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ABSTRACT

This study investigates the possibility and utility of clearly defining Indigenous entrepreneurship as a distinct disciplinary field of science and charting for it a pre-paradigmatic framework that distinguishes this field of scholarship from all others. This study uses a strategy of literature search and examination to argue that Indigenous entrepreneurship, as a research area, is sufficiently distinguished from both mainstream entrepreneurship and other social and management sciences to constitute a legitimate, well-defined sub-field of research in its own right. The study provides both a formal definition of the field and an illustrated theoretical framework to describe it.
The study reported in this paper endeavoured to define a newly emerging field of research (or dismiss its rights to be called a field) by searching for, evaluating and classifying a body of scholarly works that might have claim to constituting the canon of Indigenous entrepreneurship research. Potentially, it is going to be very difficult to convince mainstream entrepreneurship scholars that Indigenous entrepreneurship has any claim to being a distinctive research field. This is illustrated by the following very short story. Once upon a time, not so very long ago, one of the current authors and a colleague submitted a paper featuring aspects of Indigenous entrepreneurship to a reputable, established entrepreneurship journal. A very trenchant rejection came back from one reviewer based on the reviewer’s contention that the authors had “failed to demonstrate a predicate condition” necessary to their argument that Indigenous entrepreneurship might constitute a legitimate and distinctive field of study. The reviewer complained that the authors ‘had not shown that Indigenous people in developed economies were disadvantaged’. Well, ahem, let us not make that mistake again. We turn, very briefly, to Australia as an example. Here are some ‘predicate’ data (taken largely from Hindle 2007a, which paper, in turn, used a variety of official statistical and documented secondary sources.)

It has been estimated that there are just over 420,000 Indigenous Australians, living mainly in urban centres. Over half live in New South Wales and Queensland but the highest regional concentration (27.7 per cent) live in the Northern Territory. Compared to the non-Indigenous, Indigenous Australians are two and a quarter times more likely to die before birth. Their life expectancy is only two thirds as long as a mainstream Australian. As recently as April 2007 there was major press coverage of a recent report stating that the average Indigenous Australian can expect to live 20 years
less than the average White or Immigrant Australian. Indigenous Australians have over 16 times the incarceration rate of non-Indigenous Australians. They need hospitalization nearly twice as much. Their unemployment rate is nearly four times the mainstream average. Their children are subject to nearly four and a half times the number of protection orders. They are more than 47 times more likely to be living in a dwelling with ten or more people. They have less than half the mainstream retention rates for final year high school. The Indigenous have only a third of the rate of post-high school qualifications and only 68 percent of the median weekly income of the non-Indigenous. The hospital admissions rate for Indigenous women, due to interpersonal violence, is over 47 times the rate for non-Indigenous women and the strongest causal factor is substance abuse.

Hindle argues (2007a: 485) that despite the existence of sporadic successes, it is fair using the cited data, to conclude, in the aggregate, that Indigenous Australians - as nations\(^1\) and individuals - have suffered rather than benefited from the development of the mainstream Australian state. He further argues that Indigenous welfare and adjunct policies – including those designed to foster entrepreneurship have been and remain an aggregate failure.

These conclusions can be derived dispassionately: from primary data sources. No selective choice of evidence or ideological bias is required. The litany of disadvantage occurs despite the Federal Government (Australia has six State and two Territory

\(^1\) In a subsequent section of the paper Neitschmann’s definition of ‘nation’ will be presented. It is a confronting definition for those used to thinking of ‘nation’ as being synonymous with ‘prevailing hegemonic state’.
Governments who also contribute) spending $2.2 billion or $21,450 per Indigenous household. (Hindle 2007a: 486)

Combining the demonstrable relative disadvantage of Indigenous Australians compared to mainstream Australians with the very high level of Indigenous welfare expenditure produces irrefutable evidence of spectacular failure of the passive welfare system. Hindle even argues that it would be preferable to give the money – all $21,450 per year - directly to each Indigenous household rather than to persevere in “the bootless search for ever more layers of patronising bureaucracy”.

As it is for Aboriginals and Torres Straight Islanders, the Indigenous peoples of Australia, so it is for the Indigenous peoples of Canada, New Zealand, the USA, the Scandinavian countries, Russia, Japan, Taiwan, most other Asian nations and indeed, any country where a mainstream polity, through the success of physical and cultural invasion, has come to dominate an Indigenous population who now reside as disadvantaged minority citizens in lands they once controlled. A perusal of the extensive literature presented in the reference section of this paper will provide overwhelming evidence of the global nature of Indigenous disadvantage: the pattern is generically similar in many different hegemonic states.

Is Indigenous entrepreneurship a possible solution and is it a definable field?

Addressing the first part of the above question, an argument can be made that entrepreneurship is most definitely a viable strategy for considering a multitude of challenges faced by Indigenous people’s worldwide. Interest in Indigenous
entrepreneurship has accelerated in the late nineteenth and early twenty-first century
primarily because passive welfare solutions have failed so comprehensively to solve any
of the problems that arise from the state of Indigenous disadvantage. Agrawal has argued
that the failure of neo-liberal (market) and authoritarian and bureaucratic (state)
approaches to development has lead to a “focus on Indigenous knowledge and production
systems” (Agrawal 1995, 414). Continuing, he says that these efforts are an attempt “to
reorient and reverse state policies and market forces to permit members of threatened
populations to determine their own future” (Agrawal 1995, 432). For the most part, these
efforts are not taking place outside the global economy, but within it. As Bebbington
(1993, 275) suggests, ‘like it or not, Indigenous peoples are firmly integrated into a
capricious and changing market. Their well-being and survival depends on how well they
handle and negotiate this integration’. He goes on to say that the Indigenous approach to
negotiating this integration is not to reject outright participation in the modern economy:

But rather to pursue local and grassroots control... over the economic and social
relationships that traditionally have contributed to the transfer of income and value from
the locality to other places and social groups (Bebbington 1993, 281).

In this context, entrepreneurship conducted by Indigenous people for their own
benefit has come to be one area where representatives of the hegemonic mainstream state
and members of various Indigenous communities have strong points of mutual
agreement, though they arrive at them from very different premises. All Indigenous
people, long suppressed as minority stakeholders in what were once and they regard still
as their own lands, seek a higher degree of autonomy than the mainstream state is often
willing to convey. There is also a growing awareness by many Indigenous leaders around the world that economic independence is an obvious path towards preserving all aspects of community integrity including lifestyle, heritage and culture. We present the words of a prominent Canadian Indigenous leader, Chief Clarence Louie of the Osoyoos First Nation, to emphasize and validate this shift in thinking:

_We need no strings attached by government. In the 1800’s, the government took away the Natives’ economic development [capabilities] by removing their ability to support themselves. Native people, over the years, have fed into that system. Say money. Language, culture, pow wows… I don’t care what, they all cost money. Every idea costs money… You’re going to lose your language and culture faster in poverty than you will in [pursuing] economic development… (Chief Clarence Louie, 2007)_

_Meanwhile, the mainstream state requires no altruism to wish that the obvious waste and failure of expensive passive welfare could be re-applied via more productive policies. So, mainstream states and Indigenous peoples come to the same ground from different starting positions. The basis of all freedom is economic freedom. The ability to enhance both the autonomy and economic development of Indigenous people, at all levels (individual, group, community and nation) by creating new ventures, new initiatives and new wealth – entrepreneurship – is mutually attractive to Indigenous people and mainstream polity._
This burgeoning interest in the process and practice of Indigenous venturing extends into and informs the key question: has academic research in this area evolved into a well-structured field of study? Enter the possibility that the unique conditions and contexts that define the phenomenon of Indigenous entrepreneurship might require both a specialised field of practice and a specialised field of research. Accordingly, a rigorous examination and analysis of the extant literature in this area is overdue.

**Literature search strategy and design of the paper**

A comprehensive literature search was designed to include all academic book publications, peer reviewed journals, University sponsored reports and documents published though reputable research institutes. As Indigenous entrepreneurship does not yet appear to be well represented within the realm of mainstream research, the authors cast a wide net using as many search tools and contacts to locate as much of the extant literature as possible. This required gaining access to papers published in peer-reviewed journals that are sometimes not represented in the main search engines such as ABI/Inform and EBSCO. Journal and book editors were contacted to retrieve forthcoming chapters and papers not currently housed within accessible online databases. Over 25 search parameters were used within available search engines, and were corroborated against searches with the internet utility “Google scholar” to locate any gaps within the data retrieved from all other databases. Keywords, terms and phrases used in the search were all recorded for each database used, as well as the exact search tools used. Each search term either began with “Indigenous”, “Aboriginal”, or “Native American”. This predicate was then joined to an array of terms best perceived to elicit the full range of concepts and phenomena that could be synonymous, representative, or aligned with “entrepreneurship”. The search generated a total of 102 works
that were deemed to be worthy candidates for inclusion in a possible Indigenous entrepreneurship canon.

This paper reports the examination of these “candidate” works and employs the following design.

First we deal with the task of providing predicate perspectives and definitions of key terms. How does the putative derivative field potentially relate to the parent field of entrepreneurship research? Is there any established consensus about the meaning of “Indigenous person”, “Indigenous entrepreneurship” and “Indigenous entrepreneurship research”?

Second is the task of literature classification. Works that might qualify for inclusion in the putative field of “Indigenous entrepreneurship research” were sought, examined and arranged using the search strategies and techniques previously described. After close reading of the works resulting from the search strategy, one major theme was determined a priori and four other major themes emerged. These were used as structural aids to the creation of a comprehensive categorization table, listing all works deemed to fall within the canon of papers constituting the existing body of scholarship directly germane and principally focused upon Indigenous entrepreneurship. The table (and associated discussion of and conclusions drawn from the works it contains) is arranged in three major subdivisions: works featuring a heavy emphasis on “boundary setting” and defining the field; works that, while not emphasising it, make an important contribution to field definition; and all other works deemed to fall within the boundaries of the field
defined by the contribution of works in the previous two categories. A brief section discusses the grounds used to determine which works should be excluded from the field.

Third, the tasks of sense making and conclusion-drawing are embraced in an assessment of the current status and future direction of the emerging field. This resulted in the development of new generic definitions “Indigenous entrepreneurship” and “Indigenous entrepreneurship research” and production of an illustrated, structured framework depicting the field. Fourth, discussion focused on degrees of consensus and controversy among existing scholars in the field, limitations of work done to date, methodological issues and future directions.

Finally, it was decided to distinguish “general” references (papers that contributed to the scholarly development of our arguments) from ‘specific’ references – an unalloyed collection of the citation details of the papers we deemed to constitute the current canon in what we did find to be the recognisably distinct field of Indigenous entrepreneurship research.

**PREDICATE PERSPECTIVES AND DEFINITIONS**

**Mainstream entrepreneurship**

Entrepreneurship is a multifaceted, complex phenomenon. Researchers studying it are more often characterized by their differences than their similarities. Davidsson (2003 and 2004) has articulated four important perceptual distinctions when it comes to understanding entrepreneurship. First, it is important to distinguish the *societal perspective* from the *research perspective*. Second, it is important to recognize that,
within the research perspective, there are two major schools of thought: one focuses on the emergence and development of new organizations the other on developing an opportunity. Opportunity is a concept closely allied to implementation of an innovation: the derivation of economic benefits from the production of new relationships.

Emphasis on the newness of the enterprise itself is stressed in an article so well cited that it can be called seminal. Low and Macmillan (1988: 141) suggested that entrepreneurship – in practice as distinct from being a research field - should be defined as “the creation of new enterprise” whereas the purpose of entrepreneurship research should be to “explain and facilitate the role of new enterprise in furthering economic progress”. They stressed that both micro and macro elements of the phenomenon should be studied at multiple levels of analysis. In contrast, emphasis on the newness of what the enterprise does is found in Shane and Venkataraman (2000: 218), another article of seminal significance. They retain an emphasis on novelty – the newness of economic activity – but relax the condition that a new enterprise must be created in order for an activity to be called “entrepreneurship”.

We define the field of entrepreneurship as the scholarly examination of how, by whom and with what effects opportunities to create future goods and services are discovered, evaluated and exploited. Shane and Venkataraman (2000: 218),

Shane and Venkataraman stress that there is an essential distinction between specifically entrepreneurial opportunities and the larger set of all opportunities for profit – especially those concerned with enhancing the efficiency of existing goods, services,
raw materials and organising methods. The key difference is that entrepreneurial opportunities involve the discovery and evaluation of new relationships between means and ends. This is quite distinct from improvement or optimisation within existing means-ends frameworks. Most management textbook tools, techniques and guidelines aim to help managers to do existing things better. However, entrepreneurial opportunities are not about doing existing things better: they are about doing entirely new and different things and/or achieving outcomes in entirely new ways.

Davidsson (2003) provides a succinct discussion of these two main streams in the entrepreneurship literature: the emergence perspective and the opportunity perspective. The first stream views entrepreneurship as organisational or firm emergence (Gartner 1993) where the evolutionary and dynamic aspects of entrepreneurship are crucial and the focus is on organising activities in a Weickian sense. The second stream essentially argues that entrepreneurship is about the discovery, evaluation and exploitation of opportunities (c.f. Shane and Venkataraman 2000). This literature emphasises entrepreneurship as a disequilibrium activity where opportunities are defined as ‘situations in which new goods, services, raw materials, markets and organizing methods can be introduced through the formation of new means, ends, or means-ends relationship’ (Eckhardt and Shane, 2003: 4). See Figure 1.

Figure 1 represents two main dimensions distinguishing the emergence view from the opportunity view. Dimension one is whether the actions involved in an
entrepreneurial process are defined by creation and identification of new means and ends relationships or maximizing existing means and ends relationships. Dimension two is whether the context involves creation of new organizations or if entrepreneurship takes place in an existing organizational context. A is characterised by ventures whose essence is to be an innovative start-up that changes the competitive conditions within an industry and drives the market. B involves start-ups that do not change underlying competitive conditions within an industry or the fundamental forces that drive the operation of an existing market, but fill gaps in an existing market by maximizing existing means and ends relationships. C includes creation or identification of new means and ends relationships exploited in an existing organizational context, involving an existing organisation changing competitive market conditions by the introduction of new products, processes or production methods. The opportunity perspective embraces A and C. The emergence perspective embraces A and B. D is not entrepreneurship from either the opportunity or the emergence perspective but merely traditional management.

**Current attempts to define Indigenous entrepreneurship**

What exactly qualifies as a scientific field of inquiry? Kuhn (1962/1970a) relates all scientific inquiry into the collection of ‘mere facts’, whereas a body of a priori beliefs is often already implicit in the guidance of their collection. During the early stages of an inquiry, different researchers will confront the same phenomena, interpreting them in different ways until schools of thought are formed, coalescing a wide assortment of descriptions of the scrutinised phenomena into collections of special emphasis that are pre-paradigmatic in nature. Competing schools vie for pre-eminence until a limited few emerge, based upon their capacity to synthesize old and new, attracting greater numbers of potential
scholars. These paradigms thus transform a group into a profession of practice that embraces some or all of the following items:

i. The creation of specialized journals.

ii. Formation of specialized research groups within larger fields

iii. Direct and indirect claims made to the designation of a special place within a field or curriculum (and designated research institutes or networks)

iv. The fact that members of the group need no longer build their field from scratch as a host of principles, justification of concepts, questions, and methods are already formed in order to galvanize research tracts.

v. Promulgation of peer reviewed articles intended for a select group of aligned scholars who are assumed to understand and relate to the work being advanced.

vi. Within the context of modern communications capacity, the appearance of discussion groups, blogspots and web sites hosting and disseminating scholarly research.

Thus a research paradigm guides and brings together the disparate and often unrealized elements of a special group's research. It is by these criteria that we seek to investigate the possibility of identifying and clearly proclaiming Indigenous entrepreneurship as a distinct sub-discipline of entrepreneurship and charting for it a pre-paradigmatic framework that distinguishes this field of scholarship from all others.

If Indigenous entrepreneurship is to be a field, it must also retain the parent discipline’s emphasis on novelty: the newness of either the enterprise being built or the
opportunity being developed. The putative new field does not have to “take sides” and
decide whether the opportunity perspective or organisational emergence perspective is
the “true” heart of the parent field. Indigenous entrepreneurship, if it is to be a field, can
and ought to embrace both perspectives. It can and should be about activities covered by
boxes A, B and C, in figure 1. What can make it distinct as a field in its own right will be
two things. First is the issue of ‘whom’. Are Indigenous people sufficiently distinguished
from mainstream entrepreneurial actors to warrant special attention? Their relative
deprivation alone is sufficient to give a positive answer to this question. Second, comes
the issue of ‘what matters and for whom’. In mainstream entrepreneurship, the key thing
that matters is the achievement, within the bounds of mainstream law and ethics, of a
profitable outcome for the principal protagonists of an entrepreneurial venture.
Indigenous contexts are markedly different. Depending on circumstance, culture, norms
and other variables, Indigenous entrepreneurship may have to take account of a wider
array of stakeholders and a wider variety of issues – particularly social impacts - than just
the achievement of economic success by individual or firm protagonists.

Who, exactly, qualifies as an “Indigenous” person?

The convention observed in this paper is to use a capital “I” for every use of the
word “Indigenous”. Australia has two groups of Indigenous people: Aboriginals and
Torres Strait Islanders. The basis of classification was given in a High Court judgment in
the case of Commonwealth v Tasmania (1983) 46 ALR 625. An Aboriginal or Torres
Strait Islander is a person of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent who identifies as
an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander and is accepted as such by the community in
which he or she lives. Essentially, various United States agencies also use self-
identification to determine Indigenous status for members of the 500 Indian nations.

Canada has three groups of formally defined Indigenous people. Rather than go to a
taxonomic assembly of definitions from various international political jurisdictions we
will defer our offering of a generic definition of an “Indigenous person”, for research
purposes, until after our consideration of the literature. In the actual world, far more
important than how any scholar or government agency defines Indigeneity is the way
Indigenous people define themselves.

The Australian example – and, it can be shown, all other attempts to define
Indigeneity for legal or governmental purposes - illustrates that a very important
definition of “Indigenous” is self-definition by individuals, groups and communities. For
non-Indigenous majorities, one of the hardest issues to grasp comes at the highest level of
community: the concept of nation. Many Indigenous people see themselves as members
of a “nation” within a “state”.

A nation is a cultural territory made up of communities of individuals who see
themselves as “one people” on the basis of common ancestry, history, society,
institutions, ideology, language, territory, and often, religion. A person is born into a
specific nation. (Neitschmann 1994: 226)

A state is a centralized political system within international legal boundaries
recognized by other states. Further, it uses a civilian-military bureaucracy to establish
one government and to enforce one set of institutions and laws. It typically has one
language, one economy, one claim over all resources, one currency, one flag, and sometimes one religion. (Neitschmann 1994: 226).

Neitschmann is credited with the development of what has come to be termed “Fourth World Theory”. This is the structured attempt to understand the situation of deprivileged original owners in lands now controlled by an alien hegemony - the essential concept of Indigeneity that underpins our literature search. Indigenous people are a dispossessed and disadvantaged minority living under a hegemony, which has much dissimilarity to their own social, economic and cultural traditions.

Hindle and Lansdowne (2005 and 2007) provide a definition of Indigenous entrepreneurship which has been adopted by the editors of the recently published Handbook of Indigenous Entrepreneurship Research (Dana and Anderson 2007: 9)

Indigenous entrepreneurship is the creation, management and development of new ventures by Indigenous people for the benefit of Indigenous people. The organizations thus created can pertain to either the private, public or non-profit sectors. The desired and achieved benefits of venturing can range from the narrow view of economic profit for a single individual to the broad view of multiple, social and economic advantages for entire communities. Outcomes and entitlements derived from Indigenous entrepreneurship may extend to enterprise partners and stakeholders who may be non-Indigenous. Hindle and Lansdowne (2007: 9)
It might be argued that this definition leans too much to the emergence perspective.

Foley (2000) provides an overtly opportunity-focused definition:

*The Indigenous Australian entrepreneur alters traditional patterns of behaviour, by utilising their resources in the pursuit of self-determination and economic sustainability via their entry into self employment, forcing social change in the pursuit of opportunity beyond the cultural norms of their initial economic resources.* (Foley 2000: 25)

While it is hard to interpret what is meant by the phrase “beyond the cultural norms of their initial economic resources”, it is clear that here is an emphasis on opportunity development with a strong emphasis on overcoming disadvantage through creative, novel economic activity. The important thing is not the differences between these definitions (and others that could be cited), it is their common ground. Both these definitions and others offered throughout the literature (see reference section of his paper, *passim*) stress the importance of new economic enterprise, by and for the benefit of Indigenous people as a means of overcoming disadvantage through active participation in the global economy on a competitive business-based basis. All definitions insist that factors – particularly cultural and social norms - associated with ‘Indigeneity’ are so important that much of the received wisdom of mainstream entrepreneurship may well be inapplicable in Indigenous circumstances.
Using the search strategy outlined previously, 102 papers were produced for classification and analysis. The authors scrutinised each of the papers and highlighted the main points, issues and concepts in a literature classification matrix (see table 1) reproduced below. Ambiguous classifications and categorizations were resolved through careful deliberation between the authors (Davidsson and Wiklund, 2001). The matrix contains some self-evident column headings. “Date” is the date of publication. Another obvious column names the author or authors of the work. (The reference section contains full citation details for each work listed in the table). “Type” indicates whether a work is theoretical (coded “T”) or empirical (coded “E”) or both (coded “T&E”). Four column headings warrant more detailed explanation.

Three principal categories of works in the canon

Since our study was focused on defining a field, our principal categorisation variable indicates the extent to which a work concentrates on the task of field definition. Hence, the second column is coded “Cat” is short for “field defining category”. There are three principal categories, labelled, F1, F2 and F3 (where F is short for “field definition”). Works that belong to the “F1” category are those that have, as a principal objective, the attempt to conceptually map or define the boundaries of Indigenous entrepreneurship as a unique field of research or as a noteworthy sub-field. These works often postulated theoretical assumptions on what Indigenous entrepreneurship currently entails or how the field should develop and they may or may not have had empirical as well as conceptual components. Of the 102 works considered, 8 papers were designated as those that were
directly focused on defining the phenomenon of Indigenous entrepreneurship. Works classified “F2”, were those that considered, discussed, or presented theoretical or empirical data on Indigenous entrepreneurship, but were not directly or principally focused upon defining the field. Of the 102 papers considered, 17 papers fell into this second category. These papers were viewed as extremely important to the development of entrepreneurship within the Indigenous context as a distinct field of research by the authors. Together, works coded F1 or F2 addressed the question: What are key issues, terms, boundaries and variables associated with entrepreneurship in the Indigenous context? They were works interested in discovery of quantitative or qualitative data on Indigenous entrepreneurship, that lead to evaluation of best practices and processes for fostering successful entrepreneurship in the Indigenous context. They were works giving considerable attention to assessment of entrepreneurship as a tool for development.

Works coded “F3” do not directly attempt to define or map entrepreneurship in the Indigenous context but belong to the field as defined by works coded “F1” or “F2”. These works can be generically summarised as follows.

- They explore Indigenous issues with indirect reference to new venture creation or Indigenous entrepreneurship as a potential tool for forwarding the goals of Indigenous people.

- They address issues that are regarded as important or key to the development of the research field of Indigenous entrepreneurship, but do not speak directly to Indigenous entrepreneurship, per se, such as land, resources, cultural integrity, self-determination, governance, education, and dealing with disadvantage.
- They discuss, recommend or evaluate policy or historical factors that pertain to
the development issues faced by Indigenous people.

Of the 102 papers considered, 44 papers fell into the F3 category.

The matrix is arranged with F1 works listed first and not in date order, but ranked
with respect to the volume of the paper that specifically addresses the issue of field
definition. F2 works are listed next in reverse date and alphabetical order, as these works
were much more difficult to rank due to their content. F3 works are also listed in reverse
date order.

Principal themes and key concepts

The authors began the classification task with unfettered listing of prominent
concepts, issues and arguments derived or inferred from specific instances and contexts
within the literature. This process involved copious note taking upon reading each work and
identifying all main themes, issues, and concepts found, and then cross referencing them.
The results of this exercise produced a high volume and wide range of non-coded descriptive
material. Several rounds of concept comparison, amalgamation and coding followed in a
search for maximum conceptual parsimony for the purpose of systematic description and
classification of works (see table 1, below). Five principal themes emerged.

(1) Defining the field of Indigenous entrepreneurship – coded “Def”

Given the nature and mission of this study, this theme was determined a priori. It is
the indicator of whether a work contains significant content concerning the definition of
Indigenous entrepreneurship as a distinct field of practice and/or research. Four fundamental, distinct themes were discovered *a posteriori* using a range of content analysis and textual coding techniques.

(2) Culture and social norms – coded “CSN”

(3) Entrepreneurial capacity (relevant skills, experience and education) – coded “Capacity”

(4) Organizational drivers and constraints (institutions and governance) – coded “Org”

(5) Land and resource issues – coded “Land”

The term ‘key concepts’ as used in table 1 (below) embraces material emphasis that authors placed on various aspects of themes (2) to (4). For instance, a particular paper might be significantly concerned with the way Indigenous governance (subset of the “organization” theme) influences Indigenous entrepreneurship.

Unit(s) of analysis

The literature classification matrix utilises five units of analysis to distinguish the principal economic actor – the *doer* of the entrepreneurship - with which the work is predominantly concerned. They are: individuals (coded “Ind”); Groups or Firms (coded “Gr/Fi”); Institutions (coded “Inst”); communities (coded “comm.”) and multiple units of analysis (coded “multi”). If a study merely mentioned several units of analysis but really substantively concentrated on only one, then the “multi” coding was not used. If the study seriously discussed or examined more than one unit of analysis, then the coding “multi” was
used. The category of institution was used where our classification of “community” includes the ultimate plurality of “nation” (viz. Neitschmann 1994: 226).

**Studies considered but excluded**

Works that made reference to Indigenous circumstances but had no direct reference to entrepreneurship or its development potential were excluded as were works that had a lot to say about entrepreneurship but in contexts that did not fit the definition of “Indigenous” as discussed and developed in previous sections of this paper. Literature that was judged redundant or published in dual locations was also screened out. Finally, papers that addressed core or peripheral issues entailed in the phenomenon of Indigenous entrepreneurship were dropped if they did not add significant intellectual value in a manner compatible with the formal notion of “research”. In other words, these tended to be papers that merely reported acts of or issues in Indigenous entrepreneurship but did not analyse them in any scholastically meaningful manner. Of the 102 papers considered, 33 were dropped on these grounds.

The result: a literature classification matrix

---Insert Table 1 here---

**LITERATURE ANALYSIS: WHAT ARE THE GENERIC FUNDAMENTALS OF THE FIELD?**
Salient features of the literature

The frequency data illustrated in table 2 below was gathered by counting the incidences of appearance for each of the major categories of analysis found within the works that constitute the canon listed in the reference section of this paper and classified in table 1. A subsequent examination of publication features dealing with location and quality of journals was also conducted.

- Insert table 2 here –

These results highlight some interesting features of the canon. First, over 50 percent of works focus on “community” as a theoretical or empirical unit of analysis. The next most common unit of analysis, the “individual” only appeared in 21 percent of the works. Second, the principal theme, “Culture and social norms”, appeared in just over 50 percent of works, while “Capacity” and “Organizations” followed with 40 percent and 36 percent respectively. Third, 74 percent of the “Type” of works are theoretically based, 47 percent were empirical, and of these, the majority of those that could be defined as having a specific method were case studies, at 36 percent. Finally, the authors detailed and recorded the origins of all the works included in the “Canon” and then by using a multi-faceted journal quality list (JQL), found that the majority of the works (36 percent) hailed from unranked journals, and that only a fraction of these papers were housed in A-grade (7 percent) or B (16 percent) ranked journals.

Definitions resulting from the literature review
As a result of the literature review we offer the following formal definitions.

**Indigenous people are individuals, groups, communities or nations who reside as disadvantaged minority citizens or non-citizens of a mainstream polity, which, through the success of physical and cultural invasion, has come to dominate them in lands they once controlled or who have been displaced by the dominant hegemony from lands they once controlled.**

**Indigenous entrepreneurship is activity focused on new venture creation or the pursuit of economic opportunity or both, for the purpose of diminishing Indigenous disadvantage through culturally viable and community acceptable wealth creation.**

**Indigenous entrepreneurship, as a research field, is the scholarly examination of new enterprise creation and the pursuit of opportunities to create future goods and services in furthering economic progress by redressing key issues of the disadvantage suffered by Indigenous people.**

There are several issues raised by these definitions that we reserve until the discussion section of the paper.
A formal framework of the field of Indigenous entrepreneurship research: figure 2 presents the field of Indigenous entrepreneurship as a formal framework.

-- Insert Figure 2 here --

The framework represents a distillation of the literature into four categories, 1) the level of analysis used to analyse entrepreneurial actors, 2) the motivating agenda behind the phenomenon, 3) principal themes emerging from the research, and 4) the emerging themes that formalize the principal themes. What this graphic clearly illustrates is that by and large, research conducted in this field has been driven by one overarching dominant agenda: the need to redress multiple aspects of disadvantage relative to the colonial societies that Indigenous people now find themselves enveloped. In effect, the process of invasion and cultural domination has attenuated, and in some instances, truncated generations of cultural knowledge transmission that is bound within the ecological connection that Indigenous people commonly share with the lands they once inhabited, resulting in a loss of spiritual and traditional aspects of their identity (Berkes, 1999). This theme of disadvantage is underpinned by the need for building economic capacity (independence) to regain the political and social control that is required for establishing self determination and the ability to travel multiple pathways: both past and future.

The entrepreneurial actors involved with this transformational activity of redressing Indigenous disadvantage are measured using multiple units of analysis on many levels of inquiry. Thus studies are focused upon individuals, groups/firms, communities, institutions, nations, or multiple aspects of some or all of these levels of analysis. Upon closer scrutiny
of the levels of analysis used in these studies, an important feature of Indigenous entrepreneurship emerges. We classify and define this prominent feature as the ‘degree of Indigeneity’ attached to the entrepreneurial actors involved. This aspect of ‘Indigeneity’ can be assessed in two ways: 1) how strongly Indigenous factors relating to the dominant agenda affect the venture or opportunity involved with an entrepreneurial endeavour, and 2) to what extent is any Indigenous venture involved with mainstream actors. These two factors do not express a dichotomy, but instead, offer keen insight into the mindset of Indigenous entrepreneurial actors that distinguishes them from all others: whether or not and to what level venturing is a for profit exercise involving the dominant agenda and to what extent does involvement in the global economy allow the pursuit of this agenda on their own terms (Hindle and Lansdowne, 2005). In simple terms, how can and through what measures can Indigenous people, groups, communities, or nations operate within both worlds to achieve their multiple goals?

The achievement of these goals is overshadowed by four principal themes within the literature: 1) culture and social norms, 2) education and the fostering of general and specific skills required for venturing, 3) organizational drivers and constraints and 4) land and resources. These principal themes are built upon the foundation of emerging themes within each that have been distilled through rigorous examination of the literature into a dominant category. We posit that these four themes represent the pre-eminent domains of the extant research into the phenomenon of Indigenous entrepreneurship that shapes the emerging canon.
DISCUSSION: STATUS AND FUTURE OF THE FIELD

Strongest areas of consensus among existing scholars in the field

Our study of the extant Indigenous entrepreneurship literature reveals strongest convergence upon the fundamental importance of two dominant issues:

• the definition and role of ‘community’ as a consideration affecting all forms and processes of Indigenous entrepreneurship;

• and the multi-faceted importance of ‘land’ (where ‘land’ embraces all issues pertaining to land ranging from emotional attachment to formal property rights).

The importance of ‘community’ emerges as one of the clearest issues that distinguish Indigenous entrepreneurship from mainstream entrepreneurship. First of all, the community may well be the protagonist of Indigenous entrepreneurial activity. Whereas mainstream entrepreneurship scholarship has been critically interested in the intentions, actions and cognitive make up of the individual (Shephard and Krueger, 2002; Shane, 2003; Baron and Ward, 2004; Mitchell, et al., 2004), Indigenous entrepreneurship has the additional burden of studying the intentions and actions of a complex plural entity – the community – whenever it takes the lead role in an entrepreneurial process. However, in the field of Indigenous entrepreneurship, there is a second, less obvious but more pervasive importance of the concept and reality of ‘community’ even when the entrepreneurial protagonist is not the community itself. Multiple aspects of community strongly affect any Indigenous entrepreneurship process even when other actors (individuals, groups, institutions) are the
entrepreneurial protagonists. Consider the case where the protagonist is an individual. The end goal of the individual Indigenous entrepreneur is tied to the harmonization of several personal and community oriented goals that extend from his or her ability to generate new economic value (whether such value be designated as ‘profits’ or by any other term).

Indigenous entrepreneurship is always strongly conscious of the chain of effects that connects personal wealth creation and achievement with an Indigenous community’s underlying communal goals – particularly those of redressing relative disadvantage within the dominant polity and preservation of the features which define the Indigenous community’s desired distinctions from the dominant polity. This is not the same thing as saying or assuming with the naïve paternalism of some of the worst forms of outdated mainstream welfare thinking that Indigenous communities do not value individual initiative, enterprise and innovation. But it is to say that the vast majority of Indigenous communities, from the smallest band to the largest nation, are vitally interested in the maintenance of what we will call ‘community integrity’: that combination of factors including culture, heritage and weltanschaung which define the Indigenous community and can keep defining its distinctive character in a world of globalization and rapid economic change.

So, the practical illustrations of the importance of community in Indigenous entrepreneurship abound. Indigenous entrepreneurs are more likely to hire Indigenous people, creating higher rates of employment (Foley, 2006). As well, the type, structure and content of the business opportunity are often linked to traditional and heritage factors. At the end of the day, Indigenous entrepreneurs – even urban based Indigenous entrepreneurs who superficially seem to have more in common with the mainstream than their ‘roots’ - are still Indigenous, and cannot be removed from their existence as a distinct member of a
minority community within a hegemony that is in many ways alien. This situation engenders in many Indigenous entrepreneurs a pervasive regard for the plural consideration of other community members and the relevant Indigenous community and communities as a whole, which, in turn, generates many contextual issues that mainstream entrepreneurs simply do not encounter. The research and practical relevance of the conscious address of issues pertaining to ‘community’ applies even in extreme contrarian cases, where Indigenous entrepreneurs reject their Indigeneity, ‘opt out’, or are not inclusive of community activities. Such attitudes and activities, either beyond a community, without community support, or even with community hostility still demand that overt consideration of community must be undertaken. At the crudest practical level this is because it would be bad entrepreneurial marketing to ignore strategic consideration of forces that might have a negative impact on business success. At a deeper level of sound research practice this is because protagonists’ senses of identity and self-efficacy are well-established factors in helping to explain business behaviour generally and entrepreneurial behaviour in particular (Boyd and Vozikis, 1994; Krueger and Brazeal, 1994; Thornton, 1999; Warren, 2004; Zhao, et al., 2005). In extreme case of an individual Indigenous entrepreneur acting against the express wishes or values of a relevant community, hostility may be generated and is a very important factor influencing the entrepreneurial process. In summary, the nature and role of any relevant Indigenous community as a factor affecting entrepreneurial process is an issue that must be overtly considered in the study of Indigenous entrepreneurship. This is one of the strongest themes extant in the emerging canon.

We turn now, briefly, to the canon’s insistence upon the importance of land and well-defined property rights. This is both ecologically and economically intertwined with
opportunity management and the successful creation of new ventures within the Indigenous context. Indigenous entrepreneurship, in common with mainstream entrepreneurship, can only be successfully carried out in the context of well-defined property rights (De Soto 2000) and through the leverage of entrepreneurial capital. However, in mainstream entrepreneurship, especially in developed Western economies, the existence of well-defined, well-regulated property rights focused on the ability of individuals to own and dispose of property is so thoroughly assumed that it scarcely warrants attention. Quite simply, in mainstream entrepreneurship, it is reasonable to assume an environment of legally-enforceable property rights and institutional abundance (e.g. the existence of capital markets, and a wide range of facilitating institutions). These ‘background assumptions’ cannot be made in Indigenous entrepreneurship. Indeed, the nature of property rights will often assume foreground status as a major impediment to entrepreneurial process. In many Indigenous community situations, property rights are communally held and very hard to leverage as collateral in a way that the individual mainstream entrepreneur may take for granted. For instance, banks and other financial intermediaries often have no experiences, policies or inclinations enabling them to value a proportion of communally held land as a security against an individual Indigenous entrepreneur’s proposed new venture. From the other side of the ledger, heritage issues entailed with land rights often complicate the assignment of commercial property rights (Sully and Emmons, 2004; Pearson 2005). In many examinations of mainstream entrepreneurial processes, the background situation of property rights may be taken for granted. In nearly all Indigenous entrepreneurship studies the nature of relevant property rights will require overt attention and scrutiny as an integral component of the entrepreneurial process.
Principal areas of controversy among existing scholars in the field

Is entrepreneurship a major or a minor issue for the economic and social development of Indigenous communities? This is a fundamental question.

There exists a perspective where entrepreneurship is viewed by some researchers as only a minor tool in the arsenal of Indigenous communities wishing to engage in ‘economic development’. In this view, Indigenous entrepreneurship should only be defined as a minor subset of ‘economic development’ and not exist as a field in its own right. Scholars of this ilk tend to want to paint with a broader brush than the entrepreneurship scholar whose focus tends to detailed study of individual examples of opportunity management and new venture creation. Many ‘broad brush’ scholars believe that the focus should be wider and directed to how development can be achieved within a global context and the modes of development that allow communities to govern their interactions with the outside world (Morris, 1963; Anderson, et, al., 2006). For such scholars, this attitude makes entrepreneurship, though important, a secondary consideration rather than an area of primary focus. In sharp contrast, most ‘entrepreneurship oriented’ scholars view entrepreneurship as the prime driver of any meaningful hope for the economic and social improvement of Indigenous individuals, communities and nations. In particular, these scholars (cf Hindle and Lansdowne 2005 and 2007; Sirolli 2003; Foley, 2006; Kayseas, et. Al., 2007) are highly sceptical of any welfare initiatives of central hegemonic governments. Their point of view is the dominant one in the emerging field, but it is advisable for the field to be aware that there are valuable contributions to be made by scholars for whom entrepreneurship is a second order issue rather than a first order issue.
A further point of controversy that features in the emerging canon concerns alleged commonalities of Indigenous entrepreneurship, ethnic entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship. Some commentators are inclined to bracket these concepts rather than to distinguish them. The bulk of author opinion in the emerging canon argues (overtly or inferentially) that this tendency needs to be vigorously refuted. First, the original inhabitants of a land who owned it before the advent of the dominant hegemony are clearly distinguishable from ethnic minorities who arrived after the prevailing hegemony was established – by temporal if by no other distinction. The history and sociology of the two phenomena are highly distinct. The only common factor shared by both ethnic – i.e. migrant – entrepreneurs and Indigenous entrepreneurs is their minority status. Even more pernicious and fallacious than the equation of Indigenous entrepreneurship with ‘ethnic’ (migrant) entrepreneurship is the mistake of viewing it as some a priori subset of ‘social entrepreneurship’. Contrary to the false assumption or inference that Indigenous entrepreneurship is guided in most part by non-profit or socially driven factors, it is strongly and explicitly focused upon for-profit activities. The fact that the achievement of profit motives has to embrace community values and attitudes in a more overt and complex way than is the case in mainstream entrepreneurship does not alter this fact. Indigenous entrepreneurship processes can be either profit or non-profit oriented (just as mainstream entrepreneurship may be). To equate Indigenous entrepreneurship with social entrepreneurship is a priori judgementalism and misplaced patronization of the same ilk that has bedevilled mainstream passive welfare systems for so long. The canon overwhelmingly evidences the reason why Indigenous people themselves are principally interested in Indigenous entrepreneurship. They value it as a means to create sustainable revenue streams
as the basis of truly viable self-determination and ever less dependence on the mainstream welfare system. They’re in it for the money.

Limitations of work done to date

As previously indicated, the emergent Indigenous entrepreneurship canon features more conceptual than empirical works and what empirical studies do exist tend to be case studies. This is not an unusual situation for an embryonic discipline (Kuhn, 1962). The current emphasis on qualitative study results from the early stage necessity for both substantive and formal (Glaser and Strauss 1967) theory development focused upon contribution to the exploration and advancement of the field. The broad field of entrepreneurship itself has as yet no dominant theoretical framework, though hopefully this study has provided it with a useful field map.

The emergence of Indigenous entrepreneurship fits Kuhn’s (1962/1970) picture of how nascent scholarly fields of inquiry typically appear. They begin on the periphery of existing paradigms. Nearly seventy five per cent of articles represented in the emerging Indigenous entrepreneurship canon have been published outside of mainstream academic journals in the management, sociology, strategy and entrepreneurship fields. Research papers on Indigenous entrepreneurship have, to date, rarely been tailored for or targeted toward higher-level journals, and thus there is relatively little awareness among the majority of mainstream scholars in these four established fields that there is an emerging canon of Indigenous entrepreneurship. Promotion of this awareness has been one of the prime aims of the present study.
Relatively few attempts to operationalize theory for testing and quantitative evaluation of best practices and processes for Indigenous venturing have been carried out. This once again is indicative of the nascent stage of growth within the field (Edmundson, A. and McManus, S., 2007; Van Maanan, et.al. 2007). Yet, though the research field is relatively new, the need for it is well-established. There is very little doubt in either mainstream polities or Indigenous communities of the social need for replacing decades of failed passive welfare policy instituted by a post-colonial hegemony through patronising institutions using inefficient systems. Stringent efforts are required for the expedient advancement of the field from broad theoretical concern to applied research and empirical testing that can help to enact positive change. Examination of best practices, structures and guiding frameworks is as pressing a need as the fostering of capacity through sensitive and specialized educational curricula.

**Methodological issues**

Indigenous peoples make the claim that they are among the most studied people’s in the world, and that little good comes from the academic research that involves them (Weir and Wuttunee, 2004). This is confirmed within our study as the analysis of the emerging canon reveals that very few studies have indicated the usage of specialized techniques outside of the traditional realms of qualitative data collection. There is a long list of concerns voiced by Indigenous people that claim the data collected on their communities also require greater levels of consultation. According to a document generated for the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada:
Where power, knowledge and authority are clearly unequal, ethical guidelines seek to place limits on the exercise of power by the powerful – chiefly by moral suasion (ITC, 1993).

This aim to mitigate the unequal distribution of power held by researchers in contrast to their Indigenous respondents is an ongoing struggle. Methodologies must be built upon frameworks grounded within long standing Indigenous knowledge management techniques, ensuring ownership, control, access and possession (OCAP). Through this process ‘overzealous’ colonial approaches to ethics, data collection and knowledge dissemination may be better controlled by the subjects being studied. Kayseas and Hindle are two scholars in the early stages of addressing the issue through development of a culturally sensitive protocol for use in Indigenous entrepreneurship case studies, depth interviewing and focus groups (Kayseas and Hindle, 2008).

Unfortunately, to date, very little research has been generated, financed, controlled and directed by Indigenous communities themselves. A need for greater involvement by Indigenous academics in designing and conducting critical research may provide Indigenous peoples with a stronger voice in the trajectory of research concerning them. Many of the stories that must be told, and the questions that must be explored can be better facilitated through researchers grounded through the unique conditions of ‘Indigeneity’. You cannot become Indigenous. To be or not to be is not the question. The field is in urgent need of the empathy that only being Indigenous can provide. Several universities in Canada, such as the University of Victoria and First Nations University of Canada, have responded to the need for Indigenous people to conduct research and provide specialized curriculum for Indigenous
venturing. This notion is also clearly conveyed within a Royal Commission Report on Aboriginal Peoples conducted by the Canadian government:

_In the past, research concerning Aboriginal peoples has usually been initiated outside the Aboriginal community and carried out by non-Aboriginal personnel. Aboriginal people have had almost no opportunity to correct misinformation or to challenge ethnocentric and racist interpretations._ (Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, 1996)

Predicate perspectives include the creation of academic institutes that are wholly governed by Indigenous people. Specifically in the Canadian First Nations context, there is considerable scepticism targeted at the ability of universities to adequately produce Indigenous scholars that are not influenced by the hegemonic nature of the academic system itself. This belief is evidenced by the loss of many individuals who pursue PhD’s and then become enveloped by mainstream careers in governments and universities, making the potential benefits to Aboriginal communities unclear. Relatively minor concern is given to the impact of educational assimilation. The challenge is to ensure that Indigenous individuals who work outside of their communities are capable of managing the transitions that limit their proximity to community values (First Nations Center, 2007).

**Future direction**

It is to be hoped that the development of the field of Indigenous entrepreneurship research will be a partnership. It needs the vigorous co-involvement of academics who are representative of the hegemonic western culture but respect Indigenous culture and
perspectives, and representatives of a wide range of Indigenous communities who know viscerally what it means to be a member of a disadvantaged minority but have respect the norms of quality scholarship as the basis for investigation, analysis and ultimate redress of the evils of relative disadvantage. Such partnership is emerging and shows strong signs of leading to balanced development of the emergent research field. The best traditions of western scholarship ought not to be any more negotiable than respect for the empathic understanding of key themes, issues and modes of knowledge creation that only the increasing involvement of Indigenous scholars can generate.

As mainstream hegemonies come to appreciate the need for reconciliation with the indigenous minorities of their nation states and, accordingly, Indigenous people accumulate more land and resources through treaty negotiations, the need for a defined and vigorous field of Indigenous entrepreneurship research becomes more urgent. Greater emphasis on empowering Indigenous people through a clearer understanding of their circumstances is critical to the successful harmonization of the interests of mainstream and Indigenous communities after centuries of unresolved conflict. Development of best practices to be for redressing disadvantage and assuring greater self-determination of Indigenous people is in the national interest of every mainstream state with significant indigenous minorities. The right policies of redress can only be based on rigorous research.

True civilization never comes from enforcing the social pre-eminence of any one set of cultural beliefs and ideals predicated by economic dominance. True civilization demands respect for diversity in the context of a quest for ever-improving understanding.
of the world. Many aspects of Indigenous approaches to innovation, and wealth creation
differ in challenging ways from established Western stereotypes of entrepreneurial
process. The increasing urgency of climate change as the result of inappropriate
economic behaviour is just one of many clear indications that the world urgently needs
more models of value creation – not one hegemonic approach. The emerging sub-field of
Indigenous entrepreneurship research, as defined and mapped in this study, offers to
provide better evidence, greater understanding and greater hope of addressing the distinct
and chronic problems of Indigenous disadvantage which have proved insoluble for
centuries. That is what the field offers us as citizens. What it offers us as scholars is a
civilizing influence on the hitherto monochromatic approach to entrepreneurship
scholarship. Entrepreneurship is a parent field whose axioms have been effectively if
silently dominated by the world view of the prevailing Western hegemony. The diversity
of insight offered by the emergence of Indigenous entrepreneurship as a defined and
focused discipline will expand the horizons and relevance of entrepreneurship
scholarship.
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**SPECIFIC REFERENCES: INDIGENOUS ENTREPRENEURSHIP CANON**


Table 1. The Indigenous Entrepreneurship Research Canon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Unit(s) of Analysis</th>
<th>Principal Theme(s)</th>
<th>Key Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Hindle, Lansdowne</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Multi Def Org CSN Capacity</td>
<td>Reconciling tradition with innovation; the importance of understanding non-mainstream world-views and values; twin skills, heritage index, autonomy accountability network.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Peredo, Anderson</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Multi Def Org CSN Land</td>
<td>Social enterprise, cognition, communal aspects, alliances, culture. IE is a growth area of scholarship and appears to be a distinguishable subject.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Peredo, Anderson, Galbraith, Honig, Dana</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Multi Def Org</td>
<td>There is a distinguishable kind of activity appropriately called &quot;Indigenous entrepreneurship&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Galbraith, Rodriguez, Stiles</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Multi CSN Land</td>
<td>Property rights, entrepreneurial behavior, environmental resources; dispelling false myths as to the processes and themes of IE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Dana, Leo Paul</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ind Def CSN</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship a function of cultural perceptions of opportunity, leading to research on IE. Seminal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Foley</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ind Def Capacity</td>
<td>Positivism, face, chaos experience, networking, family, discrimination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Chamard, Christie</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Multi Def</td>
<td>Compare/contrast Canadian &amp; Australian Indigenous strategies for entrepreneurship; base similarities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Kayseas, Hindle, Anderson</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Com Def, Org, Land, Capacity</td>
<td>Current level of research in Indigenous entrepreneurship, land rights, governance, institutional development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Anderson, MacAulay, Kayseas, Hindle</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Com Capacity</td>
<td>Global economy, laws, customs, history, accumulation regime; IE as a tool for development, not undertaken solely for purpose of profit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Anderson, R, Dana, L.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Com CSN</td>
<td>Heterogeneity, resources, kinship, egalitarianism, cooperative entrepreneurship, culturally influenced opportunity recognition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Keywords</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Environmental factors, barriers to capital, social capital.</td>
<td>Furneaux, Craig</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Quality assurance, aboriginal branding, e-commerce, international trade, capacity building.</td>
<td>Meis-Mason Dana Anderson</td>
<td>Gr-Fi CSN Org</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Community entrepreneurship/capitalism; corporate partnership.</td>
<td>Wuttunee</td>
<td>Comm CSN Org</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Modernization, dependency, regulation, global economy, foundation for Indigenous venturing tied to land, culture and nationhood (inseparable from sense of self).</td>
<td>Anderson, Dana, L, Dana, T.</td>
<td>Comm Land, Capacity</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Social enterprise, cultural values, politics of resource access.</td>
<td>Berkes, Adhijari</td>
<td>Comm CSN</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Dichotomy of indigenous community vs. stand-alone business venture; cognition.</td>
<td>Foley, Dennis E, T</td>
<td>Comm CSN Capacity</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Indigenous entrepreneurship emphasizes both econ, and non-econ objectives; cognition, EO, EOR.</td>
<td>Lindsay N. Lindsay, W. Jordaan, Hindle</td>
<td>Ind CSN</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Eship intimately linked to community and cult survival; Indigenous women play major roles in politics and business.</td>
<td>Lituchy Reavley, Lvina, Abraira</td>
<td>Ind CSN</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Model of Eship for western different than Indigenous model, social entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Dana, L., Dana, T., Anderson</td>
<td>Ind CSN</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Cultural misunderstanding, sensitive education.</td>
<td>Hindle, K</td>
<td>Nat CSN, Capacity</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Cultural dimensions and entrepreneurial attitude; Ind ent is more holistic; Ind ent values will reflect Ind cultural values; EO, EOR.</td>
<td>Lindsay, Noel J.</td>
<td>Comm CSN</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Indigenous cultural paradigm of success in entrepreneurial activity; educational and training expertise, sacrifice/survival techniques in business.</td>
<td>Foley, Dennis</td>
<td>Ind CSN</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Capacity building, barriers to capital, policies and procedures, socioeconomic conditions, business skills, and finance.</td>
<td>Zapalska, Perry, Dabb</td>
<td>Ind Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Regulation theory, capacity building, creating new organizations (economic</td>
<td>Anderson MacAulay</td>
<td>Inst</td>
<td>Capacity Org</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Unit(s) of Analysis</td>
<td>Principal Theme(s)</td>
<td>Key Concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weir, Wuttunee</td>
<td>T Com</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Self-sufficiency, culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowler</td>
<td>T Com</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Highly collective entrepreneurship, (large corps tied to tribal).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katschner</td>
<td>T Com</td>
<td>Land, Org</td>
<td>Empowerment theory; barriers to capital.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torres, Anderson</td>
<td>T E Com</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Sustainable development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Honig, Peredo</td>
<td>T Com</td>
<td>Def Org</td>
<td>Compares/contrasts social, Indigenous, ethnic entrepreneurship; social and Indigenous entrepreneurship alike.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardomone Rentschler</td>
<td>T Inst</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Struggle to market culture; capacity building.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen, Parker, Lin</td>
<td>E Gr-Fi</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Using IT to compete globally, transition to new markets, core capabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick, Foley</td>
<td>E Ind</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>Cognition, disadvantage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gombay, Nicole</td>
<td>T Ind</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>Food shared, not sold in Inuit society; regulatory incentives; market exchange convergence (breaking of tradition and social norms to emulate western economic practices).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keelan, T.J. Woods, C.</td>
<td>T Ind</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>Myth of the entrepreneur connection of traditional knowledge and behavior to entrepreneurial activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritz,</td>
<td>T E Ind</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>Lifestyle entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial orientation, cultural assessment of wealth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, Ron, K.</td>
<td>T Com</td>
<td>Capacity Org, Land</td>
<td>Key transaction cognitions; access to capital on reserve, via property rights, adjust native governance to lower trans costs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowbray, Martin</td>
<td>T Com</td>
<td>Org Capacity</td>
<td>Social capital, localist policy, community &quot;evidence based&quot; results; governance, economic development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papanek, Gustav F.</td>
<td>T Gr-Fi</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Affirmative action creates dependency upon policy while atrophying entrepreneurial skills; incentives misaligned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peredo,</td>
<td>T Com</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>Traditional concept of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Unit(s) of Analysis</td>
<td>Principal Theme(s)</td>
<td>Key Concepts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>F3 Smith</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>CSN Land</td>
<td>Land CSN</td>
<td>Development &quot;on their own terms&quot;; modernisation based efforts failed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>F3 Anderson, Camp, Nkongolo-Bakenda, Dana, Peredo</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Com m</td>
<td>Land CSN</td>
<td>Transfer of land/resources, provision of labor and capital, contrast between commercial and community goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>F3 Camp II, Anderson, Giberson</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Com m</td>
<td>Org, Land Capacity</td>
<td>Venturing = self-reliance on own terms, yet capacity must be developed to compete strategically in global business, JV, trust.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>F3 Dana, L Dana, T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Com m</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>If entrepreneurs are influenced by culture, not just individual but the aspects of environment must be studied; environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>F3 Hindle, Anderson, Giberson, Kayseas</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Gr-Fi Capacity Org</td>
<td>Active participation in global economy on competitive business basis; twin skills, heritage index, autonomy/accountability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>F3 Jacobsen, Jones, Wybrow</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Com m</td>
<td>Land CSN</td>
<td>Connection to place and individual identity undermines assumption of free mark solutions; policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>F3 Anderson, Kayseas Dana, Hindle</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Com m</td>
<td>Land CSN</td>
<td>Socioeconomic objectives of the Aboriginal people through entrepreneurship and business development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>F3 Aspaas, Helen Ruth,</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>Nexus of family obligations, economic necessities, cultural ties commitment for serving communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>F3 Anderson, Giberson</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Com m</td>
<td>CSN Capacity</td>
<td>Regulation theory, mode of accumulation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>F3 Dodson, Smith</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Com m</td>
<td>Org</td>
<td>Sustainable, development; good governance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>F3 Fuller, Don Eileen, Cummings</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Gr-Fi</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>Integrity of market-based &amp; subsistence-based behaviors and a consequent adaptation of associated social and inst systems necessary to overcome dominant culture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Frequency analysis of aspects of the Indigenous entrepreneurship canon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Galbraith, Stiles</td>
<td>E Comm</td>
<td>Org</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Gaming industry stimulates 100% of new entrepreneurial ventures; of these ventures, they are all in relation to the gaming industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Anderson, Robert E T Comm</td>
<td>CSN Capacity</td>
<td>Business development is the centerpiece of the Aboriginal approach to economic development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Cachon, Jean-Charles E Gr-Fi Comm</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Lack of capital, isolation from markets, poor social capital, education levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Cornell, Robert E T Comm</td>
<td>Org</td>
<td>Resource or human capital endowments not as important as political/governance bodies; without these, the above is limited; nation building.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Sullivan, Margaritis E Comm</td>
<td>Org Capacity</td>
<td>Transition from welfare state to liberal market damaging to Indigenous people without proper transitions and policy support mechanism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Schaper, T Gr-Fi Comm</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Culturally attuned success factors, barriers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Cornell, Robert E T Comm</td>
<td>Org CSN</td>
<td>Stable institutions and policies, fair and effective dispute resolution, separation of politics from business management; cultural “match”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Duffy, Stubben T Comm</td>
<td>Org CSN</td>
<td>A model that incorporates cultural and sovereignty variables is presented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Anderson, E Gr-Fi Org</td>
<td>Discussion on factors that motivate CSR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Cornell, Robert E T Comm</td>
<td>CSN Org</td>
<td>Cultural norms of political legitimacy provide foundation of effective self-government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Cornell, Robert E T Comm</td>
<td>Org</td>
<td>Socio-historical factors and their consequences for institutional efficacy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Dana, Leo Paul E T Ind</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>Results suggest that identification of or response to opportunity is linked to culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Vinje, David L. E T Comm</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Education, as an indirect approach to economic development is significant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>O'Neill, Kelly M. T Ind</td>
<td>CSN Land</td>
<td>Local community culture and values, local economics, and local resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Robinson, Hogan T Gr-Fi CSN</td>
<td>Collective achievement over individual achievement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units of Analysis</td>
<td>Principal Themes</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Publication category²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>Perc</td>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>Perc</td>
<td>Tot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>Def</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr/ Fi</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>Cap</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Org</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Na*</td>
<td>Na*</td>
<td>Na*</td>
<td>Na*</td>
<td>Na*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Do not add up due to counting

** May not add up due to rounding

Figure 1. Distinguishing the two main perspectives of entrepreneurship research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Actions involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New organisations</td>
<td>Creation of new means and ends relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Change oriented venture creation</td>
<td>Maximising existing means and ends relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Non-change oriented venture creation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Rankings were obtained by using the Journal Quality List (JQL) of Bradford University that contained various journal-ranking systems.
³ Empirical
⁴ Theoretical
Existing settings  
(C) Change oriented venturing in existing contexts (e.g. corporate venturing; licensing via markets etc)  
(D) Traditional Management

Source: Klyver, 2005; Blackman and Hindle 2007.

Figure 2. Indigenous Entrepreneurship Research Framework