municipality. However, in practice, entrepreneurs with financial and human capital do not need the services provided by the House of Entrepreneurs. Instead, entrepreneurs with low income, language competency, education and access to finance benefit from this institution, and thus this institution depends very much on migrant entrepreneurs, who are seen as "in need of help". Similarly, the ethnic business associations also provide a closed network for Turkish migrant women entrepreneurs. While the Turkish business association and the ethnic women's platform interviewed for this study positioned their organisations in connection with Dutch public institutions and political authorities, their member entrepreneurs are mostly of Turkish origin and they predominantly network with Turkish organisations. Therefore, the networking choices of both these ethnic business associations and the Chamber of Commerce reinforce an "us versus them" dichotomy and the "Otherization" process between locals and migrants (Essers and Benschop 2007).

In addition to language barriers and closed-off networking possibilities, the perception of the head of the Dutch SME Association regarding Turkish women entrepreneurs reflects another opportunity structure that influences ethnic business relations and business development. The following quote from the head of this association illustrates this:

> I think it is good that someone is not from here [the Netherlands], but she should give the image that she is also modern, etc. They [migrant people] sometimes complain, but what you experience is not the fact that you are Turkish, but your personality does not fit into the corporation or business. (…) The extra admirations [of gender, ethnicity] are not extras anymore, but inadequacy for the people who came here 20 years ago and are still not that successful. Ask yourself if it is good that we have an award for the best women entrepreneur, best non-Dutch entrepreneur, or even best non-Dutch women entrepreneur. No, it shouldn't be like this.

Underscoring the discriminatory approach towards Turkish migrant women, the head of this association has a culturalist and ethnocentric perception that migrants in general (and Turkish migrants in particular) are not modern and do not fit into the business environment in the Netherlands. This is highlighted by the belief that they need to show that they are modern and capable of doing the work for which they have applied (Ghorashi 2003).

In Turkey, entrepreneurs are mostly supported financially through local government and private organisations such as banks and private universities. The programmes, in general, do not require an attendance fee, which stimulates participation among small business owners with low income. The most popular government institution that supports entrepreneurs is the Head of Support and Development of SMEs (KOSGEB). KOSGEB delivers grants of 30,000–100,000 Turkish liras (equivalent to approximately €4500–15,000—as of January 2020) without any interest or payback requirements for the entrepreneurs who start their companies after attending an entrepreneurship training programme that is free of charge (KOSGEB 2016). Entrepreneurs also receive subsidies for trade fairs or new machinery investments. Women entrepreneurs receive grants 10 per cent higher than the amount that male entrepreneurs receive. In Turkey's less developed regions, entrepreneurs receive grants that are 10 per cent higher than the amount received by entrepreneurs in a developed region, and, in these instances, women still receive the 10 per cent extra grant. Additionally, certain programmes are implicitly directed to women entrepreneurs. For instance, one of the government banks offers first step credit guarantee funding for entrepreneurs who cannot provide any collateral. This credit guarantee funding is not exclusively for women entrepreneurs, but it is implicitly directed to them because historically women do not inherit as many lands or real estate properties as men. Similarly, micro credits offered by the Turkey Grameen Microfinance Programme to entrepreneurial teams of three or more people for their business ideas are not provided only for women, but the programme coordinators only refer to women:

> These are for the women who do not participate in society at all and need to take care of their kids financially. These are at a really micro level, like around a thousand or two thousand Turkish liras [equivalent to roughly €150 to €300], but the idea is basically to make a difference in these women's living standards and social lives.

Even on the programme's website, the images of lower-class women are portrayed when the details of the programme are stated.

The Turkish government has an income tax exemption for entrepreneurs which applies to certain goods produced at home such as embroidery, needle-work, bead processing, artificial flowers, wicker baskets, Turkish ravioli and noodles. The exemption aims to help small firm owners financially; however, the main producers of these tax-free products are women. While aiming to help these entrepreneurs, the legislation unintentionally limits them. The women do not want to lose this benefit and so they work from home and stay small. This situation may sustain traditional gender roles and the patri-archy by leading the women to take care of the kids and the household, while earning some money (Toksöz 2011). Additionally, in Turkey, women's business associations and women-only sub-branches of these associations are widespread. For instance, in all major cities, the offices of the Chambers of Commerce have women entrepreneurship committees composed of women entrepreneurs who answer to the management board. Based on the inter-views with one of the offices of these committees, the biggest women's entrepreneurship association (KAGIDER) and a women's sub-branch of a business federation promote women entrepreneurship and offer a female approach to social and political issues. However, they provide a closed and, to some extent, protected environment for women, which can be consid-ered as sustaining patriarchy in the institutional domain (Sultana 2012). A representative of the organisation stated:

> When a woman entrepreneur wants to attend a conference or a business trip, her husband does not want her to go there alone, so women organisations arrange such events and help to solve the problem.

The organisation accepted that the patriarchal approach towards women reproduces gendered inequalities (Kandiyoti 2005) through their practices, as well as strengthening the traditional division of sexes in the public sphere. Patriarchal practices do not end, instead they proceed into the institutional domain.

Discussion

This chapter has studied opportunity structures in two particular national contexts (Turkey and the Netherlands) and shown the varying and layered configurations of opportunity structures for Turkish women entrepreneurs. The three categories of opportunity structures detailed in this chapter (social, political and institutional) together reveal the entrepreneurship potential and structural environment of each location relating to Turkish women

entrepreneurs. The structural environment in Turkey regarding Turkish women entrepreneurs is highly supportive and dynamic with prompt policies; however, the environment is also gendered with patriarchal norms and practices both in the private and public spheres. However, in the Netherlands, the structural environment is less supported with policies and regulations and more culturalist and ethno-centred.

This chapter has questioned the major assumption that opportunity structures are, as objective and predominantly material rules and resources, the same for everyone (Archer 1995; Mole and Mole 2010; Kloosterman 2010). The study has shown that opportunity structures in a specific national context are not the same and are not being applied in the same way for every entrepreneur operating in that context. Rather, opportunity structures are (initially) designed for certain groups of entrepreneurs. For instance, particular government bodies provide financial support specifically for women entrepreneurs or provide comparatively more support to women entrepreneurs than male entrepreneurs, as in Turkey. In other instances, opportunity structures are only utilised by migrant entrepreneurs, as in the case of the local government organisation, the House of Entrepreneurs, in the Netherlands.

This study also highlights how opportunity structures are not stable, because they are not only material, but also discursive (McCammon 2013). These discursive opportunity structures are enacted when intersecting with social diversity categories, which changes the opportunity structures for the entrepreneurs identified with these social diversity categories. Thus, this study shows that opportunity structures are rather “in the making”; this means that they are emergent structural properties, although they are historically formed by the contributions of previous agents and hard to change materially and discursively (Archer 1995; Mole and Mole 2010). Through the interviews with the representatives of 21 Turkish and Dutch organisations, this study asserts that opportunity structures are not staying out there as separate entities influencing actors (Giddens 1984; Sarason et al. 2006). The representatives of the organisations make sense of these opportunity structures. These representatives intervene in the execution and communication of various opportunity structures and thus alter the interplay between entrepreneurs and opportunity structures (Ozasir-Kacar and Essers 2019). For instance, depending on the perceptions in relation to the social discourse on migrant women, the representative of the Dutch SME Association has a discriminatory understanding and a requirement that migrant women should confirm that they are modern.

Social diversity categories shape this process. Although material rules and resources do not exclude any specific groups of entrepreneurs, opportunity structures may become restricted for these groups as a result of the sense-making of the representatives of the organisations. Hence, this study recommends that opportunity structures should be considered in a more holistic way considering the various opportunity structures simultaneously in a specific region for every section of society. It is especially important that this is done for entrepreneurs with minority attributes such as regarding their gender, ethnicity, low social status, youth, disability or seniority. This chapter has focused on the layered and varying configurations of opportunity structures for women and migrant entrepreneurs; however, this chapter's insights can be extended to other (minority) groups of entrepreneurs. As opportunity structures are not stable, prone to change, and being enacted in specific contexts, it is important to consider how they are configured and for which specific groups, as has become clear in this current study.

Conclusion

Opportunity structures are constructed historically through the cultural dynamics, ethnic milieu, economic development and governing structure of a country or a region, and they are reshaped over time in connection with various other opportunity structures. Government regulations cannot be considered without considering socio-cultural norms, and social and political discourses cannot be understood without considering the regulatory environment. Several opportunity structures interact with each other and form a structural environment for the entrepreneurs in a specific location. As these opportunity structures are not free from contextual influences of that specific location, they are not exogenous factors influencing the entrepreneurs in that location. Opportunity structures do intersect with various social diversity categories and differ with respect to them resulting in a divergent structural environment. Most of the time, this variation leads to the hindrance of entrepreneurship enacted by minority entrepreneurs, where the constraints need to be resolved or overcome by the entrepreneurs themselves.

The structural environment in a specific context might represent a uniform structure from the outside as a liberal economy, easy-to-do business regulatory system, or multicultural labour force, but it might reveal constraining opportunity structures when evaluated intersectionally with social diversity categories. The policymakers, public officials, entrepreneurial organisations need to consider these diversity categories both at the initial stage and during

periodic evaluations to see whether or not the structural environment generates inequality and discrimination. Regardless of promoting entrepreneurship for economic benefits or social purposes, for an inclusive entrepreneurial environment, opportunity structures should be evaluated with an intersectional perspective. Not only material resources but also discursive approaches and practices should be considered with this respect. Even being aware of the influence of opportunity structures intersecting with social diversity categories can lead to specific measures to be taken, and policies to be abandoned or changed. This requires a nuanced approach to opportunity structure configurations, not only for women migrant entrepreneurs but for minority entrepreneurship at large.

Minority entrepreneurs such as youth, people with disabilities, ethnic migrants, women, seniors or the poor will face varying opportunity structures. A nuanced, layered analysis of opportunity structures can reveal the multiple configurations and make them prone to intervention for a more inclusive entrepreneurial environment. Minority entrepreneurs could then, for instance, be targeted with specific measures, vis-à-vis specific opportunity structures to increase economic growth, decrease poverty and unemployment, and ensure social integration and emancipation through entrepreneurship. Alternatively, where an opportunity structure might restrict these minority entrepreneurs, despite the initial purpose of that programme, facility or regulation, such restrictions can be noticed and altered by government officials, policymakers or representatives of entrepreneurial support organisations. Future studies might extend to include various diversity categories and contexts to reflect on different configurations of opportunity structures for a more inclusive social and entrepreneurial environment.

References

Acar, Feride, and Gülbanu Altunok. 2013. "The 'politics of intimate' at the intersection of neo-liberalism and neo-conservatism in contemporary Turkey." In *Women's Studies International Forum* 41: 14–23. Pergamon.

Ahl, Helen. 2006. "Why research on women entrepreneurs needs new directions." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 30, no. 5: 595–621.

Al-Dajani, Haya, and Susan Marlow. 2013. "Empowerment and entrepreneurship: A theoretical framework." *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research* 19, no. 5: 503–524.

Aldrich, Howard E., and Roger Waldinger. 1990. "Ethnicity and entrepreneurship." *Annual Review of Sociology* 16, no. 1: 111–135.

Alvesson, Mats, and Kaj Sköldberg. 2000. *Reflexive methodology*. London: Sage.

Apitzsch, Ursula. 2003 "Policies and their paradoxes: Gaining autonomy in self-employment processes." *International Review of Sociology* 13, no. 1: 163–182.
Arat, Yesim. 2010. "Religion, politics and gender equality in Turkey: Implications of a democratic paradox?" *Third World Quarterly* 31, no. 6: 869–884.
Archer, Margaret S. 1995. *Realist social theory: The morphogenetic approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Archer, Margaret S. 2000. "For structure: Its reality, properties and powers; a reply to Anthony King." *Sociological Review* 48: 464–472.
Arends-Tóth, Judith, and Fons JR Van de Vijver. 2003. "Multiculturalism and acculturation: Views of Dutch and Turkish–Dutch." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 33, no. 2: 249–266.
Baron, Robert A. 2008. "The role of affect in the entrepreneurial process." *Academy of Management Review* 33, no. 2: 328–340.
Bilgin, Elif. 2004. "An analysis of Turkish modernity through discourses of masculinities." PhD diss., Middle East Technical University.
Blok Report Netherlands. 2004. *Parliamentary commission on integration policy: English summary, chapter 10 summary, conclusions and recommendations*. The Hague: Bruggen Bouwen SDU.
Bruni, Attila, Silvia Gherardi, and Barbara Poggio. 2004. "Doing gender, doing entrepreneurship: An ethnographic account of intertwined practices." *Gender, Work and Organization* 11, no. 4: 406–429.
Calas, Marta B., Linda Smircich, and Kristina A. Bourne. 2009. "Extending the boundaries: Reframing entrepreneurship as social change through feminist perspectives." *Academy of Management Review* 34, no. 3: 552–569.
Carter, Sara, Samuel Mwaura, Monder Ram, Kiran Trehan, and Trevor Jones. 2015. "Barriers to ethnic minority and women's enterprise: Existing evidence, policy tensions and unsettled questions." *International Small Business Journal* 33, no. 1: 49–69.
Corley, Kevin G., and Dennis A. Gioia. 2004. "Identity ambiguity and change in the wake of a corporate spin-off." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 49, no. 2: 173–208.
Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1989. "Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics." In *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 139–168.
Eckhardt, Jonathan T., and Scott A. Shane. 2003. "Opportunities and entrepreneurship." *Journal of Management* 29, no. 3: 333–349.
ECRI Report (Europe Commission against Racism and Intolerance). 2013.
Elveren, Adem Y. 2013. "A critical analysis of the pension system in Turkey from a gender equality perspective." In *Women's Studies International Forum* 41: 35–44.
Entzinger, Han. 2003. "The rise and fall of multiculturalism: The case of the Netherlands." In *Toward assimilation and citizenship: Immigrants in liberal nation-states*, edited by Christian Joppke and Ewa Morawska, 59–86. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Esping-Andersen, Gosta. 1999. *Social foundations of postindustrial economies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Essers, Caroline. 2009. "Reflections on the narrative approach: Dilemmas of power, emotions and social location while constructing life-stories." *Organization* 16, no. 2: 163–181.

Essers, Caroline, and Yvonne Benschop. 2007. "Enterprising identities: Female entrepreneurs of Moroccan or Turkish origin in the Netherlands." *Organization Studies* 28, no. 1: 49–69.

Fereday, Jennifer, and Eimear Muir-Cochrane. 2006. "Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 5, no. 1: 80–92.

Ghorashi, Halleh. 2003. *Ways to survive, battles to win: Iranian women exiles in the Netherlands and United States*. New York: Nova Publishers.

Ghorashi, Halleh. 2010. "From absolute invisibility to extreme visibility: Emancipation trajectory of migrant women in the Netherlands." *Feminist Review* 94, no. 1: 75–92.

Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The constitution of society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Göl, Ayla. 2009. "The identity of Turkey: Muslim and secular." *Third World Quarterly* 30, no. 4: 795–811.

Granovetter, Mark. 1985. "Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness." *American Journal of Sociology* 91: 481–510.

Guiraudon, Virginie, Karen Phalet, and Jessika Ter Wal. 2005. "Monitoring ethnic minorities in the Netherlands." *International Social Science Journal* 57, no. 183: 75–87.

Hooghe, Marc. 2005. "Ethnic organisations and social movement theory: The political opportunity structure for ethnic mobilisation in flanders." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31, no. 5: 975–990.

Humbert, Anne Laure, and Caroline Essers. 2012. "Turkish businesswomen in the UK and Netherlands: The effects of national context on female migrant entrepreneurs." In *Global women's entrepreneurship research: Diverse settings, questions and approaches*, edited by Karen D. Hughes and Jennifer E. Jennings, 15–35. Cheltenham/Northampton, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Johns, Gary. 2006. "The essential impact of context on organizational behaviour." *Academy of Management Review* 31, no. 2: 386–408.

Johnstone, Bruce A. 2007. Ethnographic methods in entrepreneurship research. In *Handbook of qualitative research methods in entrepreneurship*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Jones, Trevor, Monder Ram, Paul Edwards, Alex Kiselinchev, and Lovemore Muchenje. 2014. "Mixed embeddedness and new migrant enterprise in the UK." *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 26, nos. 5–6: 500–520.

Kabeer, Naila. 2005. "Jumping to conclusions? Struggles over meaning and method in the study of household economics." In *Feminist visions of development: Gender*

analysis and policy, edited by Cecile Jackson and Ruth Pearson, 144–161. London: Routledge.
Kandiyoti, Deniz. 2005. "Rethinking bargaining with patriarchy." In *Feminist visions of development: Gender analysis and policy*, edited by Cecile Jackson and Ruth Pearson, 135–154. London: Routledge.
Karatas-Ozkan, Mine, Gozde Inal, and Mustafa Ozbilgin. 2010. "Turkey." In *International handbook of successful women entrepreneurs*, edited by Sandra Fielden and Marilyn Davidson, 175–188. Cheltenham, New York: Edward Elgar Press.
Keyman, E. Fuat. 2014. "The AK party: Dominant party, new Turkey and polarization." *Insight Turkey* 16, no. 2: 19.
Kloosterman, Robert C. 2010. "Matching opportunities with resources: A framework for analysing (migrant) entrepreneurship from a mixed embeddedness perspective." *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 22, no. 1: 25–45.
Kloosterman, Robert, and John Rath. 2001. "Immigrant entrepreneurs in advanced economies: Mixed embeddedness further explored." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 27, no. 2: 189–201.
Kloosterman, Robert, and John Rath. 2003. *Immigrant entrepreneurs: Venturing abroad in the age of globalization*. New York: University of New York Press.
Kloosterman, Robert, Joanne P. van der Leun, and John Rath. 1999. "Mixed embeddedness: Immigrant entrepreneurship and informal economic activities." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 23, no. 2: 253–267.
Koopmans, Ruud. 2006. "Tradeoffs between equality and difference—The crisis of Dutch multiculturalism in cross-national perspective." Danish Institute for International Studies.
KOSGEB. 2016. http://www.kosgeb.gov.tr/. Accessed on 11 May 2016.
Koray, Meryem, Sevda Demirbilek, and Tunc Demirbilek. 1999. *Gıda İşkolunda Çalışan Kadınların Koşulları ve Geleceği*. Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Kadının Statusu ve Sorunları Genel Mudurluğu.
KSGM (General Directorate of the Status of Women). 2014. www.kadininstatusu.aile.gov.tr. Accessed on 28 May 2014.
Lewis, Patricia. 2006. "The quest for invisibility: Female entrepreneurs and the masculine norm of entrepreneurship." *Gender, Work and Organization* 13, no. 5: 453–469.
McCall, Leslie. 2008. "The complexity of intersectionality." In *Intersectionality and beyond*, 65–92. Cavendish: Routledge.
McCammon, Holly. 2013. "Discursive opportunity structure." In *The Wiley-Blackwell encyclopedia of social and political movements*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
Mills, Melinda, Letizia Mencarini, Maria L. Tanturri, and Katia Begall. 2008. "Gender equity and fertility intentions in Italy and the Netherlands." *Demographic Research* 18: 1.
Mole, Kevin F., and Miranda Mole. 2010. "Entrepreneurship as the structuration of individual and opportunity: A response using a critical realist perspective: Comment on Sarason, Dean and Dillard." *Journal of Business Venturing* 25, no. 2: 230–237.

Montreuil, Annie, and Richard Y. Bourhis. 2001. "Majority acculturation orientations toward 'valued' and 'devalued' immigrants." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 32: 698–719.

Nash, Jennifer C. 2008. "Re-thinking intersectionality." *Feminist Review* 89, no. 1: 1–15.

Neuendorf, Kimberly A. 2016. *The content analysis guidebook*. London: Sage.

OECD Publishing, and European Commission. 2014. *The missing entrepreneurs: Policies for inclusive entrepreneurship in Europe*. OECD Publishing.

Öniş, Ziya. 2012. "The triumph of conservative globalism: The political economy of the AKP era." *Turkish Studies* 13, no. 2: 135–152.

Ozasir-Kacar, Sibel, and Caroline Essers. 2019. "The interplay between identity construction and opportunity structures: Narratives of Turkish migrant women entrepreneurs in the Netherlands." *International Small Business Journal* 37, no. 7: 713–731.

Özkazanc-Pan, Banu. 2015. "Secular and Islamic feminist entrepreneurship in Turkey." *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship* 7, no. 1: 45–65.

Patton, Michael Quinn. 2002. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pfau-Effinger, Birgit. 2004. "Socio-historical paths of the male breadwinner model—An explanation of cross-national differences." *The British Journal of Sociology* 55, no. 3: 377–399.

Phillips, Nelson, and Cynthia Hardy. 2002. *Discourse analysis: Investigating processes of social construction: Qualitative research methods series*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Prins, Baukje, and Boris Slijper. 2002. "Multicultural society under attack: Introduction." *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 3, no. 3: 313–328.

Ram, Monder, and Trevor Jones. 2008. "Ethnic-minority businesses in the UK: A review of research and policy developments." *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 26, no. 2: 352–374.

Ram, Monder, Trevor Jones, and Maria Villares-Varela. 2017. "Migrant entrepreneurship: Reflections on research and practice." *International Small Business Journal* 35, no. 1: 3–18.

Rath, John. 2001. "Research on immigrant ethnic minorities in the Netherlands." In *The Politics of Social Science Research*, 137–159. Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Rath, John, and Robert Kloosterman. 2000. "Outsiders' business: A critical review of research on immigrant entrepreneurship." *International Migration Review* 34: 657–681.

Romero, Mary, and Zulema Valdez. 2016. "Introduction to the special issue: Intersectionality and entrepreneurship." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 39, no. 9: 1553–1565.

Rusinovic, Katja. 2006. *Dynamic entrepreneurship: First and second-generation immigrant entrepreneurs in Dutch cities*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Sarason, Yolanda, Tom Dean, and Jesse F. Dillard. 2006. "Entrepreneurship as the nexus of individual and opportunity: A structuration view." *Journal of Business Venturing* 21, no. 3: 286–305.

Schriemer, R. 2004. *Analytical report on education: 'National focal point for the Netherlands'*. Leiden: European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC).

Siebers, Hans. 2010. "The impact of migrant-hostile discourse in the media and politics on racioethnic closure in career development in the Netherlands." *International Sociology* 25, no. 4: 475–500.

Silverman, Robert Mark. 2000. *Doing business in minority markets: Black and Korean entrepreneurs in Chicago's ethnic beauty aids industry*. New York: Garland.

Steyaert, Chris, and Jerome Katz. 2004. "Reclaiming the space of entrepreneurship in society: Geographical, discursive and social dimensions." *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 16, no. 3: 179–196.

Stolcke, Verena. 1995. "Talking culture: New boundaries, new rhetorics of exclusion in Europe." *Current Anthropology* 36, no. 1: 1–24.

Strauss, Anselm, and Juliet Corbin. 1990. *Basics of qualitative research*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Sultana, Abeda. 2012. "Patriarchy and women's subordination: A theoretical analysis." *Arts Faculty Journal* 4: 1–18.

Toksöz, Gulay. 2011. "Women's employment in Turkey in the light of different trajectories in development-different patterns in women's employment." *Fe Dergi* 3, no .2: 19–32.

Tseng, Yen-Fen. 2004. "Review of immigrant entrepreneurs: Venturing abroad in the age of globalization." *International Sociology* 19, no. 4: 524–527.

Turkish Grameen Microfinance Program. http://www.tgmp.net/tr/. Accessed on May 2019.

Ufuk, Hatun, and Özlen Özgen. 2001. "Interaction between the business and family lives of women entrepreneurs in Turkey." *Journal of Business Ethics* 31, no. 2: 95–106.

Valdez, Zulema. 2016. "Intersectionality, the household economy, and ethnic entrepreneurship." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 39, no. 9: 1618–1636.

Vasta, Ellie. 2007. "From ethnic minorities to ethnic majority policy: Multiculturalism and the shift to assimilationism in the Netherlands." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30, nos. 5: 713–740.

Verduijn, Karen, and Caroline Essers. 2013. "Questioning dominant entrepreneurship assumptions: The case of female ethnic minority entrepreneurs." *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 25, nos. 7–8: 612–630.

Villares-Varela, Maria, and Caroline Essers. 2019. "Women in the migrant economy: A positional approach to contextualize gendered transnational trajectories." *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 31, nos. 3–4: 213–225.

Villares-Varela, Maria, Monder Ram, and Trevor Jones. 2017. *Female immigrant global entrepreneurship: The Routledge companion to global female entrepreneurship*. London: Routledge.

Walby, Sylvia, Jo Armstrong, and Sofia Strid. 2012. "Intersectionality: Multiple inequalities in social theory." *Sociology* 46: 224–240.

Waldinger, Roger David, Howard Aldrich, and Robin Ward. 2006. *Ethnic entrepreneurs: Immigrant business in industrial societies*. New York, NY: Sage.

Welter, Friederike. 2011. "Contextualizing entrepreneurship—Conceptual challenges and ways forward." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 35, no. 1: 165–184.

Yazıcı, Berna. 2008. "Social work and social exclusion in Turkey: An overview." *New Perspectives on Turkey* 38: 107–134.