

DEFINING INDIGENOUS ENTREPRENEURSHIP AS A RESEARCH FIELD:  
DISCOVERING AND CRITIQUING 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)

## 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”

- (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”.

#### 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.]*

- Agrawal, A. (1995) "Dismantling the Divide Between Indigenous and Scientific Knowledge, Development and Change." 26(3): 413-439.
- Bebbington, A. (1993) "Modernization from Below: An Alternative Indigenous Paradigm." *Economic Geography*, 69(3): 274 - 292.
- 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>.
- 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.
- Eckhardt, J.T. and Shane, S.A. (2003) "Opportunities and entrepreneurship." *Journal of Management*, 29 (3): 333-349.
- Gartner, W.B. (1993) "Words lead to deeds: towards an organizational emergence vocabulary." *Journal of Business Venturing*, 8(3): 231-239.
- Hutcheon, P. D. (1972) "Value Theory: Toward Conceptual Clarification." *The British Journal of Sociology*. 23(June): 172-187.
- Low M., and Macmillan, I. (1988) "Entrepreneurship: Past Research And Future Challenges." *Journal of Management*. 14(2): 139-162.
- 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.
- 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.
- Neitschmann, B. (1994) "The Fourth World: Nations versus States." In *Reordering the World Geopolitical Perspectives on the 21st Century*. G. J. Demko and. W. B. Wood. (Editors), 225-242. Oxford: Westview Press Inc.
- Nozick, R. (1974) *Anarchy, State and Utopia*. New York: Basic Books.
- Pearson, N. (1999) "Rebuilding communities." Australian Broadcasting Corporation (Producer) Brisbane: Brisbane Institute.
- Rawls, J. (1975) "A Kantian Conception of Equality." In *John Rawls - Collected Papers*, S. Freeman (Editor, 1999) Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rawls, J. (1972) *A Theory of Justice*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Robinson, M. and E. Ghostkeeper. (1987) "Native and Local Economies: A Consideration of Economic Evolution and the Next Economy." *Arctic*, 40(2): 138-44.
- Robinson, M. and E. Ghostkeeper. (1988) "Implementing the Next Economy." *Arctic*, 41(3): 173-82.



Seton, K. (1999) "Fourth World Nations in the Era of Globalisation An Introduction to contemporary Theorizing Posed by Indigenous Nations." *Fourth World Journal*. 4(1).

Shane, S. and Venkataraman, S. (2000). "The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research." *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1): 217-226.

Trudgen, R. (2001) *Why warriors lie down and die*. Darwin, Australia: Aboriginal Resource and Development Services Inc.

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

#### SPECIFIC REFERENCES: THE 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 Kimberly, 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 Calagary; 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 –Tables and Figures

*Table 1. The Indigenous Entrepreneurship Research Canon*

Date	Cat	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.

Date	Cat	Author	Type	Unit(s) of Analysis	Principal Theme(s)	Key Concepts
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	Furneaux, Craig	T	Comm	Capacity	Environmental factors, barriers to capital, social capital.
2007	F2	Meis-Mason Dana Anderson	TE	Gr-Fi	CSN Capacity Org	Quality assurance, aboriginal branding, e-commerce, international trade, capacity building.
2007	F2	Wuttunee	TE	Comm	CSN Org	Community entrepreneurship/ capitalism; corporate partnership.
2006	F2	Anderson, Dana, L, Dana, T.	E	Comm	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	Comm	CSN	Social enterprise, cultural values, politics of resource access.
2006	F2	Foley, Dennis	ET	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
2005	F2	Hindle, K	T	Nat	CSN, Capacity	Cultural misunderstanding, sensitive education.
2005	F2	Lindsay, Noel J.	T	Comm	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 Weir, Wuttunee	T	Inst	Capacity Org	Regulation theory, capacity building, creating new organizations (economic development officers).
2007	F3	Charlotte	T	Comm	Land	Self-sufficiency, culture.
2007	F3	Fowler	T	Comm	Land	Highly collective entrepreneurship, (large corps tied to tribal).
2007	F3	Katschner	T	Comm	Land, Org	Empowerment theory; barriers to capital.

Date	Cat	Author	Type	Unit(s) of Analysis	Principal Theme(s)	Key Concepts
2007	F3	Torres, Anderson	T	Comm	Land	Sustainable development.
2006	F3	Anderson Honig, Peredo	T	Comm	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	Ind	CSN	Lifestyle entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial orientation, cultural assessment of wealth.
2006	F3	Mitchell, Ron, K.	T	Comm	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	Comm	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, Chrisman	T	Comm	CSN Org	Traditional concept of 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	Comm	Land CSN	Development "on their own terms"; modernisation based efforts failed.
2005	F3	Camp II, Anderson, Giberson	E	Comm	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	Comm	CSN	If entrepreneurs are influenced by culture, not just individual but the aspects of environment must be studied; environment.
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	Comm	Land CSN	Connection to place and individual identity undermines assumption of free mark solutions; policy.
2004	F3	Anderson, Kayseas Dana, Hindle	T	Comm	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	Comm	CSN Capacity	Regulation theory, mode of accumulation.
2003	F3	Dodson, Smith	T	Comm	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	Comm	Capacity Org	Gaming industry stimulates 100% of new entrepreneurial ventures; of these ventures, they are all in relation to the gaming industry.

Date	Cat	Author	Type	Unit(s) of Analysis	Principal Theme(s)	Key Concepts
2002	F3	Anderson, Robert	E T	Comm	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 E	Comm	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	Comm	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	Comm	Org CSN	Stable institutions and policies, fair and effective dispute resolution, Separation of politics from business management; cultural "match".
1998	F3	Duffy, Stubben	T	Comm	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 T	Comm	CSN Org	Cultural norms of political legitimacy provide foundation of effective self-government.
1996	F3	Cornell, Kalt	E T	Comm	Org	Socio-historical factors and their consequences for institutional efficacy.
1996	F3	Dana, Leo Paul	E T	Ind	CSN	Results suggest that identification of or response to opportunity is linked to culture.
1996	F3	Vinje, David L.	E	Comm	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

	Units of Analysis		Principal Themes			Methods			Journal Category		
	Total	Percent		Total	Percent		Total	Percent		Total	Percent
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	33	47.8	D	7	10.1
Multi	5	7.2	Org	25	36.2	T	51	73.9	Non Rated	25	36.2
Nat	1	1.4							Book	8	11.5
									Other	13	15.9
<b>Total</b>	Na*	Na*		Na*	Na*		Na	Na		69	100**

\*multiple counting employed

\*\*may not add up due to rounding

Figure 2 A Framework of the Field of Indigenous Entrepreneurship Research

