

# Deakin Research Online

*Deakin University's institutional research repository*

**This is the authors' final peer reviewed version of the item published as:**

Hindle, Kevin and Moroz, Peter 2007, Indigenous entrepreneurship as a research field : developing a definitional framework from the emerging canon, *in BCERC 2007 : Proceedings of the 2007 Babson College Entrepreneurship Research Conference*, Babson College, Babson Park, Mass., pp. 1-54.

Available from Deakin Research Online:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10536/DRO/DU:30029685>

Reproduced with kind permission of the copyright owner.

**Copyright :** 2007, the authors

INDIGENOUS ENTREPRENEURSHIP AS A RESEARCH FIELD: DEVELOPING A DEFINITIONAL FRAMEWORK FROM THE EMERGING CANON

*Kevin Hindle, Swinburne University of Technology*  
*Peter Moroz, Swinburne University of Technology*

CONTACTS

Kevin Hindle  
BA(hons) MBA PhD CPA  
Professor of Entrepreneurship  
Australian Graduate School of Entrepreneurship  
Cnr Wakefield and William Streets  
Hawthorn Vic 3122 Australia  
Phone international: + 61 3 9214 8732  
Fax international: + 61 3 9214 8381  
Email: [khindle@swin.edu.au](mailto:khindle@swin.edu.au)

Peter W. Moroz  
BA MPP PhD Candidate  
Australian Graduate School of Entrepreneurship  
Cnr Wakefield and Williams Streets  
Hawthorn Vic 3122 Australia  
Phone international: (CANADA) +1 306-343-3384  
Fax international: (CANADA) +1-306-374-6874  
Email: [pwmoroz@swin.edu.au](mailto:pwmoroz@swin.edu.au)

CORRECT CURRENT CITATION DETAILS FOR THE PAPER ARE:

Hindle, K. and Moroz, P. W., 2007. Indigenous entrepreneurship as a research field: developing a definitional framework from the emerging canon. Babson College Entrepreneurship Research Conference (BCERC) 2007; Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research 2007.

**INDIGENOUS ENTREPRENEURSHIP AS A RESEARCH FIELD:  
DEVELOPING A DEFINITIONAL FRAMEWORK FROM THE EMERGING  
CANON**

Note: as a mark of respect to all Indigenous peoples, the word “Indigenous” is used with a capital “I” throughout this paper.

**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<sup>1</sup> 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*

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 \$2.2billion 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 led 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 through 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.

*-Insert figure 1 here-*

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 de-privileged 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.

## **LITERATURE COLLECTION AND CLASSIFICATION:**

### **WORKS IN THE FIELD OF INDIGENOUS ENTREPRENEURSHIP RESEARCH**

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 die 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 *weltanschauung* 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.

## GENERAL REFERENCES

Agrawal, A. 1995. Dismantling the Divide Between Indigenous and Scientific Knowledge. *Development and Change*, 26(3): 413-439.

Baron, R. A. and Ward, T. B. 2004. Expanding Entrepreneurial Cognition's Toolbox: Potential Contributions from the Field of Cognitive Science. *Entrepreneurship, Theory & Practice*, 28: 553-573.

Bebbington, A. 1993. Modernization from Below: An Alternative Indigenous Paradigm. *Economic Geography*, 69(3): 274 - 292.

Berkes, F. 1999. *Sacred Ecology: Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Resource Management*. Taylor and Francis, United States.

Blackman, Deborah, & Hindle, Kevin (2007) "Would using the psychological contract increase entrepreneurial business development potential?" Australian Centre for Research in Employment and Work Conference, Monash University and King's College London Prato, Italy, July, 1-4<sup>th</sup>.

Boyd, N. and Vozikis, S. (1994) "The Influence of Self-Efficacy on the Development of Entrepreneurial Intentions and Actions," *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, Vol. 18.

Bygrave, W. D. (1989) "The entrepreneurship paradigm (I): a philosophical look at its research methodologies." *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 14 (1): pp. 7-26.

Davidsson, P. (2003) "The domain of entrepreneurship research: Some suggestions." In J. Katz and D. Shepherd, eds. *Advances in entrepreneurship, firm emergence and growth*, Greenwich: JAI Press, 2003, pp 315-372.

Davidsson, P. (2003) "The Domain of Entrepreneurship Research: some suggestions." In Katz, J. and Shepherd S. (Eds) *Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence and Growth*, 6,: 315-372.

Davidsson, P., (2004) *Researching entrepreneurship*. Boston: Springer.

Diamond, J. (1997). "Guns, Germs and Steel: The Fate of Human Societies", W.W. Norton & Co. [ISBN 0393061310](#).

Eckhardt, J.T. and Shane, S.A. (2003) "Opportunities and entrepreneurship." *Journal of Management*, 29 (3): 333-349.

Edmondson, A. C. and S. E. McManus (2007). "METHODOLOGICAL FIT IN MANAGEMENT FIELD RESEARCH." *Academy of Management Review* 32(4): 1155-1179.

- First Nations Centre. (2007). *OCAP: Ownership, Control, Access and Possession*. Sanctioned by the First Nations Information Governance Committee, Assembly of First Nations. Ottawa: National Aboriginal Health Organization.
- Gartner, W.B. (1993) "Words lead to deeds: towards an organizational emergence vocabulary." *Journal of Business Venturing*, 8(3): 231-239.
- Hindle, K. and M. Lansdowne (2005). "Brave spirits on new paths: toward a globally relevant paradigm of Indigenous entrepreneurship research." *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship* **18**(2): 11.
- Hindle (2007a)
- Hutcheon, P. D. (1972) "Value Theory: Toward Conceptual Clarification." *The British Journal of Sociology*. 23(June): 172-187.
- Kayseas, B. and Hindle, K. (2008) "Case Studies Method for Studying Entrepreneurship of Indigenous Communities and Populations." PhD dissertation. Swinburne University of Technology: Melbourne.
- Klyver, K. (2005) "Entrepreneurship and social network development – A life cycle approach", PhD-dissertation, Kolding, University of Southern Denmark.
- Kuhn, T. (1962/1970a). "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions," Chicago: University of Chicago Press (1970, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, with postscript).
- Krueger Jr., N., Brazeal D. (1994) "Entrepreneurial Potential and Potential Entrepreneurs." *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, Vol. 18.
- Inuit Tapirisat of Canada, (1993) *Negotiating Research Relationships in the North..*
- Louie, Clarence, (2007) New Relationship Trust. <http://www.newrelationshiptrust.ca/about/2006-regional-engagement-process/chief-clarence-louie>.
- Low M., and Macmillan, I. (1988) "Entrepreneurship: Past Research And Future Challenges." *Journal of Management*. 14(2): 139-162.
- Mitchell, R. K., & Allen, W. G. (2002) New models for native economic development. In C. Nyce (Ed.), Masters in our own house: The path to prosperity and cultural well-being (pp. 1-15). Terrace, BC: Skeena Native Development Society.
- Mitchell, R. K. (2004) "Issues in Indigenous Entrepreneurship. *Indigenous Entrepreneurship: Is it, and if so, What is it?*" Symposium at the 2004 Conference of the Academy of Management.
- Morris, D. (1963) "Towards a Reinterpretation of Nineteenth-Century Indian Economic History," *Journal of Economic History*, Vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 606-618



Weir, W. and Wuttunee, W. (2004) "Respectful research in Aboriginal Communities and Institutions in Canada", In Cooperative Membership and Globalization: Eds. Brett Fairbairn and Nora Russell  
Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, University of Saskatchewan.

Whetten, D. A. (2002) *Hybrids-A Special Case of Organizational Identity Claims*. Unpublished. (Draft kindly provided by the author).

Zhao, H., Seibert, S., Hills, G. (2005) "The Mediating Role of Self-Efficacy in the Development of Entrepreneurial Intentions," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 90, No. 6, 1265–1272.

#### SPECIFIC REFERENCES: INDIGENOUS ENTREPRENEURSHIP CANON

1. Anderson, R., B. (1997). "Corporate/indigenous partnerships in economic development: The first nations in Canada." *World Development* **25**(9): 1483.
2. Anderson, R. (2002). "Entrepreneurship and Aboriginal Canadians: A Case Study in Economic Development." *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship* **7**(1): 21.
3. Anderson, R., B., L. P. Dana, et al. (2006). "Indigenous land rights, entrepreneurship, and economic development in Canada: "Opting-in" to the global economy." *Journal of World Business* **41**(1): 45.
4. Anderson, R., RJ Giberson, K Hindle, B Kayseas. (2004) "Understanding Success in Indigenous Entrepreneurship: An Exploratory Investigation." Proceedings of the AGSE-Babson Regional Entrepreneurship: Melbourne.
5. Anderson, R., Honig, B., Peredo, A.M. (2006) "Communities in the new Economy: Where Social Entrepreneurship and Indigenous Entrepreneurship Meet." *Entrepreneurship as Social Change*, Steyeart and Hjorth (eds). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
6. Anderson, R. B., Warren Weir, Benson Honig, Leo Paul Dana, & Ana Maria Peredo (2007). "Business Creation, Growth and Survival in Indigenous Communities in Canada: The Saskatchewan Experience." *International Handbook of Research On Indigenous Entrepreneurship*. L. P. D. a. R. B. Anderson. Cheltenham (UK). Edward Elgar.
7. Anderson, R. B. and L. P. Dana (2007). "A Multidisciplinary Theory of Entrepreneurship as a Function of Cultural Perceptions of Opportunity." *The Handbook Of Indigenous Entrepreneurship*. L. P. Dana. London, Edward Elgar.
8. Anderson, R. B. and R. Giberson (2003). "Aboriginal Economic Development in Canada: Thoughts on Current Theory and Practise." *Ethnic Entrepreneurship: Structure and Process*. C. S. a. C. Galbraith. Oxford, JAI Press/Elsevier: 27.
9. Anderson, R. B., S. MacAulay, et al. (2007). On Their Own Terms: Indigenous Communities, and Economic Development in the New Economy. *Non-market Entrepreneurship: Interdisciplinary Approaches*. P. F. a. R. S. Gordon Shockley. Cheltenham, Edward Elgar.
10. Anderson Robert B, Ron Camp II, et al. (2005). "Indigenous Land Rights in Canada: The Foundation for Development?" *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* **2**(2): 30.

11. Aspaas, H. R. (2004). "Minority women's microenterprises in rural areas of the United States of America: African American, Hispanic American and Native American case studies." *GeoJournal* **61**(3): 281.
12. Berkes, F. and T. Adhikari (2006). "Development and conservation: indigenous businesses and the UNDP Equator Initiative." *Int. J. of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* **3**(6): 20.
13. Cachon, J.-C. (2000). "Aboriginal entrepreneurship on reserves: some empirical data from Northern Ontario and considerations following the Supreme Court of Canada decision on the Delgamuukw vs British Columbia appeal." *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship* **15**(3): 2.
14. Camp II, R. D., Robert B. Anderson, et al. (2005). "Aboriginal Land Rights and Development: Corporations and Trust." *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, **2**(2): 15.
15. Cardamone, M. and R. Rentschler (2006). "Indigenous innovators: the role of web marketing for cultural micro-enterprises." *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* **11**(4): 347.
16. Chamard, J. and M. Christie (1993). "Entrepreneurial development in Aboriginal communities in Australia and Canada " *Small Enterprise Development* **4**(1): 27-33.
17. Chen, J., L. J. Parker, et al. (2006). "Technopreneurship in Native American businesses: current issues and future with a case study" *Int. J. of Management and Enterprise Development* **3**(1/2): 70 - 84.
18. Charlotte, P. (2007). "Focus on the Ngai Tahu tribe." *Int. J. Entrepreneurship and Small Business* **xx**(xx): 1-9. (forthcoming).
19. Chiste, K. (1996). *Aboriginal Small Business and Entrepreneurship in Canada*, Captus Press.
20. Cornell, S. and P. K. Joseph (2000). "Where's the glue? Institutional and cultural foundations of American Indian economic development." *Journal of Socio - Economics* **29**(5): 443.
21. Cornell, S. and J. P. Kalt (1998). "Sovereignty and Nation Building: The development challenge in Indian Country " *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* **4**.
22. Dana, L. P. (1995). "Entrepreneurship in a Remote Sub Arctic Community." *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice* **20**(1): 57-73.
23. Dana, L. P. (1996). "Self-employment in the Canadian sub-Arctic: An exploratory study." *Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration* **13**(1): 65.
24. Dana, L. P. (2005). "Toward a Multidisciplinary Definition of Indigenous Entrepreneurship" *The Edward Elgar World Book of Research on Indigenous Entrepreneurship*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
25. Dana, L. P. and T. Dana (2005). "Expanding the scope of methodologies used in entrepreneurship research." *Int. J. of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* **2**(1): 79-88.
26. Dana, L. P., D. Teresa, et al. (2005). "A Theory-based Empirical Study of Entrepreneurship in Iqaluit, Nunavut." *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship* **18**(2): 10.
27. Dodson, M. and D. E. Smith (2003). *Governance for sustainable development: Strategic issues and principles for Indigenous Australian communities*, The Australian National University.

28. Duffy, D. and S. Jerry (1998). "An assessment of Native American economic development: Putting culture and sovereignty back in the models." *Studies in Comparative International Development* **32**(4): 52.
29. Foley, D. (2006). "Indigenous Australian Entrepreneurs: Not all Community Organizations, not all in the Outback." Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research; Australian National University. Discussion Paper No. 279.
30. Foley, D. (2003). "An examination of Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs." *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship* **8**(2): 133.
31. Foley, D. (2000). "Successful Indigenous Australian Entrepreneurs: A Case Study Analysis." *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies Unit Research Report Series*. University of Queensland: Vol. 4.
32. Fowler, J. (2007). "Maori land claims: a historical perspective." *Int. J. Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, **xx**(x).
33. Frederick, H. and D. Foley (2006). "Indigenous Populations as Disadvantaged Entrepreneurs in Australia and New Zealand." *The International Indigenous Journal of Entrepreneurship, Advancement, Strategy and Education* **1**(1): 16.
34. Fuller, D. and C. Eileen (2003). "Indigenous small enterprise in Northern Australia: A case study of the Warai." *Journal of Small Business Management* **41**(1): 108.
35. Furneaux, C. (2007). "Indigenous Entrepreneurship: An Analysis of Capital Restraints." *AGSE 2007*. Brisbane, Swinburne University of Technology: Melbourne.
36. Galbraith, C., S. and H. S. Curt (2003). "Expectations of Indian Reservation Gaming: Entrepreneurial activity within a context of traditional land tenure and wealth acquisition." *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship* **8**(2): 93.
37. Galbraith, C. S., C. L. Rodriguez, et al. (2006). "False Myths and Indigenous Entrepreneurial Strategies" *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship* **19**(1).
38. Gombay, N. (2006). "From subsistence to commercial fishing in Northern Canada." *British Food Journal* **108**(7): 502.
39. Hailey, J. (1992). "The politics of entrepreneurship - affirmative-action policies for indigenous entrepreneurs." *Small Enterprise Development* **3**(2): 4-14.
40. Hindle, K. (2005). "Contrasting Indigenous entrepreneurship in Australia and Canada: how three applied research perspectives can improve policy and programs." *Small Enterprise Research*.
41. Hindle, K. (2005). The renaissance of Indigenous entrepreneurship in Australia: dream or educational possibility? *A theory of Indigenous entrepreneurship: the Edward Elgar handbook of Indigenous enterprise*. L. P. Dana. London, Edward Elgar.
42. Hindle, K. and M. Lansdowne (2005). "Brave spirits on new paths: toward a globally relevant paradigm of Indigenous entrepreneurship research." *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship* **18**(2): 11.
43. Hindle, K., B. A. Robert, et al. (2005). "Relating Practice to Theory in Indigenous Entrepreneurship: A Pilot Investigation of the Kitsaki Partnership Portfolio." *American Indian Quarterly* **29**(1/2): 1.
44. Jacobsen, B., C. Jones, et al. (2005). "Indigenous economic development policy: A discussion of theoretical foundations". Paper presented to the Social Change in the 21st Century Conference, Brisbane: Australia, Centre for Social Change Research, Queensland University of Technology.
45. Katschner, I. (2007). "The role of Treaty of Waitangi claim settlements on Maori economic development." *Int. J. Entrepreneurship and Small Business* **xx**(xx): 15.

46. Kayseas, B., Hindle, Kevin, Anderson, Robert (2007). *An Empirically Justified Theory of Successful Indigenous Entrepreneurship*. Australian Graduate School of Entrepreneurship, 3rd International Entrepreneurship and Research Exchange. Brisbane, Australia, February 6 – 9, 2007. , Brisbane, Australia.
47. Keelan, T. J. and C. Woods (2006). "Māuipreneur: understanding Māori entrepreneurship." *International Indigenous Journal of Entrepreneurship, Advancement, Strategy and Education* **1**(1).
48. Lindsay, N., Wendy A. Lindsay, Anton Jordaan, Kevin Hindle (2006). "Opportunity recognition attitudes of nascent indigenous entrepreneurs." *Int. J. of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* **3**(1): 20.
49. Lindsay, N. J. (2005). "Toward A Cultural Model of Indigenous Entrepreneurial Attitude." *Academy of Marketing Science Review* **2005**: 1.
50. Lituchy, T. R., M. A. Reavley, et al. (2006). "Success factors of Aboriginal women entrepreneurs: a study of Mohawk community in Canada." *Int. J. of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* **3**(6): 18.
51. Loizides, S. and R. B. Anderson (2006). Growth of Enterprises in Aboriginal Communities. , Conference Board of Canada.
52. Maritz, A. (2006). "Indigenous Enterprise in the Social Context: The New Zealand Indigenous Entrepreneur." *The International Indigenous Journal of Entrepreneurship, Advancement, Strategy and Education* **1**(1): 1-15.
53. Meis-Mason, A., Leo Paul Dana and Robert B Anderson (2007). "Building Local Capacity to Compete Globally - A Case Study of The Inuit Commercial Caribou Harvest and Related Agri-Food Industries in Nunavut." *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*.
54. Mitchell, R., K. (2006). "Globalisation, economic literacy and native economic development " *Int. J. of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* **3**(6): 743 - 759.
55. Mowbray, M. (2006). "Localising Responsibility: The Application of the Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development to Australia " *Australian Journal of Social Issues* **41**.
56. O'Neill, K. M. (1994). "Native women and micro-enterprise: micro-enterprise seems to hold many possibilities in terms of income generation." *Canadian Woman Studies* **15**(1): 54.
57. Papanek, G. F. (2006). "The pribumi entrepreneurs of Bali and Central Java (or how not to help indigenous enterprise)." *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies* **42**(1): 79-93.
58. Peredo, A. M. and J. J. Chrisman (2006). "Toward a theory of community-based enterprise." *The Academy of Management Review*. **31**(2): 309(20).
59. Peredo, A. M., Robert B. Anderson, et al. (2004). "Toward a Theory of Indigenous Entrepreneurship." *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, **1**(1): 20.
60. Peredo, A. M. a. R. B. A. (2007). Indigenous Entrepreneurship Research: Themes and Variations. *Developmental Entrepreneurship: Adversity, Risk and Uncertainty*. C. S. a. C. Galbraith. Oxford, JAI Press/Elsevier:.
61. Robinson, S. and S. Hogan (1994). "Family business: Ideal vehicle for Indian business success?" *Montana Business Quarterly* **31**(4): 2.
62. Schaper, M. (1999). "Australia's Aboriginal small business owners: Challenges for the future." *Journal of Small Business Management* **37**(3): 88.

63. Smith, T. (2006). "WELFARE, ENTERPRISE, AND ABORIGINAL COMMUNITY: THE CASE OF THE WESTERN AUSTRALIAN KIMBERLEY REGION, 1968-96." *Australian Economic History Review* **46**(3): 242.
64. Sullivan, A. and M. Dimitri (2000). "Public sector reform and indigenous entrepreneurship." *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research* **6**(5): 265.
65. Torres, J. R. a. R. B. A. (2007). La Iguana Sana” an aboriginal entrepreneurial endeavour in the Mexican State of Chiapas. *International Handbook of Research On Indigenous Entrepreneurship*. L. P. D. a. R. B. Anderson. Cheltenham, Edward Elgar.
66. Vinje, D. L. (1996). "Native American economic development on selected reservations: A comparative analysis." *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology* **55**(4): 427.
67. Wuttunee, W. (2007) “Shattering Misconceptions.” *International Handbook of Research on Indigenous Entrepreneurs*. L. P. Dana. &. R. B. Anderson. Cheltenham (UK). Edward Elgar.
68. Wuttunee, W. (1992). “In Business for Ourselves: Northern Entrepreneurs.” Montreal, Co-published by: Arctic Institute of North America and the Faculty of Management of the University of Calgary; McGill, Queen's Press.
69. Zapalska, A., P. Geoff, et al. (2003). "Maori Entrepreneurship in the Contemporary Business Environment." *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship* **8**(3): 219.

*Appendix 1 – Figures and Tables*

Table 1. The Indigenous Entrepreneurship Research Canon

Date	Category	Author	Type	Unit(s) of Analysis	Principal Theme(s)	Key Concepts
2005	F1	Hindle, Lansdowne	ET	Multi	Def Org CSN Capacity	Reconciling tradition with innovation; the importance of understanding non-mainstream world-views and values; twin skills, heritage index, autonomy accountability network.
2007	F1	Peredo, Anderson	T	Multi	Def Org, CSN Land	Social enterprise, cognition, communal aspects, alliances, culture. IE is a growth area of scholarship and appears to be a distinguishable subject.
2004	F1	Peredo, Anderson, Galbraith, Honig, Dana	T	Multi	Def Org	There is a distinguishable kind of activity appropriately called "Indigenous entrepreneurship".
2006	F1	Galbraith, Rodriguez, Stiles	T	Multi	CSN Land	Property rights, entrepreneurial behavior, environmental resources; dispelling false myths as to the processes and themes of IE.
1995	F1	Dana, Leo Paul	ET	Ind	Def CSN	Entrepreneurship a function of cultural perceptions of opportunity, leading to research on IE. Seminal.
2000	F1	Foley	E	Ind	Def Capacity	Positivism, face, chaos experience, networking, family, discrimination.
1994	F1	Chamard, Christie	T	Multi	Def	Compare/contrast Canadian & Australian Indigenous strategies for entrepreneurship; base similarities.
2007	F1	Kayseas, Hindle, Anderson	TE	Comm	Def, Org, Land, Capacity	Current level of research in Indigenous entrepreneurship, land rights, governance, institutional development.
2007	F2	Anderson, MacAulay, Kayseas, Hindle	TE	Comm	Capacity	Global economy, laws, customs, history, accumulation regime; IE as a tool for development, not undertaken solely for purpose of profit.
2007	F2	Anderson, R, Dana, L.	T	Comm	CSN	Heterogeneity, resources, kinship, egalitarianism, cooperative entrepreneurship, culturally influenced opportunity recognition.
2007	F2	Anderson Peredo, Dana Honig, Weir	TE	Comm	Org Capacity Land	Global economy, alliances/joint ventures, capacity building.

2007	F2	Furneau, Craig	T	Com	Capacity	Environmental factors, barriers to capital, social capital.
2007	F2	Meis-Mason Dana Anderson	T E	Gr-Fi	CSN Capacity Org	Quality assurance, aboriginal branding, e-commerce, international trade, capacity building.
2007	F2	Wuttunee	T E	Com	CSN Org	Community entrepreneurship/capitalism; corporate partnership.
2006	F2	Anderson, Dana, L, Dana, T.	E	Com	Land, Capacity	Modernization, dependency, regulation, global economy, foundation for Indigenous venturing tied to land, culture and nationhood (inseparable from sense of self).
2006	F2	Berkes, Adhijari	E	Com	CSN	Social enterprise, cultural values, politics of resource access.
2006	F2	Foley, Dennis	E, T	Ind	CSN Capacity	Dichotomy of indigenous community vs. stand-alone business venture; cognition.
2006	F2	Lindsay N. Lindsay, W. Jordaan, Hindle	T	Ind	CSN	Indigenous entrepreneurship emphasizes both econ, and non-econ objectives; cognition, EO, EOR.
2006	F2	Lituchy Reavley, Lvina, Abraira,	E	Ind	CSN	Eship intimately linked to community and cult survival; Indigenous women play major roles in politics and business.
2005	F2	Dana, L., Dana, T., Anderson	T	Ind	CSN	Model of Eship for western different than Indigenous model, social entrepreneurship
2205	F2	Hindle, K	T	Nat	CSN, Capacity	Cultural misunderstanding, sensitive education.
2005	F2	Lindsay, Noel J.	T	Com	CSN	Cultural dimensions and entrepreneurial attitude; Ind ent is more holistic; Ind ent values will reflect Ind cultural values; EO, EOR.
2003	F2	Foley, Dennis	E	Ind	CSN Capacity	Indigenous cultural paradigm of success in entrepreneurial activity; educational and training expertise, sacrifice/survival techniques in business.
2003	F2	Zapalska, Perry, Dabb	E	Ind	Capacity	Capacity building, barriers to capital, policies and procedures, socioeconomic conditions, business skills, and finance.
1992	F2	Hailey, J.	T	Nat	Org, Capacity	Affirmative action policy harmful.
2007	F3	Anderson MacAulay	T	Inst	Capacity Org	Regulation theory, capacity building, creating new organizations (economic

		Weir, Wuttunee				development officers).
2007	F3	Charlotte	T	Com m	Land	Self-sufficiency, culture.
2007	F3	Fowler	T	Com m	Land	Highly collective entrepreneurship, (large corps tied to tribal).
2007	F3	Katschner	T	Com m	Land, Org	Empowerment theory; barriers to capital.
ate	C a t	Author	Typ e	Unit(s) ) of Analy sis	Principal Theme(s)	Key Concepts
2007	F3	Torres, Anderson	T E	Com m	Land	Sustainable development.
2006	F3	Anderson Honig, Peredo	T	Com m	Def Org	Compares/contrasts social, Indigenous, ethnic entrepreneurship; social and Indigenous entrepreneurship alike.
2006	F3	Cardomone Rentschler	T	Inst	Capacity	Struggle to market culture; capacity building.
2006	F3	Chen, Parker, Lin	E	Gr-Fi	Capacity	Using IT to compete globally, transition to new markets, core capabilities.
2006	F3	Frederick, Foley	E	Ind	CSN	Cognition, disadvantage.
2006	F3	Gombay, Nicole	T	Ind	CSN	Food shared, not sold in Inuit society, regulatory incentives; market exchange convergence (breaking of tradition and social norms to emulate western economic practices).
2006	F3	Keelan, T.J. Woods, C.	T	Ind	CSN	Myth of the entrepreneur connection of traditional knowledge and behavior to entrepreneurial activity.
2006	F3	Maritz,	T E	Ind	CSN	Lifestyle entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial orientation, cultural assessment of wealth.
2006	F3	Mitchell, Ron, K.	T	Com m	Capacity Org, Land	Key transaction cognitions; access to capital on reserve, via property rights, adjust native governance to lower trans costs.
2006	F3	Mowbray, Martin	T	Com m	Org Capacity	Social capital, localist policy, community "evidence based" results; governance, economic development.
2006	F3	Papanek , Gustav F.	T	Gr-Fi	Capacity	Affirmative action creates dependency upon policy while atrophying entrepreneurial skills; incentives mis-aligned.
2006	F3	Peredo,	T	Com	CSN	Traditional concept of

6		Chrisman		m	Org	entrepreneurship and economic development do not apply in some environs; community based enterprise.
2006	F3	Smith	T	Inst	CSN Land	Transfer of land/resources, provision of labor and capital, contrast between commercial and community goals.
2005	F3	Anderson, Camp, Nkongolo-Bakenda, Dana, Peredo	T	Com m	Land CSN	Development "on their own terms"; modernisation based efforts failed.
2005	F3	Camp II, Anderson, Giberson	E	Com m	Org, Land Capacity	Venturing = self-reliance on own terms, yet capacity must be developed to compete strategically in global business, JV, trust.
2005	F3	Dana, L Dana, T	T	Com m	CSN	If entrepreneurs are influenced by culture, not just individual but the aspects of environment must be studied; environment.
Date	C A T	Author	Type	Unit(s) ) of Analy sis	Principal Theme(s)	Key Concepts
2005	F3	Hindle, Anderson, Giberson, Kayseas	E	Gr-Fi	Capacity Org	Active participation in global economy on competitive business basis; twin skills, heritage index, autonomy/accountability.
2005	F3	Jacobsen, Jones, Wybrow	T	Com m	Land CSN	Connection to place and individual identity undermines assumption of free mark solutions; policy.
2004	F3	Anderson, Kayseas Dana, Hindle	T	Com m	Land	Socioeconomic objectives of the Aboriginal people through entrepreneurship and business development.
2004	F3	Aspaas, Helen Ruth,	E	Ind	CSN	Nexus of family obligations, economic necessities, cultural ties commitment for serving communities.
2003	F3	Anderson, Giberson	E T	Com m	CSN Capacity	Regulation theory, mode of accumulation.
2003	F3	Dodson, Smith	T	Com m	Org	Sustainable, development; good governance.
2003	F3	Fuller, Don Eileen, Cummings	E	Gr-Fi	CSN	Integrity of market-based & subsistence-based behaviors and a consequent adaptation of associated social and inst systems necessary to overcome dominant culture.

2003	F3	Galbraith, Stiles	E	Com	Capacity Org	Gaming industry stimulates 100% of new entrepreneurial ventures; of these ventures, they are all in relation to the gaming industry.
2002	F3	Anderson, Robert	E	Com	CSN Capacity	Business development is the centerpiece of the Aboriginal approach to economic development.
2000	F3	Cachon, Jean-Charles	E	Gr-Fi	Capacity	Lack of capital, isolation from markets poor social capital, education levels.
2000	F3	Cornell, Kalt	T	Com	Org	Resource or human capital endowments not as important as political/governance bodies; without these, the above is limited; nation building.
2000	F3	Sullivan, Margaritis	E	Com	Org Capacity	Transition from welfare state to liberal market damaging to Indigenous people without proper transitions and policy support mechanism.
1999	F3	Schaper,	T	Gr-Fi	Capacity	Culturally attuned success factors, barriers.
1998	F3	Cornell, Kalt	T	Com	Org CSN	Stable institutions and policies, fair and effective dispute resolution, Separation of politics from business management; cultural "match".
1998	F3	Duffy, Stubben	T	Com	Org CSN	A model that incorporates cultural and sovereignty variables is presented.
1997	F3	Anderson,	E	Gr-Fi	Org	Discussion on factors that motivate CSR.
1996	F3	Chiste	T	Ind	Capacity	This book examines the growing small business sector in Aboriginal communities across Canada.
1996	F3	Cornell, Kalt,	E	Com	CSN Org	Cultural norms of political legitimacy provide foundation of effective self-government.
1996	F3	Cornell, Kalt	E	Com	Org	Socio-historical factors and their consequences for institutional efficacy.
1996	F3	Dana, Leo Paul	E	Ind	CSN	Results suggest that identification of or response to opportunity is linked to culture.
1996	F3	Vinje, David L.	E	Com	Capacity	Education, as an indirect approach to economic development is significant.
1994	F3	O'Neill, Kelly M.	T	Ind	CSN Land	Local community culture and values, local economics, and local resources.
1994	F3	Robinson, Hogan	T	Gr-Fi	CSN	Collective achievement over individual achievement.

Table 2. Frequency analysis of aspects of the Indigenous entrepreneurship canon

<i>Units of Analysis</i>			<i>Principal Themes</i>			<i>Methods</i>			<i>Publication category<sup>2</sup></i>		
	Total	Percent		Total	Percent		Total	Percent		Total	Percentage
Ind	15	21.7	Def	8	11.5	Case	25	36.2	A	5	7.2
Gr/Fi	8	11.5	Land	16	23.1	Surv	8	11.5	B	11	15.9
Comm	36	53.6	Cap	28	40.5	<i>Type</i>			C	0	0.0
Inst	3	4.3	CSN	35	50.7	E <sup>3</sup>	33	47.8	D	7	10.1
Mul	5	7.2	Org	25	36.2	T <sup>4</sup>	51	73.9	No rank	25	36.2
Nat	1	1.4							Book	8	11.5
									Other	11	15.9
Total	Na*	Na*		Na*	Na*		Na*	Na*		69	100**

\*Do not add up due to counting

\*\* May not add up due to rounding

Figure 1. Distinguishing the two main perspectives of entrepreneurship research

		Actions involved	
		Creation of new means and ends relationships	Maximising existing means and ends relationships
Context	New organisations	(A) Change oriented venture creation	(B) Non-change oriented venture creation

<sup>2</sup> Rankings were obtained by using the Journal Quality List (JQL) of Bradford University that contained various journal-ranking systems.

<sup>3</sup> Empirical

<sup>4</sup> 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

