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DEFINING INDIGENOUS ENTREPRENEURSHIP AS A RESEARCH FIELD: DISCOVERING AND CRITIQUING 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

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 economic, social and cultural disadvantage is a globally prominent problem as is the failure of the passive welfare policies and systems employed by mainstream states to solve it. For different reasons, Indigenous peoples and mainstream governments have come to see entrepreneurship as a potentially powerful means of redressing the relative disadvantages of Indigenous people.

Meanwhile, researchers have been examining the phenomenon of Indigenous entrepreneurship in a growing volume of works. 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. This study discovers a canon of 69 works, which are classified, analysed and discussed with reference to a comprehensive literature classification matrix. The study provides both a formal definition of the field and an illustrated framework to describe it.

NOTE: By its very nature the task of literature classification is space consuming. The sheer publication reference details of the 69 works examined in this study plus their assembly into the literature classification matrix (the core contribution of the study), consume over fifty percent of the space allowed for papers in the 2007 BCERC conference. Accordingly, we crave readers’ indulgence. The text of this paper will often indicate where severe abridgement of necessary argument and discussion has occurred to meet the space constraints of the conference. Even though the forced abridgements compromise the paper significantly, we determined that the presentation of the literature classification matrix and associated formal framework of what we deem to be a distinct sub-field of entrepreneurship was a matter sufficiently on the “frontiers of entrepreneurship research” (the mission of the conference) that submission of an abridged paper was preferable to withdrawal. An unabridged version is available to any conference attendee who asks for it. References to the unabridged paper, where necessary, are indicated in italics.

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the study

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.

Indigenous disadvantage and the failure of passive welfare

In this section, the unabridged paper presents the evidence of Indigenous disadvantage and the failure of passive welfare.
Is Indigenous entrepreneurship a possible solution and is it a definable field?

In this section, the unabridged paper details the history of Indigenous people and mainstream governments “discovery” of entrepreneurship as a potentially powerful means of economic development and redress of disadvantage.

Literature search strategy and design of the paper

A comprehensive literature search was designed to include all academic book publications, peer reviewed journals, and 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 comes 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**

*In this section, the unabridged paper delineates some of the consensus and controversy issues affecting mainstream entrepreneurship as a research field. The unabridged paper presents, as figure 1, a depiction of the differences between the two major schools of thought in the entrepreneurship discipline: the “emergence” perspective and the “opportunity” perspective. This figure is not reproduced in this shortened version of the paper.*

**Current attempts to define Indigenous entrepreneurship**

*In this section, the unabridged paper argues that, if Indigenous entrepreneurship is to be a field, it must retain the parent discipline’s emphasis on novelty: the newness of either the enterprise being built (the “emergence” perspective) or the opportunity being developed (the “opportunity” perspective). The putative new field does not have to “take sides” and decide whether opportunity or organisational emergence is the “true” heart of the parent field. Indigenous entrepreneurship, if it is to be a field, can and ought to embrace both perspectives. The unabridged paper then examines different extant attempts to define the field. Differences are less important than similarities. All 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 is 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 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 is 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 address 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”
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”.

Studies considered but excluded

Works that made reference to Indigenous circumstances but had no direct reference to entrepreneurship or its development potential were excluded as were works that had a lot to say about entrepreneurship but in contexts that did not fit the definition of “Indigenous” as discussed and developed in previous sections of this paper. Literature that was judged redundant or published in dual locations were also screened out. Lastly, 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 other words, these tended to be papers that reported acts of or issues in 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 and classified in table 1. A subsequent examination of publication features dealing with location and quality of journals was also conducted. (This table does not appear due to article size limitations).

- 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 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 is presents the field of Indigenous entrepreneurship as a formal framework.

- Insert figure 2 here -

DISCUSSION: STATUS AND FUTURE OF THE FIELD

The unabridged paper provides substantial discussion of the status and future of the field under four sub-headings:
- Consensus and controversy among existing scholars in the field;
- Limitations of work done to date;
- Methodological issues;
- Future directions.

We conclude that the current study has provided a needed and useful contribution to scholarship by defining a previously inchoate field of research and classifying its canon. The most important future issue is that Indigenous scholars need to take ownership of the field so that the empathy that can only come from being an Indigenous person can be conveyed effectively to a body of scholars currently comprised overwhelmingly of privileged members on mainstream hegemonies.
GENERAL REFERENCES

The unabridged paper has 24 general references. Here, only those works specifically addressed in the abridged version are cited.


SPECIFIC REFERENCES: THE INDIGENOUS ENTREPRENEURSHIP CANON


APPENDIX 1 –Tables and Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Units of Analysis</th>
<th>Principal Theme(s)</th>
<th>Key Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Hindle, Lansdowne</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>Def Org CSN</td>
<td>Reconciling tradition with innovation; the importance of understanding non-mainstream world-views and values; twin skills, heritage index, autonomy accountability network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Peredo, Anderson</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>Def Org, CSN Land</td>
<td>Enterprise, cognition, communal aspects, alliances, culture. IE is a growth area of scholarship and appears to be a distinguishable subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Peredo, Anderson,</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>Def Org</td>
<td>There is a distinguishable kind of activity appropriately called &quot;Indigenous entrepreneurship&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Galbraith, Honig,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Galbraith, Rodriguez</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>CSN Land</td>
<td>Property rights, entrepreneurial behavior, environmental resources; dispelling false myths as to the processes and themes of IE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Dana, Leo Paul</td>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship a function of cultural perceptions of opportunity, leading to research on IE. Seminal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Foley</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>Def Capacity</td>
<td>Positivism, face, chaos experience, networking, family, discrimination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Ty</td>
<td>Type of Analysis</td>
<td>Principal Theme(s)</td>
<td>Key Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Chamard, Christie</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>Def</td>
<td>Compare/contrast Canadian &amp; Australian Indigenous strategies for entrepreneurship; base similarities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Kayseas, Hindle, Anderson</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Current level of research in Indigenous entrepreneurship, land rights, governance, institutional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Anderson, MacAulay, Kayseas, Hindle</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Global economy, laws, customs, history, accumulation regime; IE as a tool for development, not undertaken solely for purpose of profit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Anderson, R, Dana, L.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>Heterogeneity, resources, kinship, egalitarianism, cooperative entrepreneurship, culturally influenced opportunity recognition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Furneaux, Craig</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Environmental factors, barriers to capital, social capital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Mess-Mason, Dana, Anderson</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Gr-Fi</td>
<td>Quality assurance, aboriginal branding, e-commerce, international trade, capacity building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Wittunee, Anderson</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Community entrepreneurship/capitalism; corporate partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Berkes, Adhijari</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>Social enterprise, cultural values, politics of resource access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Foley, Dennis</td>
<td>E, T</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>Dichotomy of indigenous community vs. stand-alone business venture; cognition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Lindsay N., Lindsay, W.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>Indigenous entrepreneurship emphasizes both econ, and non-econ objectives; cognition, EO, EOR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Lituchy, Reavley, Livina, Abraira</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>Esip intimately linked to community and cult survival; Indigenous women play major roles in politics and business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Dana, L., Dana, T., Anderson</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>Model of Esip for western different than Indigenous model, social entrepreneurship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Hindle, K</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>CSN, Capacity</td>
<td>Cultural misunderstanding, sensitive education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Lindsay, Noel J.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>Cultural dimensions and entrepreneurial attitude; Ind ent is more holistic; Ind ent values will reflect Ind cultural values; EO, EOR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Foley, Dennis</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>Indigenous cultural paradigm of success in entrepreneurial activity, educational and training expertise, sacrifice/survival techniques in business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Zapalska, Perry, Dabb</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Capacity building, barriers to capital, policies and procedures, socioeconomic conditions, business skills, and finance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Self-sufficiency, culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Fowler</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Highly collective entrepreneurship, (large corps tied to tribal).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Katschner</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Land, Org</td>
<td>Empowerment theory; barriers to capital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Unit(s) of Analysis</td>
<td>Principal Theme(s)</td>
<td>Key Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Torres, Anderson</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comm, Land</td>
<td>Sustainable development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Cardonone, Rentschler</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Inst</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Struggle to market culture; capacity building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Chen, Parker, Lin</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Gr-Fi</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Using IT to compete globally, transition to new markets, core capabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Frederick, Foley</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ind CSN</td>
<td>Cognition, disadvantage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Gombay, Nicole</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Ind CSN</td>
<td>Food shared, not sold in Inuit society, regulatory incentives; market exchange convergence (breaking of tradition and social norms to emulate western economic practices).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Keelan, T.J., Woods, C.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Ind CSN</td>
<td>Myth of the entrepreneur connection of traditional knowledge and behavior to entrepreneurial activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Maritz</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Ind CSN</td>
<td>Lifestyle entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial orientation, cultural assessment of wealth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Mitchell, Ron, K.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comm Capacity Org, Land</td>
<td>Key transaction cognitions; access to capital on reserve, via property rights, adjust native governance to lower trans costs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Mowbray, Martin</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comm Org Capacity</td>
<td>Social capital, localist policy, community “evidence based” results; governance, economic development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Papanek, Gustav F.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Gr-Fi Capacity</td>
<td>Affirmative action creates dependency upon policy while atrophying entrepreneurial skills; incentives mis-aligned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Peredo, Chrisman</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comm CSN Org</td>
<td>Traditional concept of entrepreneurship and economic development do not apply in some environs; community based enterprise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Inst CSN Land</td>
<td>Transfer of land/resources, provision of labor and capital, contrast between commercial and community goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Anderson, Camp, Nkongolo-Bakenda, Dana, Peredo</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comm Land CSN</td>
<td>Development &quot;on their own terms&quot;; modernisation based efforts failed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Camp II, Anderson, Giberson</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Comm Org, Land Capacity</td>
<td>Venturing = self-reliance on own terms, yet capacity must be developed to compete strategically in global business, JV; trust.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Dana, L.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comm CSN</td>
<td>If entrepreneurs are influenced by culture, not just individual but the aspects of environment must be studied; environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Hindle, Anderson, Giberson, Kayseas</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Gr-Fi Capacity Org</td>
<td>Active participation in global economy on competitive business basis; twin skills, heritage index, autonomy/accountability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Jacobsen, Jones, Wybrow</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comm Land CSN</td>
<td>Connection to place and individual identity undermines assumption of free market solutions; policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Anderson, Kayseas, Dana, Hindle</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comm Land</td>
<td>Socioeconomic objectives of the Aboriginal people through entrepreneurship and business development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Aspaas, Helen Ruth</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ind CSN</td>
<td>Nexus of family obligations, economic necessities, cultural ties commitment for serving communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Anderson, Giberson</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Comm CSN Capacity</td>
<td>Regulation theory, mode of accumulation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Dodson, Smith</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comm Org</td>
<td>Sustainable, development; good governance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Fuller, Don Eileen, Cummings</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Gr-Fi CSN</td>
<td>Integrity of market-based &amp; subsistence-based behaviors and a consequent adaptation of associated social and inst systems necessary to overcome dominant culture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Galbraith, Stiles</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Comm Capacity Org</td>
<td>Gaming industry stimulates 100% of new entrepreneurial ventures; of these ventures, they are all in relation to the gaming industry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Unit(s) of Analysis</td>
<td>Principal Theme(s)</td>
<td>Key Concepts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Anderson, Robert</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>Business development is the centerpiece of the Aboriginal approach to economic development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Cachon, Jean-Charles</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Gr-Fi</td>
<td>Lack of capital, isolation from markets poor social capital, education levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Cornell, Kalt</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Resource or human capital endowments not as important as political/governance bodies; without these, the above is limited; nation building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Sullivan, Margaretis</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Transition from welfare state to liberal market damaging to Indigenous people without proper transitions and policy support mechanism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Schaper,</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Gr-Fi</td>
<td>Culturally attuned success factors, barriers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Cornell, Kalt</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Stable institutions and policies, fair and effective dispute resolution, Separation of politics from business management, cultural “match”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Duffy, Stubben</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>A model that incorporates cultural and sovereignty variables is presented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Anderson, E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Gr-Fi</td>
<td>Discussion on factors that motivate CSR.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Chiste</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>This book examines the growing small business sector in Aboriginal communities across Canada.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Cornell, Kalt</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Cultural norms of political legitimacy provide foundation of effective self-government.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Cornell, Kalt</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Socio-historical factors and their consequences for institutional efficacy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Dana, Leo Paul</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>Results suggest that identification of or response to opportunity is linked to culture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Vinje, David L.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>Education, as an indirect approach to economic development is significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>O'Neill, Kelly M.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>Local community culture and values, local economics, and local resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Robinson, Hogan</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Gr-Fi</td>
<td>Collective achievement over individual achievement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units of Analysis</th>
<th>Principal Themes</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Journal Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total Percent</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr-Fi</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>CSN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Na*</td>
<td>Na*</td>
<td>Na*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*multiple counting employed

**may not add up due to rounding
Figure 2 A Framework of the Field of Indigenous Entrepreneurship Research

**Entrepreneurial Actors**

- **Degree of Indigeneity**
  - How strongly do indigenous factors affect the venture or opportunity?
  - To what extent is any indigenous venture in partnership with mainstream actors?

- **Multiple units of analysis**
  - Individuals
  - Groups and firms
  - Community (e.g., land, tribe)
  - Institutions (e.g., partnership, development corporation)
  - Nation (e.g., Nation-states)
  - Multiple

**Dominant Agenda**

- **Addressing multiple aspects of relative disadvantage**
  - Identity (sense of self, wholeness)
  - Loss of culture, values, traditions
  - Discrimination by dominant hegemony
  - Economic deprivation
  - Independence (self-determination)

**Four Principal Themes**

- **Culture and Social Norms**
  - Tradition
  - Heritage
  - Spirituality
  - Degree of collectivity
  - Limits of generality
  - Effects of discrimination

- **Entrepreneurial Capacity**
  - Social networks and social capital
  - Worldviews
  - Education
  - Experience
  - Skills

- **Organizational Drives and Constraints**
  - Governance systems
  - Formal institutions
  - Resource strengths and weaknesses
  - Land rights and property systems
  - Capital ability
  - Spiritual aspects

**Emerging Themes**

- Land and Resources

---

16