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Abstract

This PhD research project views and examines the socio-economic environment of the urban Indigenous Australian entrepreneur. The proposed research project explores Indigenous entrepreneurs. As they experience enlightenment, empowerment and emancipation through success in business, do they identify less with Indigenous culture and more with the Anglo-European values of the dominant Australian or American culture? Do successful Indigenous entrepreneurs, in effect, need to take on or adopt values of the dominant Anglo-European culture to remain successful in business? Are there impediments/inhibitors existing that restrict business growth and subsequent success to the Indigenous entrepreneur? From case study analysis and literature review, is the Indigenous entrepreneur different in comparison with the non-indigenous entrepreneur? Does entrepreneurship free the Indigenous business person from the welfare system? These are the questions that this research attempts to answer.

The project involved a case study analysis of twenty five contemporary urban Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs geographically spread from Hobart, Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney, Brisbane and Cairns and a few major regional centres. The Hawaiian study was similar with twenty five case studies from the major urban centres on the islands of Oahu, Molokai, Kauai, Hawaii and Maui. The Hawaiian study also included a control study of sixteen non-Hawaiian minority entrepreneurs to ensure that the Hawaiian findings were objective. Indigenous Standpoint theory was applied together with a Grounded theory approach to ensure that the research was based in an Indigenous epistemological approach to knowledge. Constant comparative coding was used to ensure the qualitative data was analysed using a semi structured format.

The outcomes of the study provide a rich insight into the world of minority entrepreneurs who operate within post-colonial cultures of western dominance and negative stereotypes that have created welfare dependant societies. In summary the outcomes identify that the intrinsic motivator for Indigenous entrepreneurs is to provide for their family, to give their children a better life than what they experienced, and to escape the entrapments of poverty. Racism and discrimination combined with lack of capital and access to micro-credit were seen as the major
inhibitors to business success. The Indigenous entrepreneurs are struggling to cast off the shackles of welfare, to no longer be at the mercy of successive government programmes. The study results indicate that success in small enterprise undertakings by Indigenous entrepreneurs is a move up from self management, success in entrepreneurial activity is self-determination for those entrepreneurs. The end result is one of micro-economic reform within the Indigenous families who benefit from the success in small business enterprise and entrepreneurial activity. Indigenous values in Hawaii were maintained with a strong connection to land and language, whether it be spoken or not by the entrepreneur. It was the values attached to language that included a strong work ethic, maturity and respect that were seen to be dominant issues. Within Indigenous Australia the result of genocide inflicted on successive Indigenous generations has not destroyed Indigenous Australian culture altogether. Strong views remain concerning protocol and ethics, what has evolved are contemporary Indigenous values that allow the Indigenous Australian to maintain cultural standards revolving around kinship in contemporary Australia.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Research Project

This project considers research questions initially applicable to urban Indigenous Australian Entrepreneurs. To test validity and Pacifica correlation to the Australian case studies, the questions are then applied in a comparative case study of urban Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs. The Native Hawaiians are arguably an Indigenous comparison owing to their history of colonial subjugation and existence in a contemporary capitalist profit driven economy that has similarities to Australia. The aim of a comparative study is to highlight similarities or differences that the Indigenous groups experience on their entry and survival in business. There is limited literature available on either group (Daly 1995; Foley 2000a; Fuller, Dansie, Jones and Holmes 1999; Jones 1998; Martin and Liddle 1997; Morris personal interview 29 November, 2001; Schaper 1999; Taylor 1997). The adoption of a comparative research approach may illustrate previously unrecognizable important social issues concerning Indigenous people's entry into business. The questions that this research addresses are:

1) As Indigenous entrepreneurs experience enlightenment, empowerment and emancipation through success in business, do they identify less with Indigenous culture and more with the Anglo-European values of the dominant Australian or American culture?

2) Do successful Indigenous entrepreneurs, in effect need to adopt or conform to the value system of the dominant Anglo-European culture to remain successful in business?

3) Are there existing impediments/inhibitors that restrict business growth and subsequent success of the Indigenous entrepreneur?

4) Is the Indigenous entrepreneur different from the non-indigenous entrepreneur?

5) Does entrepreneurship free the Indigenous business person from the welfare system?

As mentioned, there is little literature available that enables educators, policy makers or concerned individuals to understand the 'how' and 'why' Indigenous entrepreneurs succeed. An aim of this research project is to fill this apparent void in literature.

The poor socio-economic position of both Indigenous Australians and Native Hawaiians is well documented (Alu Like 1998; Commonwealth of Australia 1992) and will be discussed in
the following sections. It would appear in the Australian example that a driving force behind the development of Indigenous Australian entrepreneurial activity is the need to reduce poverty (Foley 1999) therefore the poverty levels of Indigenous Australia needs to be addressed. This will be followed by an explanation of the research concepts and research outline. The balance of Chapter 1 addresses these issues.

1.2 Need for the Development of Indigenous Australian Businesses

Indigenous Australian societies have been forced to make radical changes in their economic and social systems following two centuries of colonial policy. The results of colonial domination have been devastating. Economically Indigenous Australians have been kept on the fringe, and in poverty (Fisk 1985; Pollard 1988). A critical economic disadvantage is the continuing low level of Indigenous household income. Regardless of individual wages, household income is low when spread across the multi-generational and multi-family households (Smith and Daly 1996). Poverty is the result of the combined effects of past government policies, high unemployment, low levels of education, poor health, and low levels of home ownership. Poverty in Indigenous Australian society is the direct result of the lack of a formal structured path to a self-determination process, which involves the lack of self-reliance and economic development (Nagle and Summerrell 1998). The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC) recognised and recommended to the government the need for improving the economic and social status of Indigenous people in reducing poverty which would create benefits for all Australians (ATSIC 1998c).

In 1991, the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody concluded that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island people are: 'the most socially, economically and culturally disadvantaged group in Australian society' (Commonwealth of Australia 1992: 1). Indigenous Australia has a high welfare dependency ratio with fewer marketable skills and less work experience than other sections of Australian society (ATSIC 1998c; Fisk 1985; Hunter 1999). The Indigenous population also experiences discrimination and prejudice by employers, together with high levels of unemployment, between 38% or 54% depending on the interpretation of government statistics (Fisk 1985; Spicer 1997: 5), 24% excluding the Community Development Employment Program (CDEP) participants (Australian Bureau of Statistics [ABS] 2001). The
lack of marketable skills and resultant high levels of unemployment compound the poverty problems of Indigenous Australia in general.

The maintenance of an Indigenous Australian 'welfare system' to cope with high levels of Indigenous unemployment, together with an almost non-existent Indigenous economic base, is expensive (Fuller, Dansie, Jones and Holmes 1999; Fisk 1985; Hunter 1999; Spicer 1997). In addition there is the cost of funding debates over Indigenous issues that include land rights, mining, the stolen generation, stolen wages (Queensland), reconciliation, education, health, housing and numerous other cultural socio-economic matters. These costs, plus the lack of productivity of a sizeable proportion of Indigenous Australians, constitute an expensive burden on both the Indigenous and general Australian economies (Fuller, Dansie, Jones and Holmes 1999; Taylor 1997).

A possible solution to this negative situation is the entry of Indigenous Australians into small business. Self-employment and the environment of entrepreneurship that is synonymous with private enterprise development are considered not only as a means of achieving economic independence, they also are a contributing fundamental force behind social change (Holt 1997). The 1991 Royal Commission Report states that one of the most important single steps in the achievement of self-determination is to redress the negative effects of poverty (Nagle and Summerrell 1998). The development of Indigenous businesses has been advocated as a possible means of escaping from welfare dependency (Fuller, Dansie, Jones and Holmes 1999; Herron 1998) [and poverty]. This also has the potential to improve Indigenous Australia's economic and social circumstances (ATSIC 1998a; Herron 1998).

Indigenous Leaders also endorse the need for economic development and Indigenous enterprise. Mr. Gatjil Djerrkura, former ATSIC Chair in his opening speech on economic development at the conference 'Doing Business with Aboriginal Communities' in Alice Springs on February 24, 1998 summed up the need for this proposed research:

... why is economic empowerment necessary? ... We need to find a way out of welfare dependency. We need to find replacements for the traditional economic activities of the past ... our young people are growing in number and they will need something productive and meaningful ... we need to be participants, rather than bystanders ... we need to develop indigenous businesses and entrepreneurs (1998: 2).
Entrepreneurial activity that results in the development of a capital base that is independent of government subsidization is essential if Indigenous Australia is to be economically self-reliant. Entrepreneurial activity in mainstream society is a building block in a formal structured path to self-determination.

1.3 The Research Concepts

Entrepreneurial activity within Indigenous Australian families and networks can provide an economic base that is not government dependent. However, we need to understand the cultural ramifications of entrepreneurial activity. The development of the Indigenous Australian businessperson or the Indigenous Australian entrepreneur is economically a prudent policy as the economic returns from gainful employment outweigh the cost of welfare dependency (Fuller, Dansie, Jones and Holmes 1999). Yet this study must ask, at what cost to the Indigenous participant? What is the social, cultural and spiritual cost to the Indigenous entrepreneur of engaging in economic activity in mainstream Australia (Martin and Liddle 1997)? Moreover we must ask how such entrepreneurs can succeed given the low economic and social position of Indigenous people.

Is economic activity for the Indigenous participant a process that fosters a middle class society within Indigenous Australia that duplicates a Protestant work ethic (Dodd and Seaman 1998)? If a Protestant work ethic is duplicated, is this a mirror of Anglo-American or European capitalism? In the extreme this could be argued as the final phase of colonialism in the extirpation of Indigenous culture. Another question that must be considered is whether Indigenous values and cultural ties can be retained while the entrepreneur still develops economically within the dominant culture of contemporary Australia? There is a need to understand how entrepreneurial activity affects the cultural values of its Indigenous participants. The research project, explores change or loss of cultural values from the Indigenous entrepreneur’s prolonged involvement in business. Does the Indigenous entrepreneur become (in effect) culturally non-indigenous whilst engaged in entrepreneurial activity? Or are the individual’s cultural values maintained, transformed or subdued? Does entrepreneurship free the Indigenous business person from the welfare system? These are the questions that this research
hopes to answer. To enable a conclusion to be realized, twenty-five Australian Indigenous entrepreneurs will be studied together with twenty-five Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs as a comparative study looking at the research questions.

This study also explores the background of successful entrepreneurs and investigates whether there are impediments or inhibitors that restrict business growth. This can also assist to explain inhibitors to business entry. Further exploration may indicate why some Indigenous entrepreneurs achieve success. The literature review and case study analysis results might also indicate whether the Indigenous entrepreneur is different from the non-indigenous entrepreneur.

Historical precedents have shown that numerous groups, the target of prejudice and discrimination, have successfully used business as a means of upward mobility in their economic development (Salinger 1993). Research has shown that ethnic entrepreneurial success is found in the ability to compensate for the typical background deficits of their groups and the discrimination that they encounter through the use of their distinctive socio-cultural resources (Lincoln and Denzin 1994; Waldinger 1993). Literature suggests that the cultural differences between nascent Indigenous and ethnic entrepreneurs within the dominant culture are negligible which places the Indigenous and ethnic entrepreneur on an even playing field (Lincoln and Denzin 1994; Reynolds and White 1997). The culture of the minority group does not determine their economic success. Rather their success is based in the ability to use their social position in a process to achieve economic action (Waldinger 1993). How the Indigenous entrepreneur then uses their social position, what values are adopted and what Indigenous values are retained is the basis of this research.

An explanation of the Indigenous entrepreneur and their position in business and society will follow a thematic concept that will develop in each chapter. The concept develops with the inclusion of additional information and theoretical applications in the progression of the chapters evolving into The Indigenous Australian Entrepreneurial model as shown in figure 10 in Chapter 5. This model includes the socio economic barriers and social constraints experienced by the Indigenous entrepreneur together with their needs, the development of contemporary values and the dichotomy of Indigenous values combining with the interaction of kinship ties which results
in a depiction of the Indigenous Australian entrepreneur in a simple figure. The commencing model developed by the author for this study is shown in Figure 1:

**Figure 1** The Indigenous Entrepreneur: Pre-Business Model.

The Indigenous entrepreneur pre-business model simply illustrates the Indigenous entrepreneur having personal needs which include the need for economic empowerment, such as the need to provide basic food, accommodation, clothing (Maslow 1970). It also includes the need for self determination, to be in control of their life becoming a part of society rather than being subjected to the controls of the state in a welfare existence. The basic delivery and access to the satisfaction of needs however suffers from a socio-economic barrier which includes (and is not limited to) poverty, unemployment, poor health, and poor education.

### 1.4 Outline of the Chapters: The Research Project.

As previously mentioned, Indigenous Australia needs economic development to achieve self-reliance on a path to self-determination (ATSIC 1998a; Djerrkura 1998; Herron 1998). Entrepreneurial activity can provide an economic base. This research examines successful
Indigenous entrepreneurs to learn from their experience. To appreciate the scope of this research it is important that the reader be aware of how an Indigenous Australian is defined including some understanding of the demographics of Indigenous Australia. The reader also needs to be familiar with the definition of a Native Hawaiian. These definitions are provided in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 outlines the Literature Review, which illustrates the theoretical foundation upon which the research is based. A theoretical foundation will be built around Minority theory applying Cultural theory, Ethnic Enclave theory, and Middlemen Minority/response to Cultural Antagonism theory, Opportunity/Ecological Succession theory, and Interactive theories in addition to the application of Social Identity theory. In the construction of the theoretical base, a wide body of knowledge will be linked to exploring conventional entrepreneurial discourse. Collectively these inter-linking areas of literature examined will conclude in the development of a hypothesis on the phenomena of the Indigenous Australian entrepreneur and Native Hawaiian entrepreneur. The bridge (or gap) in literature across Pacifica between Australia and Hawaii on Indigenous entrepreneurs is closed to some degree with a literature review studying several Pacific nations that are geographically spread between the two case study islands.

Chapter 4 builds onto the research questions explaining the case study procedures, research parameters, the selection of participants, case study protocols and the ethics of the research methodology. This chapter also includes an explanation of the data collection and the coding. An explanation of Indigenous behaviour is provided that leads to the theoretical approach to the methodology that discusses Indigenous epistemology. The context of Social theory, Critical theory and Feminist Standpoint, Insider-Outsider theory are then applied in the construction of an argument in the development of an Indigenous Standpoint theory. The Indigenous philosophies of the physical, human and sacred worlds are summarized and are complimented by the Japanangka Paradigm and the Rigney ‘Indigenist’ research approach. Hawaiian Indigenous epistemology is briefly discussed preceding an explanation of the Indigenous Standpoint theoretical application resulting in a thematic model of the theory.

Chapter 5 explains that the research was undertaken in three distinct phases. Firstly preliminary Australian research was undertaken to test the hypothesis, secondly Hawaiian research and data gathering was completed, thirdly the Australian field studies and compilation
of data was finalized. Chapter 5 then examines and explains the data gathering and interview processes both in Australia and Hawaii discussing demographics and case study frameworks from which to benchmark the explanation of the research findings. In summary this chapter provides details of the interview results in a concise readable format. In the conclusion of Chapter 5 the thematic model development is addressed and applied to the research findings.

Chapter 6 reviews issues raised in the methodology and literature review which are relevant to the research findings such as the application of Indigenous Standpoint theory, the application of cultural values that includes religion and family. Microeconomic reform is discussed in its relation to the Indigenous entrepreneur and other issues of relevance are discussed. These are the researchers’ acceptance into the Hawaiian network, the effect of Matriarchal/Patriarchal systems on the entrepreneurs, the correlation between non-indigenous spouses and success, and the effect of the stolen generation. This provides a base on which to discuss recommendations and conclusions in Chapter 7.

Throughout this paper the Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Commission (ATSIC) is discussed or referenced. When this project commenced in the year 2000, ATSIC was an autonomous government entity that had a unique ministerial and management structure based around a philosophy of self-determination for Indigenous Australians. Recently in 2004 this structure changed with the dismissal of the then chief executive of ATSIC Mr. Geoff Clark and the redistribution of a number of ATSIC functions into several mainstream government departments together with the creation of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Services which has a philosophy of Indigenous self-management. During the finalization of this research paper ATSIC ceased to exist. Any reference to ATSIC as a functioning entity is restricted to the research periods of 2000 to 2003 and early 2004 inclusively. Any perceived or stated negative comment from the participants is not political rhetoric aimed at the downfall of ATSIC rather it is the outcome of the research findings. The recommendations stated in Chapter 7 are aimed at a long term positive application for Indigenous Australians, the writer has no political affiliation and this research paper is written with no political intent other than the economic and social improvement of Indigenous Australia.
2 INDIGENOUS AUSTRALIA & HAWAII

This chapter provides the reader with a brief background on Australian and Hawaiian Indigenous culture and their respective Indigenous economic activity. It defines who is regarded as Indigenous in both Australia and Hawaii, briefly discussing the current level of economic activity of Indigenous people in each country. This chapter also examines entrepreneurship within pre-colonial societies. This information is necessary to understand and discuss the application of prior research in the area of cultural studies and entrepreneurship to the Indigenous Australian and the Native Hawaiian situation. For the purpose of this study, Native will be substituted for Indigenous in respect to referencing Indigenous Hawaiians, as this is acceptable within current American discourse (Kame’eleihiwa personal conversation August, 2001; Kiste personal conversation July, 2001; Trask personal conversation August, 2001). This section also defines the Indigenous entrepreneur for the purposes of this study.

2.1 Definition of an Indigenous Australian and Indigenous Australian Economic Activity

The accepted ‘common law’ definition of Australian Aboriginality is a three-part definition. An Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander person is a person:

1. Who is of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander descent,
2. Identifies as an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander person, and
3. Is accepted as such by the community in which they live (ATSIC 1998c: 60).

This three-part definition has been accepted and upheld by the High Court in The Commonwealth v Tasmania (1983), and confirmed in Gibbs v Capewell (1995) receiving general acceptance by governments and the Australian Indigenous community. All participants subject to this study must fall within this definition.

The Indigenous population of Australia as at June 30, 2001 was estimated at 458,500 which represents 2.4% of the country’s overall population (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare 2003). The geographic distribution of Indigenous Australians reveals that the majority (72.6%) live in towns or cities on the eastern seaboard and the south east of Australia with 55.7% of the Indigenous population living in New South Wales and Queensland alone (ABS
1999). Nearly 20% reside in Brisbane and Sydney (Commonwealth of Australia 2000). Urban or semi-urban living is the fundamental structure of Indigenous Australian society, as we know it today (Fisk 1985). The statistical inclusion is to justify why this research is urban based. It should not be forgotten or trivialised, that within the context of the Australian population sizeable communities of Indigenous Australians are also located in rural remote locations. Many of the rural remote communities suffer from a lack of business opportunities, poor economic position, and limited access to education. The rural community experiences differing opportunities and constraints in comparison to the urban counterpart and is in general more dependant on government assistance (Altman and Hunter 1996).

The underlying Indigenous demographic trends in the late 1990’s of poor health statistics, an increasing youth population with decreasing family wealth/income per capita, combined with government reductions in funding programs has thought to result in a declining economic situation for Indigenous Australia (Taylor 1997). This trend continued into 1999 with the extent of labour market disadvantage increasing with respect to Indigenous women and youth (Fuller, Dansie, Jones and Holmes 1999). More importantly for the purposes of this study, the proportion of Indigenous Australians who are self-employed or classified as employers remains very low in comparison with non-indigenous Australia. Based on the 1996 Population Census Data the estimated proportion of Indigenous self-employed in the labour force was 2.4%. This was one third of the non-indigenous rate of 7.3% (Fuller, Dansie, Jones and Holmes 1999). The number of Indigenous Australians actively engaged in small business indicates a declining trend since 1994 (Hindle and Rushworth 2002; Schaper 1999). The 2001 Population Census Data estimated the proportion of Indigenous self-employed in the labour force to have increased to 4.8% in comparison to 2.4% in 1996. The unexpected variance in these results would appear to be unnecessarily complicated census methodology by the ABS in 1996 (Hunter 2004b). The important statistic to understand is that in 2001 the statistical comparison of self-employment rates between Indigenous and non-indigenous Australia decreased from 0.31 to 0.30 (Hunter 2004b) which supports the declining trend since 1994. The sobering outcome of this literature is that: 'Indigenous Australians remained three times less likely to be self-employed than other Australians' (Hunter cited in ABS 2004a: 1)
As at June 30, 1996 the ATSIC funded Business Funding Scheme’s loan portfolio was comprised of only 489 active loans (ATSIC 1997). The majority of these loans were to community based Aboriginal Corporations rather than to individuals. Funding programs over the last twenty years have resulted in little commercial success. A restructure of the ATSIC Business Development Program in 2002-2003 resulted in one hundred and twenty new loans totalling $6.3m being funded in that period with an increased number to individuals and an increased emphasis on serviceability (ATSIC 2003). The number of commercially viable businesses supported by ATSIC increased from 489 in 1996 to 631 in June 2003 (ATSIC 2003). A large percentage of this loan portfolio however is without personal guarantees and is to community based organisations.

Indigenous entrepreneurs are statistically few in number and the peak funding body is investing in group/community based ventures over stand alone individual entrepreneurial pursuits.

### 2.2 An Australian Cultural Consideration

The Australian Indigenous economic situation has been outlined in the previous section. When considered in conjunction with the issues raised in Chapter 1 concerning high unemployment, high welfare dependency, few marketable skills and low work experience, it is clear that the outlook for this sector of Australian society is bleak. The social positioning of Indigenous Australia is poor, placing them in a generalised category that is similar to the commonly held negative views that categorise African-Americans in the United States (Waldinger 1996).

It is easy to understand and accept the social plight of the African-American and the resultant social differences as this is portrayed openly in modern media in the genres of film and TV. Yet the social plight of Indigenous Australia is still a relatively unknown or unpublished area in modern Australian media (Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation 1994). What is possibly not understood is that Indigenous Australians have differing cultural and social values to that of mainstream Australia be they deeply urbanised with life styles similar to the non-indigenous Australian or the rural remote (Commonwealth of Australia 2000). These cultural differences remain despite the cultural deprivation following postcolonial contact and cultural diffusion of Indigenous society post 1788 as shown in the following conversation:
Australian] Aboriginal people in general have differing cultural values to that of the dominant white European, and they [the white European] don’t understand us. We have been studied, put under the microscope for two hundred years yet they, the whitefella still don’t understand us (Budby personal conversation 7 October, 2002).

Culture as a way of life of an entire society includes codes of manners, dress, language, rituals, norms of behaviour and systems of belief (Jary and Jary 1995). It could be assumed that Indigenous Australia would display the effects of cultural diffusion following the colonial subjugation of Indigenous practices and the poor social economic position as outlined. However, postcolonial studies have seen a resistance in Indigenous culture to recolonisation in modern times (Fuery and Mansfield 2000). The ‘Anglo’ and Indigenous Australian society have remained: ‘incalculably various, constantly mutable, and [a] labyrinthine in their elaborateness’ (Carrithers 1992: 2). An underlying question of the researcher is to consider whether Indigenous Australia can survive as a culture and improve its social economic position? Whilst we acknowledge the differences between Anglo-European and Indigenous Australian culture, there are some similarities and we must accept that the cultures are continually mutating, change is inevitable (Carrithers 1992). The answer to the researcher’s question may lay in a commonality between the two cultures that is arguably evident is the activity that is entrepreneurship.

Entrepreneurial activity has existed in a different cultural format within Indigenous Australian trading groups for in excess of 40,000 years (Flood 1995; Willey 1979). This historical cultural common thread may possibly be a part of the economic and social solution that is required to cast off the encumbrances of a welfare dependency that subjugates contemporary Indigenous Australia (Fuller, Dansie, Jones and Holmes 1999).

Discussion on Indigenous Hawaiian identity, the Native Hawaiian economic position and Native Hawaiian cultural differences to mainstream United States follows.

2.3 Definition of a Native Hawaiian and Native Hawaiian Economic Activity

The United States Federal government defines a Native Hawaiian as having 50% or more Native blood quantum (Trask 1999). This creates a problem for comparability in this study as this
definition is vastly different from the Australian example. Blood quantum is based in race-based theory, which is a ‘politically manipulated pseudoscience’ (Wallace 1999: 45) and can sustain scientific stereotypes (Barley 1987). Blood quantum relies on a biological concept of race which revolves around purity, ancestry and origin as opposed to ethnicity, which is based on culture and affiliation (Clark 2004). The use of a definitive based on blood content to determine one’s culture and national identity is a concept that is grounded in nineteenth-century European biogenetic models that includes the now-discredited fields of eugenics and phrenology. Blood quantum principles assume that the race of one group is a fundamental genetic characteristic that determines a person’s identity. Measuring racial purity by blood quantum legitimises racism to some extent by providing an image of scientific precision. The mindset that governs blood quantum views any amount of blood from another race ‘pollutes’ the ‘racial purity’ contaminating the other (Clark 2004). The ‘other’ in most cases is the white European, as the comparatives historically have been Indigenous people and/or African slaves. Blood quantum applications do not consider the individuality of people, their ethnic affiliation or their cultural beliefs, “... it is inherently racist” (Clark 2004: 41). The legislative use of blood-quantum first appeared in the Dawes Severalty Act of 1887 in respect to Native Americans. “Indianness” in the United States of American legislation is defined thirty-three different ways (Brownell 2000). Therefore to ensure compatibility, the Australian definition has been adopted following consultation with academic staff at the School of Hawaiian Studies, University of Hawaii and senior Hawaiian community leaders.

For the purpose of this study, a Native Hawaiian is accepted as a Native Hawaiian by descent, by self-recognition and by community recognition. It is accepted (following community consultation in Hawaii) that delineation by blood quantum percentiles is racist and will not be applied to this study. The issue of blood quantum is no longer a key issue in some areas of governance, as the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) has recently adopted a broader approach on the debate of Hawaiian ancestry. As an example, the Hawaiian Registry [Ancestry Registration] implemented on January 10, 2002 does not use existing blood quantum in the registration process. In effect you are recognized as Hawaiian if you have Hawaiian ancestry and identify as Hawaiian, similar to the Australian definition (OHA Hawaiian Registry 2002). A
further example is the OHA broader approach to the concept of blood quantum in the community based loan funds scheme which:

... unlike the Bishop Estate, the Queen Emma Foundation, the Queen Lili‘uokalani Trust, the Lunalilo Trust [organizations that are restrictive basing funding on 50% blood quantum] ... [OHA] has a much broader mandate. Its purpose is to provide the opportunity for a better future for all Hawaiians. The mix of trust funds earmarked for Hawaiians of at least 50 percent blood quantum and general funds provided annually by the legislative, allows OHA to serve Hawaiians of any blood quantum (Office of Hawaiian Affairs, Mission Statement 2002).

When the question was first raised by the writer with Hawaiian elders of the possibility of using the Australian definition of Aboriginality in lieu of the U.S. official blood quantum definition, it was warmly received. It would appear that since discussions were undertaken with its staff and several trustees, the peak Hawaiian Indigenous body is also adopting a similar definition in its policies (Office of Hawaiian Affairs, Mission Statement 2002).

There are approximately 93,982 registered firms in Hawaii, only 875 of which are Native Hawaiian owned (U.S. Census 1997). U.S. Census figures can be confusing when discussing Native Hawaiians as some statistics relate to those with blood quantum of 50% or more, others relate to those stating Hawaiian ancestry. The 1997 figures used (which are the most accurate to the date of writing) are based on blood quantum data.

There is little entrepreneurial literature available on Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs (Morris personal conversation 29 November, 2001) and what literature is available can portray the Hawaiian in a negative stereotype (Alu Like 1998). Consequently, there is a need to undertake further study to fill the current void of published literature on contemporary Native Hawaiians (Morris personal conversation 29 November, 2001).

2.4 An Hawaiian Cultural Consideration

The peaceful existence of traditional Hawaiian society is recorded in history as shattered with the arrival of Captain James Cook in 1778 (Warschauer 2000). Almost overnight the effect of Western society and technology changed the country's laws, introduced a new concept of land ownership, quashed their native language, their culture and in 1893 overthrew their Queen.
Lili'uokalani (Warschauer 2000). The result was almost extinguishment of the Hawaiian race (Department of Hawaiian Homelands 2003).

In the 1920’s Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalaniana'ole, the Hawaiian delegate to Congress saw an urgent need to save his people and restore their culture. The concept devised has been called *aina ho'opulapula* ('from the land we flourish') which was the Prince’s strategy in his attempt to save his people. Leading up to this strategy, generations of Hawaiians had been exterminated through foreign borne illnesses like smallpox and leprosy (Department of Hawaiian Homelands 2003). In the early twentieth century they found their culture was being destroyed by societal and political forces of which they had no control over (Department of Hawaiian Homelands 2003). The efforts of the Prince resulted in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920. The act was flawed as it lacked a clear purpose, yet the U.S. Congress apparently intended to provide homesteads and financial assistance to Native Hawaiians. According to the then territorial Representative William Jarrett the best public lands remained under the control of the sugar growers and ranchers. The land left available to the Native Hawaiians was land that ‘a goat could not live on’ (Department of Hawaiian Homelands 2003: 5). The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act 1920 helped destroy a Native economy that, prior to US colonization and subsequent annexation, had been an economy that was primarily independent (Department of Hawaiian Homelands 2003).

Early in the 1960’s, jumbo jets began arriving in Hawaii, which heralded a land and building boom (OHA 2003). The population jumped 25%. What were once virgin shores were replaced by hotels and subdivisions expanded into the once pristine valleys and cane fields. Often Native Hawaiian farmers and fishermen had no place to go (OHA 2003). The sixties and early seventies saw the birth of Hawaiian political activism and in 1978 a Constitutional Convention was called which resulted in the establishment of the OHA (OHA 2003).

Native Hawaiians make up approximately 19.85% (mixed blood) (U.S. Census 2000) and 9.4 % (50% or more blood quantum) of the population of the State of Hawaii (U.S. Census 1997). Despite the commercialization of their culture and the images presented of Hawaii of beaches, swaying palms and hula, the socio-economic position held by Indigenous Hawaiians is very low (similar in many ways to Indigenous Australia):
Correctional records show Hawaiians with the highest percentile of all those incarcerated. Schools record ethnic Hawaiians on the lower end of the educational scales. Mortality rates are the highest among newborn Hawaiian children. Longevity is the shortest (Alu Like 1998: 1).

The effects of colonisation and the subsequent commercialization of modern Hawaii have resulted in a 200-year history of cultural upheaval with similarities of dispossession, genocide, and assimilation that parallel those experienced by Indigenous Australia.

To understand the socio-economic issues regarding Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs, preliminary interviews were undertaken with senior staff within the OHA, the Hawai’i Alliance for Community-Based Economic Development (HACBED) and the U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA). These interviews confirmed that Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs appear to seek self-determination through economic independence, via their success in small business undertakings, to overcome a societal stereotype that they are in general welfare dependent (Agres personal interview 23 October, 2001; Mills personal interview 17 October, 2001; Sakihama personal interview 8 November, 2001).

These discussions developed to include a definition as to what constitutes a successful Hawaiian entrepreneur. Literature reviewed revealed that success is seen as dealing with a locus of control that is influenced by goal-striving behaviour (Fan and Karnilowicz 1977) or as a process of self-actualization (Maslow 1968, 1970; Rogers 1964). Previous research on Native Hawaiians determined that success for the Native Hawaiian was restricted to objective quantitative measures associated with financial statements. Success was simply the financial position of an entrepreneur rather than an attitude or value (Ward 1983). Previous research however revealed that Hawaiian entrepreneurs considered their personal satisfaction (psychic and social wealth) of providing employment for other Hawaiians as a significant reward for their entrepreneurial efforts, which could be defined as success (Ward 1976). Taking these findings into account, a much simpler definition was determined. Staff within OHA HACBED and the SBA advised that when the high risk of business failure in Hawaii in the first twelve months of business operation is considered, if the Hawaiian entrepreneurs were still in business after twelve months, then they were considered successful (Agres personal interview 23 October, 2001; Mills personal interview 17 October, 2001; Sakihama personal interview 8 November, 2001).
Native Hawaiians are a minority in their own country. They have suffered and still suffer sociological and economic problems driven by industry and an economy that is the by product of an administration that toppled their sovereign leader and dispossessed them of their lands. Prior to the late 1960's, agriculture drove their economy. Now the Hawaiian economy relies heavily on tourism (U.S. Census 2000). The success of the Hawaiian entrepreneur is possibly dependent on their encroachment into a society driven by the United States of America (Agres personal interview 23 October, 2001).

Both Indigenous Australians and Native Hawaiians have been briefly discussed to illustrate their position, both socially and economically within the dominant European heritage of their ruling administrations. Previously a link has been made between entrepreneurial activity pre-colonisation. The following section expands on this topic to determine who is an Indigenous entrepreneur in the modern context, as this is important in the development of this study.

### 2.5 Who is an Indigenous Entrepreneur?

It is helpful to gain a background understanding of entrepreneurial discourse before defining an Indigenous Entrepreneur. The origin of the word ‘entrepreneur’ is derived from the French words _entre_ meaning between, and _prendre_ being the verb to take (Bolton and Thompson 2000). It is a term for a merchant who acts as a go-between for parties in the trading process. The first person reputed to have used this terminology was the French economist Richard Cantillon in 1725 (cited in Bolton and Thompson 2000) who related it to the party that carried the risk in transactions between the supplier and the retailer or customer. ‘Entrepreneur’ in French means a contractor, such as a building contractor. It seems that the English usage of the word follows on from the French verb _entrepredre_, meaning to undertake, as in undertaking a new venture (Bolton and Thompson 2000).

‘Entrepreneurship has long been acknowledged as a dynamic factor in economic growth, yet economists have not found it easy to define its role’ (Fairbairn 1988a: 17). After decades of study of entrepreneurial characteristics, there is no clear model or definition to describe entrepreneurs (Holt 1997). The inability to agree on a clear entrepreneurial model or definitive traits is that entrepreneurs are viewed differently subject to the theoretical interpretation that is
attempting to define them (Fairbairn 1988a). Economic literature which can be dated back to the eighteenth century (Fairbairn 1988a) has depicted entrepreneurs as risk takers. Some eighty years ago, Knight (1921) viewed entrepreneurs as a special group of people who accept uninsurable risks, and manage uncertainty in the pursuit of profit. Others see the entrepreneur as a proprietary capitalist, a supplier of capital managing labour and consumers (Fairbairn 1988a; Harbison 1961). The connection between management skills of the entrepreneur in the factors of production and risk in the creation of new wealth was then envisaged (Fairbairn 1988a; Kent 1984). Differing economists view the entrepreneur having various functions. Leibenstein (1968) argues that the entrepreneur coordinates inter-market activities, Kilby (1971) sees the entrepreneur as one who perceives market opportunities gaining command over scarce resources and Kirzner (cited in Kent 1984) describes the entrepreneur as one who perceives what others have not seen and acts upon that perception. Marshall (1961) views the entrepreneur as one who accepts the risk-taking, linking managerial ability with organizational ability and innovation. This work was initially published in 1890 and published as a variorum edition in 1961. Schumpeter (1934) also viewed the entrepreneur as an innovator, which was a significant breakthrough in the analysis of entrepreneurship (Fairbairn 1988a).

Following on from the previous paragraph, decades of study into the characteristics of entrepreneurs has resulted in no one clear model or definition to describe entrepreneurs (Holt 1997). This has been compounded in recent debate in the field of entrepreneurial research as to a specific definition of what or who is an entrepreneur (Tiessen 1997). The concept of the entrepreneur however continues to fascinate a variety of people from many fields of study, including economists, sociologists, psychologists, politicians, historians, anthropologists and enterprise academics (Beaver 2002). This research study also has a multi-disciplinary aspect as it entails understanding literature in the fields of anthropology, history, management, sociology and to an extent psychology.

Current thinking in the area of entrepreneurial study acknowledges that there are three perspectives of entrepreneurial characteristics (Beaver 2002):

- **The Psychological perspective;** which concentrates on attempting to identify personality traits and characteristics such as the need for achievement (McClelland

- The Economic perspective: the macro-economic change (Homaday 1990), the resultant economic flow-on from innovation (Casson 1982) and
- The Sociological perspective: the opportunistic, adventurous, ambitious, innovative, proactive, high profile image-makers (Chell et al., 1991).

Having outlined these three areas of thought, it is accepted that, in general, entrepreneurship is associated with three desirable economic outcomes: growth, innovation and flexibility (Tiessen 1997: 368). An entrepreneur therefore is:

... one who creates a new business in the face of risk and uncertainty for the purpose of achieving profit and growth by identifying opportunities and assembling the necessary resources to capitalise on them (Zimmerer and Scarborough 1998: 3).

One definition promoted by the Harvard Business School defines entrepreneurship as: ‘the pursuit of opportunity beyond the resources one currently controls’ (Smilor 1997: 343). Both the Harvard Business School and Zimmer - Scarborough definitions are simplistic. They lack applicability to the Indigenous Australian as they fail to take into consideration other environmental variables or allow for the social positioning of the Indigenous entrepreneur. A more detailed explanation and definition of what entrepreneurship is:

entrepreneurship is a subversive activity. It upsets the status quo, disrupts accepted ways of doing things, and alters traditional patterns of behaviour. It is at heart, a change process that undermines current market conditions by introducing something new or different in response to perceived needs. It is sometimes chaotic, often unpredictable. Because of the dynamic nature of entrepreneurship and because of the entrepreneur’s ability to initiate change and create value ... the concept of ‘creative destruction’ is an apt description of the process ... the entrepreneur thus disrupts the economic status quo, and as a result creates new market opportunities (Smilor 1997: 341).

Smilor’s (1997) definition and explanation allow for an understanding of the dynamics of the entrepreneurial environment. The dynamics of change, of turbulence, are experienced in the
entrepreneur's daily habitat. Perhaps it is chaotic, sometimes it may be predictable, but often the change process is not. It is the entrepreneur's ability to harness this change to advantage, or perhaps even to initiate the change in the first place that is their distinguishing ability or the characteristic that makes them different. Applying this to the Indigenous Australian, a definition has been developed to encapsulate the phenomenon of the Australian Indigenous entrepreneur, which is also applicable in the Hawaiian study. That definition is as follows:

entrepreneur alters traditional patterns of behaviour, by utilising resources in the pursuit of self determination and economic sustainability via entry into self employment, forcing social change in the pursuit of opportunity beyond the cultural norms of initial economic resources (Foley 2000a: 11).

This definition goes beyond the simplicity of the Harvard definition, and is more comprehensive than Smilor's (1997) application and correspondingly more encompassing than Zimmerer and Scarborough (1998). From previous research we know that Indigenous Australians may experience a dramatic change process in their lives on entering business, notably the change in their values resulting from considerable personal sacrifice (Foley 2000a, 2003). This change process is continual. It is a transformational process not only within their own personal lives, it is also evident within their business pursuits (Knight 1997). The former Minister of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, Senator John Herron defined the economic status quo imposed on Indigenous Australia as the 'Welfare Shackles' (Herron 1998). This status quo is oppressive. Entrepreneurial activity for an Indigenous Australian certainly disrupts their lives changing them from a group often labelled as welfare dependant to a self-determined individual. The control of this determination is subject to the education, skills and resourcefulness of the individual. This is highlighted in the following description of entrepreneurial activity:

entrepreneurship refers to the pursuit of creative or novel solutions to challenges ... Entrepreneurship is a fundamental posture, instrumentally important to strategic innovation, particularly under shifting conditions in the external environment ... entrepreneurial activity is critical because it stimulates superior performance and may well be the key fundamental element in the procurement of advantages relative to competitors (Knight 1997: 213).

To succeed and maximise this advantage over a competitor or to achieve a market niche, (as mentioned previously) the entrepreneur has three desirable economic outcomes to aspire to:
growth, innovation and flexibility. These are consistent with the two critical ingredients of entrepreneurship, economic opportunity and resources (Tiessen 1997: 369) together with the stimulation for superior performance (Knight 1997) or as the ‘fire in the belly [to succeed]’ (Smilor 1997: 342). The ability of Indigenous entrepreneurs to grow, be innovative and be flexible can be impeded by environmental factors. As a consequence of the general poverty levels experienced in their communities, Indigenous entrepreneurs may not have access to pooled family or community capital or other resources (Fuller, Dansie, Jones and Holmes 1999). This in turn will have a negative effect on growth. The Indigenous entrepreneur may also experience racism or be impeded in their business endeavours by racial stratification (Waldinger 1996).

As illustrated contemporary Indigenous entrepreneurs alter traditional patterns of behaviour and utilise resources in the pursuit of self determination and economic independence by self employment. They force social change in their pursuit for opportunity outside of the constraints of their social norm.

The literature may suggest that entrepreneurship is a factor of Western economic development. However entrepreneurial trading economies existed prior to the voyages of ‘discovery’ in the Pacific by Captain James Cook, and in some areas relatively modern concepts in entrepreneurial practices flourished pre-colonization. The history of Indigenous entrepreneurship is scantily referenced. It is important that this study expands on current literature to ensure that the reader has a historical background to entrepreneurship. The following section discusses pre-colonial entrepreneurship amongst Indigenous groups within relevant sectors of Pacifica.

### 2.6 Pre-Colonial Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurial activity has existed between Indigenous trading groups in Australia for in excess of 40,000 years (Flood 1995; Willey 1979). Within neighbouring areas of the Pacific Rim, entrepreneurial activity by Indigenous groups has been well documented, showing that entrepreneurial activities were often pursued vigorously during pre-European times (Fairbaim 1988a). The traditional (entrepreneurial) skills associated with economic activity pre-colonial
contact became a basis for exploiting new economic activities generated by the opportunities that contact with Europeans initially gave the Indigenous entrepreneurs (Fairbairn 1988a).

Epstein's (1968) work in the study of the Gazelle Peninsula of Papua New Guinea provides evidence of regional markets of produce and value added goods that thrived during pre-contact times. 'Primitive Capitalism' (Epstein 1968: 29) provides evidence of surplus resource management, organization of labour resources (employment), and the ethic of profit in the accumulation of wealth (Epstein 1968). This is an example of a surplus economy that provided for and was possibly determined by market demand in the production of goods to meet consumer demand (Fairbairn 1988a). Other examples manifested through trade can be found throughout the Pacific Island nations between trading partners (Diamond 1999; Fairbairn 1988a). Fiji is an example where coastal peoples traded regularly with inland inhabitants of numerous islands (Fairbairn 1988a). Other examples include intensive trade between Samoa and Tonga (Fairbairn 1988a). Close to home, the Torres Strait Islanders also enjoyed a sea-borne trade between marine harvested products and surplus agricultural produce with mainland Australia and the coastal areas of southern New Guinea (Diamond 1999; Shnukal 2000). The trade of produce outward in the purchase of value added products such as canoes, adzes and axes, and their subject re-tooling and re-engineering by the Torres Strait Islanders also provides evidence of a surplus Torres Strait Islander economy (Beckett 1987; Sharp 1993; Shnukal 2000).

'A notable feature of the economic development of several Pacific island countries was the efflorescence of entrepreneurial activity that occurred during the post-contact period' (Fairbairn 1988a, 1988b). This can be illustrated in the Cook Islands in the 1860's, forty years after European contact. Other examples that predate the Cook Islands include Tahiti and New Zealand. The Tahiti trade ended abruptly with the French takeover in 1842. Likewise the Cook Islands and New Zealand, Maori trade also ended abruptly with the New Zealand (European) colonial administration stripping commercially orientated chiefdoms of their autonomy and entrepreneurial freedom once the yoke of colonisation was firmly applied. The stifling of activity was also compounded with the corresponding religious zeal of missionary activity and their subsequent imposition of restrictive practices (Fairbairn 1988b). Some of the entrepreneurial activities that were squashed were substantial with prior Indigenous control over trade with non-
indigenous buyers predominantly within the whaling industry which involved restocking vessels with fresh produce and pork. The entrepreneurs particularly in the Cook Islands developed merchandising networks, distribution and marketing facilities that included several schooners that traded throughout the Cook Islands group (Fairburn 1988b). Maori (New Zealand) vessels traded with the Australian colony and later some of the vessels, their Maori Masters and crew were to be involved with the marine industry in far northern Australia and the Torres Straits (Shnukal 1995). As in the Australian comparative, Indigenous entrepreneurs in these examples were ultimately subjugated by European colonial dominance.

In recent times, New Guinea has received intensive examination by scholars on the entrepreneurial performance of its people resulting from contact with Europeans that has involved the introduction of a cash economy (Fairbairn 1988a). This is chronicled in works that include Crocombe and Hogbin (1963), Epstein (1968), Finney (1973b), and Sailsbury (1970). Collectively these works attempt to understand Indigenous entrepreneurship that is developing at an accelerated pace to bridge the gap between stone-aged technology (and methodology), with the modern computerized world of post-contact Papua New Guinea. These scholastic works have a dominant anthropologic application that in some cases fails to realize that there is an Indigenous standpoint in entrepreneurial development that is not based or driven by greed, prestige and social status. New Guinea did not have a permanent colonial settlement until the 1880s and it was the last of the Pacific/Australian areas to be subjugated by colonization (Diamond 1999). It already had examples of thriving highland and coastal micro-economies of trade amongst certain tribes that involved surplus economic activity (Diamond 1999). In addition the Indigenous population did not suffer the same widespread suffering and de-population from introduced disease that surrounding entrepreneurial economies in the Pacific, New Zealand and Australia experienced (Diamond 1999). Its economic base remained relatively intact, as did the entrepreneurial knowledge of its leaders.

The aggressive adoption of western concepts and technology by some groups are illustrated in the example of the Chimbu peoples who within a period of less than fifty years, now own several large coffee growing businesses, timber mills and the transport, warehousing infrastructure required to run these operations (Diamond 1999). The collective works of
Crocombe and Hogbin (1963), Epstein (1968), Finney (1973b), and Sailsbury (1970) are perhaps flawed by their failure to recognise that entrepreneurial ability is not merely an attribute of the modern European world. Rather, it has existed in various forms and applications (as illustrated by Diamond 1999) in Indigenous communities around the world. The 'cash economy' of Papua New Guinea post-European contact is an introduced environmental factor that has been devastating for some and stimulating for others (Diamond 1999; Fairbairn 1988a).

The discussion of Indigenous entrepreneurial activity pre and post-European contact could continue as example after example is explored. For the purpose of this study however, the argument is presented only to demonstrate that Indigenous entrepreneurial activity did exist pre-European/colonial contact.

2.7 Conclusion

This chapter defined Indigenous Australian and Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs. The definition adopted is applied in the selection of cases for this study. This chapter has also discussed the economic and social position of the Indigenous Australian and Native Hawaiian people. In both Australia and Hawaii the Indigenous people suffer from poor education levels, high unemployment rates, poor health statistics, high incarceration ratios, discrimination, and welfare dependency is common due to high poverty levels. As a result the two Indigenous groups are at the bottom of their respective country's societal racial ladder.

The thematic discussion illustrates the Indigenous entrepreneur at the conclusion of this chapter as follows:
Following the discussion in this chapter, the Indigenous entrepreneurship model has another barrier added to it. Before the Indigenous entrepreneur can satisfy their personal needs, they must not only overcome the hurdle of a suppressive socio-economic barrier, but the social barrier of negative stereotypes and racial stratification. Literature examining minority groups in Chapter 3 will further explain the negative situation of the Indigenous entrepreneur.

The background information given in this chapter is important in understanding both the significance of entrepreneurship in the lives of the entrepreneur illustrated in this study and the difficulties they encounter in commencing their businesses. Finally a brief history of entrepreneurial activity was presented to demonstrate that entrepreneurship itself is not solely the result of colonisation, but existed in pre-colonial cultures.

The next chapter discusses contemporary discourse within a formal literature review that initially looks at Indigenous small business theory which leads into Ethnic theories, Social Identity and Co-cultural theory. Conventional contemporary entrepreneurial discourse is then discussed followed by the cross-cultural environment of the Indigenous entrepreneur and
dominating values. The literature review concludes in a summation of comparative Pacific Island entrepreneurial research on Ethnic Small Business.
3 LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 Introduction

As there is little literature available on the study of Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs (Daly 1995; Foley 2000a; Fuller, Dansie, Jones and Holmes 1999; Jones 1998; Martin and Liddle 1997; Schaper 1999; Taylor 1997) or Native Hawaiian’s, (Morris personal interview 29 November, 2001) the broader literature review of ethnic theories will illustrate and assist the development of a theoretical foundation upon which this research is based (Perry 1994). As both Indigenous Australian and Native Hawaiians are a minority group within their respective countries then it is appropriate to utilise research on minorities in business to develop a theoretical foundation (Perry 1994). The theoretical frameworks surveyed include; Cultural theory, Ethnic Enclave theory, Middlemen Minority/response to Cultural Antagonism theory, Opportunity/Ecological Succession theory, and Interactive theories (for the purpose of this paper they will be referred to collectively as Ethnic Small Business theories). A common assumption made in these theories is that the entrepreneur is simply defined as a self-employed business person (Bonacich and Modell 1980; Bonacich, Castle and Collins 1989; Donthu and Cherian 1994; Dyer and Ross 2000; Light 1980; Light and Rosenstein 1995; Light and Wong 1977; Min 1996; Park 1997; Stanger 1992; Waldinger 1985, 1986a, 1986b, 1997; Ward 1985; Wilson and Martin 1982; Yoon 1997).

Conventional entrepreneurial discourse is limiting in the construction of a theoretical base when ethnic small-business theories are applied to the Indigenous entrepreneur. A wider body of knowledge needs to be explored which includes studies on racial stratification and developments in ethnic-immigrant research. When these interlinking areas of literature are collectively examined it is proposed that the conclusion will result in the development of a hypothesis on the phenomena that are the Indigenous Australian entrepreneur. In addition literature on Pacific Islander entrepreneurs will also be discussed connecting into a wider discourse to reduce the gap of knowledge spread within Pacifica between Australia and Hawaii.

The conclusion of this chapter deduces that Ethnic Small Business theories (Cultural theory, Ethnic Enclave theory, Middlemen Minority/response to Cultural Antagonism theory, Opportunity/Ecological Succession theory, and Interactive theories) have little application to the
Indigenous Australian entrepreneur. However, as this research thesis is possibly seminal in its research content and methodology, it is extremely important to include Ethnic Small Business theoretical understanding to assist the development of the thematic model and the readers understanding of the environment of Indigenous entrepreneurs. Both the reader and the researcher need to understand Ethnic Small Business theories so that it can be used as a standard, or reference point in the development of this research. The justification to examine Ethnic Small Business theories is further explained in the following sections.

3.2 Indigenous Small Business Theory

Why study Ethnic Small Business theory when the topic is Indigenous Australian and Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs? The answer is simple. Within the academic circles of Australia and Hawaii there are only a few researchers who have published works on Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs/small business/self employed Indigenous Australians. This small group consists of Arthur (1996), Daly (1993, 1994, 1995), Foley (1999, 2000a, 2000b, 2003), Fuller and Forsaith (1995), Fuller Dansie Jones and Holmes (1999), Hunter (1999), Martin and Liddle (1997), Schaper (1999), Smith and Daly (1996), Taylor (1993) Taylor and Hunter (1998), and Taylor and Roach (1998). Daly, Fuller and Taylor are seen as the most influential in this field. However studies of Indigenous remote ‘communities’ rather than urban Indigenous people dominate their collective works. These works also include a strong emphasis of presenting summaries of Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), statistics and previously published government funded reports on the socio-economic plight of Indigenous Australia. Moreover, they discuss the symptoms of the socio-plight of Indigenous Australia rather than the causation (Murphy 2000). Only a few of the researchers (Fuller and Parker 2002; Foley 1999, 2000a, 2000b, 2003) have applied qualitative research in field based studies looking at the impact of environmental variables on the establishment and success of Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs and/or looked at economic models in the examination of Indigenous entrepreneurial activity. There is no known published theory on Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs.

Research into the economic performance of immigrant entrepreneurs is also a neglected part of Australian knowledge (Pascoe 1990). Pascoe includes an Indigenous Australian couple in his publication and states that: 'their story is salutary, and worth including alongside that of
immigrant entrepreneurs, because they too are strangers in their own land' (1990: 4). With such small participation rates and the lack of research or comparable literature, some may feel that it is logical to classify the Indigenous entrepreneur as an immigrant in their own country and apply Ethnic Minority theory in an attempt to explain (and understand) the Indigenous Australian entrepreneur. The application of Ethnic Minority theory is a research method, it does not imply that Indigenous Australian’s are ethnic minorities. To the contra, they are the first Australians; it is the Anglo-European Australians who in reality are the historical ethnic inclusion into Australia.

3.3 Ethnic Theories

Literature that deals with ‘ethnic business’ can be vague in determining specifically what ethnic small business is. Stanger defines ethnic small business as: ‘all businesses which are independently owned and controlled by owner-managers whose ethnic and cultural origins are significantly different from the host country’ (1992: 18).

Recent developments in literature on Ethnic Small Business theory over the last decade have been dominated by American researchers (Light and Rosenstein 1995; Min 1996; Park 1997; Waldinger 1996; Yoon 1997).

The theoretical frameworks applied to Ethnic Small Business include Cultural theory, Ethnic Enclave theory, and Middlemen Minority/response to Cultural Antagonism theory, Opportunity/Ecological Succession theory, and Interactive theories. Two other interesting and inter-related theories; Social Identity theory and Co-cultural theory will be discussed in their own right prior to discussing conventional/contemporary entrepreneurial discourse.

In the discussion of Ethnic theories, the application of these theories will only be considered in the Indigenous Australian context as the Hawaiian studies are taken as the comparative study. The first of the theories to be discussed is Cultural theory.

3.3.1 Cultural Theory

Cultural theory attempts to explain the breakdown between ‘elite’ and ‘mass’ cultures, whilst critically appraising both (Jary and Jary 1995). Drawing on post structuralism, Cultural theory links Social theory and sociology (Easthope and McGowan 1992). It is seen as an attempt to bring to light the forms taken by the dispersed groups or individuals living in a society in which
they are not a part of the dominant culture (Orbe 1998). Early studies (Caudill and De Vos 1956) took the view that immigrant groups have traits and patterns of behaviour that enable them to move from menial type work to small business start-ups. The immigrant group’s collective organization of resources enables them to establish small business activities (Light 1972). This places a heavy emphasis on ethnic community ties and kinship in a pluralist approach to explain resource redistribution to provide initial start up capital.

Cultural theory is a way of explaining how a minority group may gain access to ethnic resources, assuming that resources do exist (Stanger 1992; Waldinger 1985). There are two phases of the resource application: an orthodox approach to resource management before emigrating; and a reactive pattern of behaviour in response to the situational developments, post immigration (Light 1980). The rotating credit associations of some Asian immigrants in America who display group solidarity outside of the family or clan network are seen as an example of orthodox tradition while the immigrant clan and family groups of the Chinese sub-economy in America in the early twentieth century is seen as a reactive tradition (Waldinger 1986b). The orthodox group organises start up capital prior to departure. The reactive group organise capital on arrival (Light 1980).

Cultural theory fails to consider the economic environment in which immigrant businesses operate (Stanger 1992). Immigrant success in business has been linked with the environment at the time of business commencement. The business environment must provide a niche in which the firm can operate with the possibility of gaining access to business ownership and access to resources necessary to exploit these opportunities (Waldinger 1985). A core issue in understanding this theory is to consider the relationship and interaction between power and communication. The dominance of a culturally accepted group or individual, and their resultant power is related to their communication ability over their peers (Orbe 1998).

Research indicates that Cultural theory does not explain how immigrants having a common cultural background and settled in different countries do not experience similar business development. Inconsistent results may appear owing to differences in the social/business environment (Stanger 1992). Research that compared Indian immigrants in Britain, Australia and the USA found that geographical enclaves performed better in some
countries than in others (Evans 1990; Stanger 1992). Following on from this research, it was evident that the role of psychological characteristics, values and perceptions of the individual in small business participation determine business involvement (Baum 1995; Brockhaus and Nord 1979; Carland 1984; Filion 1991; Herbert and Link 1988; Hunsiker 1986; Johnson and Ma 1994; Liles 1978; McClelland and Winter 1969; Stanger 1992; Solomon and Winslow 1988; Stevenson, Roberts and Grousbeck 1989). It can be concluded that Cultural theory is simplistic in its application, generalising on the immigrant group traits without considering the business environment or the attributes of the individual (Waldinger 1986a).

Although cultural theory may have some relevance to Indigenous Australia, on examining the limited resources available to the Indigenous entrepreneur (Fuller and Forsaith 1995; Fuller and Parker 2002; Hunter 1999; Pollard 1988), difficulties arise as to the application of the theory in Australia. In addition Cultural theory does not allow for environmental factors, individual psychological characteristics, values and perceptions that are believed to play an important role in the establishment and continuance of Indigenous businesses (Baum 1995; Brockhaus and Nord 1979; Carland et al., 1984; Filion 1991; Foley 1999, 2000a; Herbert and Link 1988; Hunsiker 1986; Johnson and Ma 1994; Liles 1978; McClelland and Winter 1969; Smilor 1997; Solomon and Winslow 1988; Stanger 1992; Stevenson, Roberts and Grousbeck 1989).

3.3.2 Ethnic Enclave Theory

An ethnic enclave is defined as a concentration of ethnic enterprises, which are firms of any size owned and managed by members of an identifiable cultural or national minority (Stanger 1992). For ethnic enclaves to exist there needs to be a presence of an immigrant group with sufficient capital and entrepreneurial skills in addition to a regular supply of enclave labour through sustained migration (Stanger 1992). As a result of cultural barriers, differences in language and other societal barriers, ethnic members of the enclave gain access to their own enclave’s market. The enclave market is a source of labour, which supports fellow immigrants with employment, supplying goods and services to the same immigrant group (Stanger 1992). The extent of this self-supporting market integration is highlighted in the pioneering research in Ethnic Enclave theory that revealed vertical and horizontal integration of the Cuban ethnic community in Miami.
(Wilson and Portes 1980). The immigrant’s lack of social conformity with mainstream society owing to lack of local knowledge, language skills and possibly work skills allows the enclave to be a preferred alternative to entry into the mainstream economy (Portes and Bach 1985).

A concentration of ethnic businesses is not necessarily explained by Ethnic Enclave theory. Research into the Korean immigrant enclaves in Los Angeles (Bonacich, Light and Wong 1977; Light and Rosenstein 1995; Light 1984) reveals that many had business experience in their former country, access to start up capital from pooled savings, and family networks to provide sources of labour. Light’s (1979) work attributes the high incidence of business ownership amongst Koreans to language difficulties in that it is easier to be self-employed than to work for others when one cannot speak the dominant language. Bonacich, Light and Wong (1977) argue that the immigrant enclave is fulfilling a commercial vacuum. Light (1984) goes on to establish that the Korean example is a distinction of class resources rather than ethnic resources. Light and Rosenstein (1995) conclude that it is the immigrant status of the Koreans, their education, capital, church/neighbourhood/immigrant organisation networks and training that explains the ethnic immigrant concentration in business, rather than Ethnic Enclave theory.

Ethnic Enclave theory is constrained in that it describes how the ethnic enclave sector may appear at a point in time rather than explaining its development (Stanger 1992). It is not the causation of ethnic small business growth, rather Ethnic Enclave theory illustrates the result (Waldinger 1986a, 1986b).

Ethnic enclave may be observed in Indigenous Australia. With only 2.4% (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare 2003) of the Australian population dispersed over such a large geographic area, small enclave groups exist in former mission reserves (such as Yarrabah and Cherbourg) and in residential concentrations in some major cities (eg Inala/Brisbane, Redfern and Mt. Druitt/Sydney). Stanger’s (1992) view is that for ethnic business enclaves to exist there needs to be a presence of an immigrant group with sufficient capital and entrepreneurial skills in addition to a regular supply of enclave labour through sustained migration. The poverty level existing in Indigenous Australia does not provide a sufficient capital base that enables Indigenous Australia to participate in business at comparable ratios (2.4% vs 7.3%) with non-indigenous Australia business representation (Fuller, Dansie, Jones and Holmes 1999; Pollard
1988; Smith and Daly 1996). In addition, the labour base available is relatively uneducated with 83% over fifteen years of age lacking post-school qualifications (Fuller, Dansie, Jones and Holmes 1999). There is no known field research to determine if Ethnic Enclave theory explains Australian Indigenous business involvement but it is unlikely given the lack of capital and skills.

3.3.3 Middlemen Minority/Response to Cultural Antagonism Theory

Early publications in this area used a peasant-feudal model of society to describe the middleman minority individuals who occupied an intermediate position or niche with a differing cultural heritage to those around them (Blalock 1967). Bonacich (1973) extended the model to include the Chinese in Southeast Asia and the Jews in Europe. Two conditions were cited as being necessary in the application of this theory: sojourn with the intention to return to their place of origin, and maintaining the culture of their origin. The sojourners form their own communities segregating themselves within the host society. The differing goals result in conflict between the middleman minority and their clientele, which develops into cultural antagonism (Stanger 1992). This model was applied to the study of Japanese immigrants in the United States (Bonacich and Modell 1980). However, it has since been repudiated as sojourning does not appear to be a characteristic of the Asian immigrant. Middleman Minority theory has been dismissed by some (Waldinger 1986b). The defining characteristics are so broadly stated that it is impossible to differentiate between those minority businesses classified as middleman minority and those who are not, owing to both groups maintaining cultural ties and identifying with their culture of origin (Bonacich 1973).

Earlier theorists noted the ways in which Middleman theory promoted ethnic attachment, arguing that it systematically increases ethnic solidarity (Min 1996). If antagonism increases, ethnic solidarity intensifies (Min 1996). Earlier work, which focused on Korean immigrants in the United States, refutes conspiratorial theories of why Koreans become middleman entrepreneurs (Min 1996). More recent work looks at the 'unassimilable' ethnic minorities, how they became assimilable and the development of stronger transitional ties of contemporary immigrants to their country of origin without increasing sojourning (Min 1996, 1999). This does not dismiss Middleman theory, rather it refines it to contemporary examples where host countries such as the USA with their multicultural policies in society, encourage the minority
group’s cultural traditions. In lieu of the minority group’s culture being antagonistic, it is culturally accepted, not assimilated. The new immigrants become bilingual and bi-cultural (Min 1999).

When applying middleman minority/response to Cultural Antagonism theory to Indigenous Australia, Bonacich’s (1973) defining variables of sojourning and maintaining the culture of their origin cannot be applied. For the purposes of this study we are dealing with ‘urbanised’ Indigenous Australians. Whilst they retain strong cultural ties it is not in the same context as determined by Bonacich. Perhaps Blalock’s (1967) peasant-feudal model of society to describe the middleman minority as the Indigenous individual who occupies an intermediate position or niche with a differing cultural heritage to those around them could be loosely applied as there is cultural antagonism and the Indigenous entrepreneur occupies a position within a different cultural heritage. The position of the Indigenous entrepreneur is better explained as one of ‘dissimilarity’ in comparison with the dominant Australian ‘Anglo’ society that is based on racial segregation (Fuller, Dansie, Jones and Holmes 1999) rather than middleman minority/response to Cultural Antagonism theory. Further theory development leads us onto Opportunity Structure/Ecological Succession theory.

3.3.4 Opportunity/Ecological Succession Theory
The opportunity structure approach provides a broad explanation of minority (immigrant) groups in small business, and has several assertions:

- the opportunity for a minority business is in an industry that has low entry costs and high risk of failure.
- places in areas of low status and rewards or high opportunity cost deter other entrepreneurs, and areas where changes in the local neighbourhood ethnic composition result in a decrease in the pool of native entrepreneurs or the high failure rate create openings for the immigrant (Stanger 1992).

Studies of Mexican and Latino-American entrepreneurs and some instances of Korean-Americans support these assertions (Light and Rosenstein 1995; Min 1996; Park 1997; Spencer and Bean 1999; Stanger 1992; Waldinger 1985, 1996; Yoon 1997). Ethnic consumer products, the ethnic ‘exotic goods’ (Stanger 1992) provide the initial market that in turn may add to
chained migration patterns with an increase of the ethnic group in the area. Subsequently the lack of job opportunity encourages the establishment of numerous businesses, which leads to increased competition and results in higher failure rates and poor returns of the business. Examples are found in the Cuban ethnic enclaves in Miami (Portes and Bach 1980; Portes and Manning 1986; Wilson and Portes 1980) and the Mexican ethnic enclaves in Los Angeles (Spencer and Bean 1999; Waldinger 1997).

Ecological Succession theory suggests that as the ethnic group population in the residential area increases, any business failures will be filled by the ethnic group rather than the ‘native’ group (Stanger 1992). Opportunity structure assumes business owners are ethnically similar, as does ecological succession, which assumes that they are ethnically the same as the local population, which is an ethnic population. Both theories have merit in their application, but they ignore the relevance of cultural resources (Stanger 1992). Light (1984) establishes the important distinction between class resources (level of education, management expertise) and ethnic resources (ethnic ties, ethnic solidarity, and ethnic networks). It is the class resources of the opportunity structure that establishes the entrepreneur. The ethnic resources determine or prolong success of the entrepreneur (Light 1984).

The Indigenous Australian application to this theory has strength in the establishment of a niche in the supply of ‘exotic goods’ (Pascoe 1990; Stanger 1992) as in the example of an Indigenous Tour Operator selling their ‘interpretation of the Dreamtime’ (Pascoe 1990) to mainstream clientele. This differs from the market for the goods categorised by American based researchers (Portes and Bach 1980; Stanger 1992; Waldinger 1997; Wilson and Portes 1980) who view the ethnic minority as supplying exotic goods pertaining to their culture and selling them to their own minority enclave consumers.

Ecological Succession theory does not apply to the Indigenous entrepreneur even though business vacancy places may exist in industries. Typically, within this scenario, there are few economies of scale with low entry costs and a high risk of failure (Waldinger 1985). Indigenous operators do not exist in sufficient numbers with sufficient capital or experience (Fuller, Dansie, Jones and Holmes 1999) to take the place of the pool of existing non-indigenous business people. Opportunity structure does not apply in the Australian application as it assumes business
owners are ethnically similar. Ecological succession also maintains they are ethnically the same as the dominant population which is not the case with Indigenous Australians who are a very small minority and culturally different from wider Australian society. The important inclusion of class resources (level of education, management expertise) and ethnic resources (ethnic ties, ethnic solidarity, ethnic networks) (Light 1984) in the opportunity structure establishes the ethnic entrepreneur. Their absence in Indigenous Australia (Fuller, Dansie, Jones and Holmes 1999) negates the application of Opportunity Structure/Ecological Succession theory to Indigenous Australian entrepreneurial pursuits. This leads on to economic opportunity with cultural resources.

3.3.5 Interactive Theories

Interactive theory links the independent variables of the ethnic small business models with the resources of the mainstream society (Stanger 1992).

The market demand for an ethnic small business is determined by the economic environment. The economic environment is influenced by the market factors outlined in the Opportunity Structure/Ecological Succession theory that is the demand for the business is set by the ethnic population (Stanger 1992). The same group also determines the supply to the business, resources of community and family networks. This ensures a supply of ethnic labour and an understanding regarding cultural behaviour and expectations within this specific workplace. Interactive theory provides a perspective on the linkages between opportunities, behavioural patterns and the aspirations of the immigrant group (Stanger 1992).

On face value it would appear that Interactive theory is a combination of Opportunity Structure/Ecological Succession theory with Ethnic Enclave and Cultural theory. The applicability of this theory to Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs could only be found in isolated micro application in Indigenous enclaves that are rural and rural remote which do not conform to the parameters of this study. In Pascoe’s (1990) case study, even though the Indigenous entrepreneur was based in an Indigenous enclave that was a former mission with a high concentration of potential Indigenous labour they could not find a successor due to the lack of education, management expertise, capital and the negative social situation. The lack of capital, education, training and networking resources and general poverty evident in Indigenous

3.4 Conclusion and Summary of Ethnic Small Business Theories in Australia

It would appear that the majority of Ethnic Small Business theory could not be applied in total to the Australian situation (Stanger 1992). With little empirical research in the Australian context, it is not possible to explain Indigenous business in Australia using ethnic cultural theories. Ethnic Small Business theory should not be discarded. Rather, the theories should be continually re-evaluated and adapted to fit the Australian business, social, and cultural environment. Ethnic Small Business theory is a base, a platform from which Indigenous business theory can develop.

Theoretical developments in discourse that lead from ethnic theories include Social Identity theory and Co-cultural theory. In the following sections Social Identity theory, which is focused on stereotyping and prejudice, will be examined together with Co-cultural theory in its explanation of people living in a society that is not a part of the dominant culture (Abrahams and Hogg 1999; Orbe 1998).

3.5 Social Identity Theory

Social Identity theory is relevant to this study due to its focus on stereotyping and prejudice. It is a theory of the dynamic and generative interdependence of self-concept and inter-group relations (Abrams and Hogg 1999) that provides for investigating basic cognitive mechanisms underlying group processes whereby people identify with a minority group and in the process of identification produce behavioural inter-group differentiation (Hogg and Mullin 1999). It is the purpose of this study to determine if the Indigenous entrepreneur maintains the same identification level with their cultural group during their time in business as the interaction and
development of personal self-esteem, the collective self-esteem, threats to personal and social identity, and the degree of identification are complex issues with many variables (Hogg and Mullin 1999; Long and Spears 1997). The purpose of this research is not to try and measure them; rather it is to acknowledge their existence to broaden the knowledge base and level of understanding of the Indigenous entrepreneur's environment.

3.6 Co-Cultural Theory

Co-cultural theory is an attempt: 'to bring to light the clandestine forms taken by the dispersed, tactical and [makeshift] creativity of groups or individuals' (Certeau 1984: 17) living in society in which they are not a part of the dominant culture (Orbe 1998). There are similarities with Cultural theory. Co-cultural theory has some application to Indigenous Australia in its application as a humanistic theory with its ability to explain societal change (Orbe 1998). It is a self-empowerment theory, effective communication being its key component with an acute awareness of inter-group relations within its cultural group. Indigenous Australia is a heterogeneous society with numerous factions. Indigenous Australian society has differing cultural groups that are subjugated by mainstream Australian society causing it to experience fractionalisation. This ensures that the general application of this theory is restricted.

The fundamental concepts of Co-cultural theory are grounded in five epistemological assumptions:

1) In each society, a hierarchy exists that privileges certain groups of people; in the USA this group includes men of European American background, heterosexual, able bodied and middle to upper class.

2) On the basis of these varying levels of privilege, dominant group members occupy positions of power that they use to create and maintain communication systems that reflect, reinforce, and promote their field of experiences.

3) Directly and/or indirectly these dominant communication structures impede the progress of those persons whose lived experiences are not reflected in the public communication systems.

4) Although representing a widely diverse array of lived experiences, co-cultural group members, including women, people of colour, gays, lesbians, bisexuals, people with
disabilities, and those from a lower socioeconomic status will share a similar societal position that renders them marginalised and underrepresented within the dominant structures.

5) To confront oppressive dominant structures and achieve any measure of 'success', co-cultural group members strategically adopt certain communication behaviours when functioning within the confines of public communication structures (Orbe 1998: 11).

The co-cultural epistemology, which is consistent with grounding in Feminist Standpoint theory, promotes a theoretical foundation that simultaneously unites and differentiates marginalized group experiences without essentialising them and seeks to uncover the commonalities among the co-cultural group members as they function within the dominant society (Orbe 1998).

This theory has little scholarly support, but this may result from ideological bias in its analysis or the limited effectiveness of the theory (Orbe 1998). Perhaps if there were more minority scholars then by their existence there would be more support and development of this theory.

Social Identity theory and Co-cultural theory lead to conventional/contemporary entrepreneurial discourse. The work of John Ogbor (2000) will serve as an example to examine the ethnocentricity of the Anglo European biases and ideological control of entrepreneurial studies.

3.7 Conventional/Contemporary Entrepreneurial Discourse

Conventional entrepreneurial discourses and praxis are:

... discriminatory, gender-based, [Anglo] ethnocentrically determined, ideologically controlled, sustaining not only prevailing societal biases, but serving as a tapestry for unexamined and contradictory assumptions and knowledge about the reality of entrepreneurs (Ogbor 2000: 605).

Privilege and power structures of the dominant groups in society are the discourse that is a structuring principle in society (Ogbor 2000). The discourse of entrepreneurship enhances the divisions among humans, race, ethnicity and gender. This is achieved through the processes of classification, codification, categorisation and taxonomies that are the privilege of the dominant
Western male mentality in Western discourse (Ogbor 2000).

Entrepreneurship research is also predominantly biased towards successful individuals (Bouchikhi 1993) in accordance with positivistic ideologies (Tomikoski 1999). Both sociologists and psychologists have criticized entrepreneurship studies using the traits oriented research approach as they lack rigorous and/or appropriate research methods in that they sample a dependant variable only, which is always the successful entrepreneur (Aldrich 1990; Brockhaus and Horwitz 1986; Thornton 1999). Comments on biased research methods however should be understood in context, so as to highlight the situation of the Indigenous entrepreneur and other minority groups who are not represented in the literature.

Recent American research (Reynolds and White 1997) that is based on nascent entrepreneurs who tend to be already well established in their career, life and communities has resulted in an existent positive bias in their establishment and identity as an entrepreneur. This positivism is evident in the following quotation:

> one in twenty-five adults and one in eight men aged twenty-five to thirty-five is attempting to start a new firm at any one time; two in five heads of households report self-employment during their work careers ... more adults [in the USA] are involved in starting new firms than in creating families (through marriage) (Reynolds and White 1997: 65).

These are not marginal individuals, they are not: ‘misfits cast off from wage work’ (Reynolds and White 1997: 65), they are people generally established and well educated. Rather: ‘Marginal individuals without education, income, work experience, jobs or community ties are the least likely to become involved in starting new firms’ (Reynolds and White 1997: 65).

The validity of any criticism of entrepreneurial discourse such as the Reynolds and White (1997) research example regarding bias towards the successful entrepreneur should be questioned. Reynolds and White (1997) and most researchers are looking at outcomes. Their methodological approach is to study results from a targeted population, in the Reynolds and White (1997) example, nascent entrepreneurs. They are not studying failed attempts at entrepreneurship or other business groups. They are researching nascent entrepreneurs over a set geographic area. Critics of research will always discount the objectivity or subjectivity of the research data undertaken broadening the research guidelines or interpreting their own discourse.
Existing literature criticising the objectivity of entrepreneurial research (Aldrich 1990; Brockhaus and Horwitz 1986; Thornton 1999) could be applied to this work as it may appear biased toward the 'successful' Indigenous entrepreneur as it only examines the successful Indigenous entrepreneurs. By the definition of what is an Indigenous entrepreneur in Chapter 2, perceived success and a minimal market longevity form the parameter of what is being studied. Criticism as to the objectivity to entrepreneurial study being biased to the successful entrepreneur is therefore not relevant and is dismissed.

There is a plethora of data on the 'successful' entrepreneur, yet there is very little qualitative study done on Indigenous Australian or Native Hawaiian businesspeople/entrepreneurs, be they successful or unsuccessful. This research will add to existing literature and partly fill the void in writings on Indigenous businesspeople.

Both age and gender have a major impact on the outcomes of entrepreneurial research, research that has also been critiqued for silencing the minority and the feminist perspective (Bowen and Hirsch 1986; Chio and Calas 1991; Ogbor 2000). Men are more than twice as likely as women to be involved in entrepreneurial start ups with the dominant age group of entrepreneurs between twenty-five and thirty-five years of age (Reynolds and White 1997). Yet within the United States estimates show that since the 1980's women have been starting businesses at twice the rate of men (Lerner and Almor 2002). It is believed world wide that firms owned by women comprise between one-fourth and one-third of all businesses (Moore 1999) however, little empirical research has focused on women business owners (Baker, Aldich and Liou 1997; Holmquist and Sudin 1996).

Contemporary scholars of race relations are also silenced in the management literature (Butler 1991). Minority business enterprise has been misinterpreted within the realities of racism, prejudice and discrimination in entrepreneurship studies (Butler 1991; Ogbor 2000). Within the entrepreneurship literature only scant comment pertaining to Indigenous Australia can be found. Schaper (1999) and Fuller, Dansie, Jones and Holmes (1999) acknowledge that there is limited research in this area. Statistical information on Aboriginal businesses is sparse as is mainstream Australia’s involvement in Aboriginal businesses outside of those with vested interests such as mining companies. Schaper is one of the few researchers who acknowledge
that: 'the number of Aborigines actively engaged in small business is very small, and may in fact be shrinking' (1999: 89). The under-representation of minority business enterprise research reinforces the privilege and power structures of the dominant groups in society (Butler 1991; Fuller, Dansie, Jones and Holmes 1999; Ogbor 2000; Schaper 1999).

Studies in ethnic small business highlight the importance of racial stratification in determining success in minority enterprise. Following the April 1992 Los Angeles race riots, a wealth of empirical research has been undertaken to explain the racial problems within American society (Min 1996; Waldinger 1996; Yoon 1997). These studies reveal that minority participation in employment and entrepreneurial activity is ultimately a social process (Light and Rosenstein 1995; Min 1996; Neckerman, Carter and Lee 1999; Park 1997; Waldinger 1996). Participation in society is subject to class acceptability. If social acceptance exists within mainstream society (as current research indicates), this enables social networks to develop and ties in the entrepreneurship process (Light and Rosenstein 1995; Min 1996; Park 1997; Waldinger 1996; Yoon 1997). If social groups are not acceptable the result is exclusion from entry into wider social networks, as is the case with African America (Waldinger 1996). This is why some racial groups do well as entrepreneurs in urban America, and other groups such as Native Americans and African-Americans fail to do so (Kim, Hurh and Fernandez 1989; Light and Rosenstein 1995). The racial disparity in the United States of America may provide the comparative to Australian society as class acceptability is also an issue in Australia (Butler 1991; Ogbor 2000; Schaper 1999).

To illustrate class stratification Warner and Stole (1945) stratified U.S. society with English speaking Protestants at the top, with Negroes and all Negroid mixtures at the bottom (Alba and Nee 1997). The author's observation is that even in this racist stratification, Native America is so below class acceptability that they do not rate a mention. Waldinger (1996) also confirms the social stratification of African-Americans fifty years on from Warner and Stole (1945). Racial stratification in the American example over the last one hundred and twenty years has allowed for changes in societal perceptions. During the period 1881-1930 mass migration into America, many of the non-Protestant immigrants from Italy, Russia, Hungary and Poland were seen as 'unassimilable races' (Min 1999: 67). Scientific evidence of the day supported the
Teutonic race of Southern and Eastern Europe as the biological inferior of the Protestant peoples. Madison Grant’s *Passing of the Great Race* published in 1916 reflected the blending of the nativist and racist ideology, which was supported by many American intellectuals (‘the Academy’). During this period Italians and even the Irish were viewed as having ‘Moorish’ or some other ‘black’ ancestry, and were therefore considered inferior to mainstream America (Waldinger 1996). The ‘unassimilable’ races in time became ‘white’ Americans. Beyond their second generation, they lost their ethnic language and many of their ethnic customs. By the 1970s their third and fourth generations achieved cultural and social assimilation (Min 1999). However the societal acceptance of African-Americans and Native Americans appears unchanged. America is a divided nation: ‘blacks’, Native Americans and other racial minorities are still subject to prejudice and discrimination (Min 1999). Former President Clinton’s call for a ‘National Conversation on Race’ highlights Washington’s concern regarding racism, which is the most persistent problem in American society (Min 1999; Waldinger 1996).

American research has been critiqued as a wider part of the literature review to ensure that race based research has been adequately covered to explain possible outcomes in the comparative Hawaiian/Australian research. American scholars and theorists have been trying to explain the declining fortunes of minority workers in the United States, (which is dominated by African-Americans in urban areas), by hypothesis and conjecture that deindustrialization was removing unskilled jobs from the areas where unskilled workers live (Waldinger 1996). Others have argued that the decline of manufacturing and rise of the service industry creates a polarised economy of many high skilled positions and many low-skilled service jobs (Waldinger 1996), but these do not provide explanations as to the decline in African-American and Native American employment. In this research there is little mention, let alone empirical research on Native American participation in business (outside of involvement in gaming houses). In contrast there is a plethora of research in areas that includes segmented assimilation and other immigrant inflows into America (Min 1999). To provide comparatives with the Australian research, African-American, Filipino-American, Korean-American and Latin-American research findings are used.
Research into the fostering of socio-economic well being among immigrants in the U.S. may be transferable to the Indigenous entrepreneur. Numerous researchers have sought the answer to the question does self-employment enhance the economic well being of immigrants? (Bailey and Waldinger 1991; Nee, Sanders and Nee 1987; Portes and Bach 1995; Sanders and Semau 1994; Spencer and Bean 1999; Zhou and Logan 1989). There are known positive effects of self-employment, which increases income (Light 1984; Waldinger 1986a; Wilson and Portes 1980). Yet other studies have found limited benefits of self-employment beyond self-employed immigrants having greater human capital than other immigrants (Spencer and Bean 1999).

Research that relates self-employment to economic well being has been focused on Koreans (Bonacich, Light and Wong 1988), Chinese (Waldinger 1986a, 1986b) and Cubans (Portes and Bach 1980). Recently the situation of Mexican-origin immigrants in the United States has received attention. This was not previously studied, as self-employment in the Mexican-origin population in the U.S. was almost non-existent. The recent growth in the Mexican-origin population together with the dramatic growth in Mexican-origin entrepreneurship/self-employment in the U.S. has created a unique opportunity to study the effects of self-employment on immigrant well being (Spencer and Bean 1999). Spencer and Bean (1999) claim that Mexican immigrant entrepreneurship will most likely foster economic gains in wider circles within their own immigrant group than to the entrepreneurs themselves. There is a pluralistic application of wealth sharing that goes beyond the nuclear family. Economic activity will develop ethnic business enclaves of wealth generation. However there is a risk that for many Mexican business enterprises, self-employment offers no more than a low-income refuge from unemployment. This occurs if the working conditions are exploitative in that many of the self-employed are in reality manual workers whose ‘business’ consists of selling their labour, often at below market rates. These enterprises will have a negative effect on the immigrant group (Spencer and Bean 1999).

The Mexican-American immigrant is a useful comparative as they suffer racial disparities similar to native Indigenous peoples, and are stereotyped as unintelligent, lazy, dishonest, and welfare recipients (Spencer and Bean 1999). They are descendants of indigenous peoples of the Mexican area yet they are replacing African-Americans in the manufacturing and
service sectors of Los Angeles because of the current positive attitudes of employers hiring them over African-Americans (Waldinger 1997). Mexican immigrants are seen at a higher social level than African-Americans (Waldinger 1997), which is indicative of a racial attitude of accepting the better of two lesser choices. Mexican immigrants are perceived as having a better work ethic than the African-American. This arises from nepotistic employment practices that almost guarantee high output by Mexican immigrants to ensure they do not embarrass their family member who first nominated them (Waldinger 1997). As mentioned previously, entrepreneurial success can be associated with social acceptance and networks. The social acceptability of Mexican-Americans over African-Americans and Native Americans may have applicability to the Australian context.

If we accept Ogbor’s (2000) opinions that conventional entrepreneurial discourse and praxis is discriminatory, gender-based, ‘Anglo’ ethnocentrically determined, and ideologically controlled and if we accept the claims that entrepreneurial participation in society is subject to class acceptability (Light and Rosenstein 1995; Min 1996; Neckerman, Carter and Lee 1999; Park 1997; Waldinger 1996, 1997), the literature is beginning to illustrate the social impediments that may exist for an Indigenous entrepreneur. This possibility of impediments for Indigenous people to enter business is further discussed in the next section discussing the Indigenous entrepreneur’s cross-cultural environment.

3.8 The Cross-Cultural Environment of the Indigenous entrepreneur

The cross-cultural environment of Australia, comprising both business and social spheres does not have a common value base or a collective ideology. It is not an environment that is receptive to indigenous views (Stajkovic and Luthans 1997). A cross-cultural gap exists rather than a homogenous environment (Holt 1997; Stajkovic and Luthans 1997).

The involvement of the Indigenous entrepreneur within Australian society is a relatively unknown subject (Fuller, Dansie, Jones and Holmes 1999; Schaper 1999). Racism is a pervasive aspect of the Australian business culture (Fuller, Dansie, Jones and Holmes 1999) however knowledge on racism within the business sector is also lacking. What the literature does allude to, however, is that the Indigenous entrepreneur needs to be accepted by the dominant culture if
they are to experience any form of longevity in business. Social acceptance within mainstream society enables individuals to develop social networks and ties in the entrepreneurship process (Light and Rosenstein 1995; Min 1996; Park 1997; Waldinger 1996; Yoon 1997). Without social acceptability, there is no entry into wider social networks, as illustrated in the previously discussed African-American situation (Waldinger 1996). Societal perceptions can change over time as shown in the U.S. immigrant and Mexican examples, but not so far, for the Native American or African-American (Waldinger 1996). Does this mean that perhaps the Indigenous Australian entrepreneur needs to appear to be non-indigenous in some context so as to be accepted by the dominant culture? Or, is there a desired perception that they need to display similar values to that of the dominant culture to survive in business? This raises some interesting social concepts, which are discussed in a following section on values. It would appear that social acceptability within the dominant culture is based on a series of values that are attached to behavioural patterns, explicit and implicit, that constitute the distinctive achievement of human groups (Kluckholn 1962; Kluckholn and Murray 1953).

Before we discuss Indigenous values and their applicability to Indigenous Australia several models have been developed in the U.S. which should be included in the review of literature as these models provide scenarios that could add to the thematic model illustrated in the previous two chapters, (refer Figures 1 and 2).

The first of these models articulates a theory that in political terms talks of ‘cultural in-betweeness’ (Bulhan 1980: 105-106). The three stages that reflect the reactions of the Indigenous group to the domination of others are:

• capitulation (to the new culture),
• revitalisation (of the Indigenous Culture), and
• radicalisation (a new synthesis of both cultures).

It could be argued that Bulhan’s (1980) work is simplified to the point that it can be applied to almost any situation. Atkinson, Morten and Sue (1979) outline a similar model to Bulhan that not only lists the stages, but also considers the attitudes that accompany the stages and the individual differences of the subjects at each stage. The model is designed to assist in understanding issues in the Mental Health fields, yet it can be adapted to many other social
science applications. It is more detailed in application than the Bulhan socio-political model which suffers from oversimplification. The Bulhan (1980) model when applied to the entrepreneurial model appears as shown in Figure 3:

**Figure 3** THE INDIGENOUS ENTREPRENEUR: INCLUSION OF THE BULHAN MODEL (1980).

The application of the Bulhan (1980) model introduces a two culture concept, the Indigenous and the non-indigenous culture. The Indigenous entrepreneur capitulates to the new culture to gain access to needs, which in this case also includes market needs and resources (such as stock, sales, capital, market networks etc.). With economic success there is an assumed feedback or revitalisation of their Indigenous culture as they can operate with some form of economic...
independence within each culture. The final phase brings radicalisation or a synthesis of both cultures, which in the Bulhan (1980) model results in absorption of the entrepreneur into the dominant non-indigenous culture. This would appear as illustrated in Figure 4:

**FIGURE 4**  **THE INDIGENOUS ENTREPRENEUR: ‘RADICALISATION’ OF THE BULHAN MODEL (1980).**

The application of Bulhan’s (1980) concept of radicalisation is flawed not simply because it is oversimplified. It does not allow for the cultural value retention of the Indigenous entrepreneur in complicated matters that include kinship and or family obligations. In addition it disregards the effect of racism, bigotry in business and the cost of funds. To commence business then transfer from one business cell to another costs money. Capital is a resource that has already
been highlighted as being in poor supply due to long term poverty within Indigenous society. The Bulhan model simplifies the shift in the Indigenous culture to non-indigenous culture yet it claims there is a revitalisation of the Indigenous culture. The synthesis in the final stage of radicalisation may well be in effect absorption or extirpation of the Indigenous culture as the entrepreneur is forced to accept the values of the dominant culture. The positives of the model, however, allow the Indigenous entrepreneur to function without the barriers of socio-economic and societal constraints to impede their operations as with their absorption into the non-indigenous culture they have access to the free enterprise market with its resources. The question is how does the radicalisation process provide access to capital resources which has already been identified as a high priority resource for the Indigenous entrepreneur? This is outside of the models' intention which further highlights its oversimplification when applied to a case study.

The second model of interest is the Shook (1992) model. This model was developed in studies regarding social phenomenon concerning conflict resolution within Native Hawaiian society, and American (Hawaiian) Pacific Islander society. The model has been subsequently applied to other ethnic minority groups in Hawaii such as American-Chinese, American-Japanese, American-Maori, American-Philippino, American-Vietnamese, and several other groups. The Shook (1992) model is titled 'the Minority Identity Model' and is comprised of five stages:

1. conformity (characterised by a preference for the dominant culture),
2. dissonance (when confusion and conflict reign),
3. resistance and immersion (rejection of the dominant culture and complete affirmation of the minority culture view),
4. introspection (the search for individual autonomy and discomfort with complete adherence to the minority stance), and
5. synergetic articulation and awareness (an integration of personal and cultural identity allowing for individual flexibility and also rejection of any form of oppression of one group by another) (Shook 1992: 37).

This model is an alternative structure where the results of future case studies could be applied to test its validity. In examining its attributes, it would appear that it is a plausible structure, worthy
of consideration. In the application of the model to previous field research, (Foley 1999) the majority of ‘failed’ Indigenous businesses fell into stages two and three. Successful Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs previously studied would appear to be in stage five. The application of the Shook (1992) model to the thematic argument would appear as shown in Figure 5:

**Figure 5** The Indigenous Entrepreneur: Application of the Shook Model (1992).

The Shook (1992) model initially allows for conformity where the Indigenous entrepreneur shifts to the dominant culture to access personal needs and market resources, fulfilling market needs by supplying a product or service. Dissonance occurs when the cultural confusion and conflict take effect with the entrepreneur moving back and forth between the original position.
and their repositioning in the dominant culture. This is represented by the two way arrow. Resistance and immersion occur with the rejection of the dominant culture and the entrepreneur returns to the original commencement position. At this position they have no access to the market and are isolated from their personal needs by societal and socio-economic barriers. Introspection occurs when the entrepreneur searches for autonomy after experiencing discomfort with the minority position due to its lack of access to market and barriers to fulfilling its basic needs. The entrepreneur once again seeks market access in the dominant culture. Synergetic articulation and awareness (Shook 1992) occurs when the entrepreneur moves away from the dominant culture. However whilst rejecting any form of oppression they will still be subjected to societal and to some extent socio-economic barriers. Their position is not ideal.

The Shook (1992) model allows for social change and changing attitudes of Indigenous entrepreneurs. Although this model oversimplifies and generalises, it increases the understanding of the entrepreneur's position in the development of a thematic argument. Neither of the models illustrated in figures 3, 4 or 5 (Bulhan 1980; Shook 1992) describe adequately Indigenous 'values'. Indigenous values therefore need to be reviewed as an important element within the literature review and are discussed in the following sections.

### 3.9 Cultural Values

#### 3.9.1 Introduction

A review of literature that provides an understanding of Indigenous cultural values is essential in providing a background for the reader of this work. The first two research questions of the thesis refer directly to the adoption of European cultural values of the dominant society and/or the possible loss of Indigenous cultural values. Question four of the research questions postulates the possibility that Indigenous entrepreneurs are different from non-indigenous entrepreneurs. Cultural values may be a defining parameter.

The review of literature on culture values initially explores a definition. This is followed by a review of business focussed literature. Further discussion then reviews literature as applied to this study. The last two sections review literature on religion and the family and consider how these values have an impact on the Indigenous entrepreneur.
3.9.2 Culture and Values, a Definition and Review of Literature

In the development of the discussion the definition of culture needs to be clarified. A definition which has evolved from considerable scholarly debate and refinement is:

[culture consists of patterns, explicit and implicit of and for behaviour acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievement of human groups, including their embodiments in artefacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e. historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values; culture systems may, on the one hand, be considered as products of action, on the other as conditioning influences upon further action (Kluckholn 1962: 181).

Culture consists of traditional ideas and especially attached values. However values within culture include knowledge, beliefs, art, law, morals, customs and any other capabilities acquired by man as a member of society (Tylor 1871 cited in Spradley and McCurdy 1972).

The framework of what is culture appears clear yet within the study of sociology, values within culture are still debated. Western thought has limitations, since the establishment of the Frankfurt School of Thought there has been a fixation on contextual values that have been argued by Marx, Weber, Durkheim, and recently by Gouldner and Becker (Jary and Jary 1995). These values are unable to consider concepts without structure and fabric as they are dominated by a framework of Western conceptualisations. The instruments of comparison and inherent classification would appear to be inadequate to recognize the Indigenous group as they do not allow for variances and evolution in culture from external factors over a given period of time (Wright and Kaluai 1994). Yet work in the 1950s argued that culture and cultural values can change with innovation (Barnett cited in Shook 1992). Literature on culture can be confusing however and: ‘anthropologists are recognizing more and more that the formative basis of culture is ... [a] matter of choice’ (Coombs, Brandt and Snowdon 1983: 64). No human behaviour is mechanical and choice is the basis for social and cultural change which reflects basic value orientation (Coombs, Brandt and Snowdon 1983). Whilst values are rarely articulated by Aboriginal people, they are rarely articulated by any people as human behaviour. The capacity to change and adapt is derived from and expressed in learned behavioural styles (Coombs, Brandt and Snowdon 1983). Behavioural styles are shaped by values which are included in the development of the thematic analysis in Figure 7. Aboriginals are impelled to articulate their
values (Coombs, Brandt and Snowdon 1983).

Culture and values as reviewed in business focused literature is discussed in the following section.

3.9.3 Culture and Values, a Review in Business Focused Literature

Indigenous cultures have experienced increased recognition within the Western world over the last thirty years. This renaissance or revitalisation of culture in Australia began with the 1967 referendum and the Whitlam years of social reform in the early 1970s. In America it coincided with the Civil Rights Movement of the Martin Luther King and John Kennedy era of the 1960s (Ogbor 2000). Cultural values held by Indigenous Australian society has informed the recent revitalization of cultural autonomy yet Indigenous Australian cultural values has also had to grapple with technological advancements and mainstream societal innovation. The ‘Coca Cola’ culture of the modern world that promotes consumption with multi-media and advertising is having a definite effect on Indigenous children, be they city based or rural remote. Technological innovation appears to be changing Indigenous values (Langton 1993; Liberman 1978).

A definition of culture has been examined together with discussion of cultural values. This discussion warrants empirical studies that isolate cultural values which determine the level of entrepreneurship within a society. Researchers in this field have stated that there are few studies in this area (Davidson and Wiklund 1995). Whilst it would appear that there have been some studies in national culture, (Hofstede 1979) there is little empirical information on regional cultural variation and its relation to new firm start-ups. Research was found that looks at regional economic development within a dominating culture that displayed cultural variances to other intra-national regions (Davidson and Wiklund 1995). This work did not examine minority cultural variations yet it is still important as it displays a macro view within a region which may possibly be a measure or a direction for future research into the Indigenous Australian entrepreneur.

There is widespread belief that cultural difference can be a powerful determinant of regional or national variation in the ‘supply’ of entrepreneurship (Davidson and Wiklund 1995). Empirical research on the issue is scarce although there are attempts to explain large-scale economic development from a sociological perspective (McClelland 1961; Weber 1930).
Hoftstede (1991) offered similar explanations for the economic development of East Asia post World War II. Support for a relationship between certain aspects of national culture and economic growth has been given in other research (Lynn 1991). However none of these studies look at minority cultural issues, nor do they explicitly study new venture formations that were formed from the attributes of there cultural variations. Previous research viewed culture and entrepreneurship in start up ventures but lacked the study of attitudes and motivators within differing cultural groups in relation to the general population (Bellu, Davidson and Goldfarb 1990; Jackson and Brophy 1986; McGrath and MacMillan 1992).

More recent research has compared values and beliefs among the general population in differing regions (Davidson and Wiklund 1995). The outcomes are superfluous to this thesis as the findings do not allow for the inclusion of minority groups such as Indigenous people within mainstream population studies.

A possible solution is the theory of cultural differentiation that is based on the two constructs of ‘values’ and ‘culture’ (Hoftstede 1979). A value was defined as: ‘a broad tendency to prefer certain states of affairs over others’ and culture as: ‘the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one human group from another’ (Hoftstede 1979: 389). The culture definition is succinct in comparison with the previously quoted definition (Kluckholn 1962). In cultural writings Hoftstede’s work is quoted regularly yet on analysis it has little application to understanding cross-cultural issues within countries or between countries that have dominant colonial influences over traditional based populations. The simplified basis of Hoftstede’s (1979) work is that it reviews comparative studies of forty countries examining societal characteristics including; individualism vs. collectivism, the power differences in society, masculine vs. feminine, and the uncertainty avoidance index. There are many inconsistencies in this work. The work challenges ethnocentric research and states that: ‘there are some classical sins in research approaches which help to account for the deplored lack of synergy’ (Hoftstede 1979: 390), Hoftstede proceeds to apply it in cross-cultural research. For all his noble rhetoric, his work suffers the same flawed or tainted results that other ethnocentric research achieves. To illustrate this, in Hoftstede’s stereotypical application of ethnocentric concepts he makes a statement regarding the individualistic generalisation of hunter-gather
cultures (Hoftstede 1979: 401). Anthropological work postdating Hoftstede by only seven years (Hunn and Williams 1986) examines the social strengths of Indigenous people in their pluralist application to sharing and maintaining the pluralist family (and extended family) networks, which is at the opposite end of the spectrum in respect to the Hoftstede findings. Modern interpretation regarding Indigenous issues has been slow yet the concepts of Williams, Hunn and their colleagues have been espoused since the 1930s. Hoftstede’s work is flawed. It is oversimplified and has little to no application to modern cross-cultural research, especially cross-cultural research within a former colonial society.

In summary, this literature review on culture and values has been inconclusive. A more detailed approach needs to be taken as to what are cultural values as applied to this study.

3.9.4 What are Cultural Values (as applied to this study)?

Cultural values are elusive, with complex and often contested practices or attributes. Often they defy definition (Said 1994). They can mean two things; firstly they mean all of the arts of description, communication and representation that have relative autonomy from the economic, social and political realms. Secondly, cultural values include a refining and elevating element that is a sense and a source of identity (Said 1994). Another view sees cultural values as the creative capacity of human normative aspirations to envision and articulate through language that shape their possibilities and way of life (Walker 1990).

A differing view that holds cultural values in an economic perspective is that they are the attitudes towards material growth and its distribution. They may include how consumption occurs, styles of consumption, work habits and work ethics together with the organisation of production and exchange. They form a system of shared ideas, concepts, rules and meanings that underlie a population. Cultural values are a population’s knowledge and behaviour (Cole 1990).

There is no one definition of what comprises a cultural value, what is culture or what is a value. They are diverse and extraordinarily hybrid continually changing. They can be heterogeneous or differentiated depending on the viewpoint of the observer (Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation 1994). In the Indigenous Australian viewpoint many groups do not see their cultural values as Aboriginal or Torres Strait. They are in fact Eora, Guringah, Gaimariagal, Yolongu or Walpiri as examples. Indigenous Australians have determined their
cultures and values since creation as have Hawaiians. Textual analysis, racist stereotypes and mythologies that inform what ‘Anglo’ Australians determine as Aboriginal culture or Aboriginal values are based in the stories of their predecessors. Anglo-Australians do not know or relate to Aboriginal people as they generally relate to the stories of former colonialists (Langton 1993).

Indigenous values/culture-cultural values differ between Indigenous groups. Anglo-European Australians often take the short cut, simplifying their anthropological interpretation of the Indigenous cultural variance to suit themselves. The dominant culture interprets the economically depressed status and relative deprivation of Australia’s Indigenous people as a given with no temporal dimension (Hindle and Rushworth 2002). Anglo-European Australia fails to see demographic differences or historical consequences. Geoffrey Blainey reminds us of this:

[i]f an Aborigine in the 17th Century had been captured as a curiosity and taken in a Dutch ship to Europe, and if he had travelled all the way from Scotland to the Caucasus and had seen how the average European struggled to make a living, he might have said to himself that he had seen the third world and all its poverty and hardship (Blainey 1982: v-vi., cited in Hindle and Rushworth 2002).

When this work discusses the Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs in contemporary Australian society and Native Hawaiians, it is dealing with people operating within a system of numerous and various Indigenous cultural value structures within a mainframe of two distinct cultures; their overall Indigenous culture and the non-indigenous culture. To simplify this study, the work looks only at the urban environment of the contemporary Indigenous entrepreneur to ensure that it is not complicated by the additional value systems of rural remote and the hundreds of differing Indigenous cultural value frameworks applicable to traditional and semi-traditional Indigenous society. In the urban setting there is the dominant culture of the western capitalist, democratic society of Australia or the United States of America, and we have the minority culture of Indigenous Australia or Native Hawaiian.

The purpose of this paper is not to define or categorise what the scales of values are between the urban and rural remote Indigenous entrepreneur in Australia or Hawaii. The purpose of the literature review is to discuss cultural values. The aim is to highlight any possible dichotomy between non-indigenous and Indigenous values in contemporary Australian and
Hawaiian societies.

Following colonization and the entrapment of Indigenous people in Christian missions as a way of managing Indigenous people as some would manage stock (Reynolds 1981, 1989), there are two distinct influences on Indigenous values. The first is religion which historically protected Indigenous people to an extent (Reynolds 1981, 1989). The second is the intrinsic mechanism that enabled the Indigenous people to survive the holocaust that was British colonisation (Tatz 2001) and this is the role of the family (Morgan 1987). The two institutions of religion and family have had an enormous effect of maintaining the sustainability of Indigenous people in Australia. The following two sections discuss the cultural values of religion and family in the Australian literature review.

Other literature suggests Indigenous Australians value:

- Their survival,
- Respect for the inherent dignity of a human being,
- Harmony in social relationships,
- Reciprocity,
- Observing kin obligations,
- Pooling resources,
- Shared experiences,
- Warranted social knowledge,
- Maintaining differences,
- Individuality,
- Competence,
- Innovation,
- Conformity and continuity,
- Improvisation, and
- The potential in all things (Coombs, Brandt and Snowdon 1983).

Many if not all of these values are synonymous in the author’s wider understanding and general application as to what are religion and family values. Their applicability will be discussed in the findings chapter. The initial value to be discussed is the value of religion.
3.9.5 Religion

Western religion has in some areas subjected to Mission control, had a profound effect on Indigenous Australian culture (Reynolds 1981, 1989). It is possible that this may have a flow-on effect to the Indigenous entrepreneur. European Christianity was considered instrumental in the: ‘salvation of the souls of the condemned people’ (Stevens 1994: 2). The Christian faith was considered as the great linchpin around which civilised life revolved in nineteenth-century Europe. The accepted cultural superiority of Europe, with its scientific vindication under Social Darwinism (Stevens 1994) ensured that Christian missionaries had unrestrained access to Indigenous Australia. The legacy of the effect of the missionary industry is highlighted in the religious zeal displayed in the Torres Straits of Northern Queensland. The London Missionary Society through the ‘Coming of the Light Ceremony’ changed the cultural interaction of these people forever. Similar illustrations can be found around Australia (Sharp 1993).

This prompts the question has the civilisation that is aligned with Christianity had an effect on the Indigenous Australian entrepreneur? It is accepted that religion both shapes and is shaped by society (Berger and Berger 1972). It supports power structures; it gives meaning and shape to societal ethical structures. It has the power and influence to reward, punish and by its existence justifies social institutions and social roles (Berger and Berger 1972). Research has indicated however, that levels of religiousness are lower amongst entrepreneurs (Dodd and Seaman 1998). This argument is fuelled by the truism that entrepreneurs suffer from a paucity of time, which limits participation in religious interaction. In Indigenous Australia this has been confirmed by case study analysis which highlighted Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs assigned less time to social interaction and cultural activities by (Foley 1999).

There are strong links evident between social enterprise, the business ethic and religion. The close association of church bodies and the successful Mondragon co-operatives in Spain are an example (Bradley 1983). For almost two centuries the European Christian Church has been a conquering military might, imposing Christian Eurocentric cultural constraints over its territories. Survival of the conquered above the status of serf within the religious zeal of cultural constraints required economic activity to generate wealth. This began with the Roman Empire’s conversion to Catholicism. Subsequently Spanish, French, British and other colonial power
 conquests in the new world have shaped the Fourth World Indigenous groups as we now know them today. Colonialism incorporates Christian religion that dominates the traditional beliefs of the Indigenous peoples (Diamond 1999).

An example of sectarian development of entrepreneurial ability within the colonial power is illustrated in the Quaker chocolate dynasties of Cadbury’s, Rowntree, Fry and Terrys. Calvin’s domination of watch making in Geneva is another example (Dodd and Seaman 1998). The cluster development of the world diamond industry in certain areas of Europe controlled by Jewish interests is another example of entrepreneurial activity associated with a religious enclave (Roberts 1972).

Small business is often seen as the embodiment of the Protestant work ethic of hard work, integrity, thrift, straight dealing and independence (Dodd and Seaman 1998). Is the spread of entrepreneurial activity the result of religious idealism, or are the entrepreneurs capitalising on the social network found within a religious society?

The importance of personal and professional networks as foundation elements that determine the success of entrepreneurial activity is well researched (Aldrich and Zimmer 1985; Birley and Myers 1991; Blackburn, Curran and Jarvis 1990). Networks from religious contacts provide the entrepreneur not only with a primary source of contacts, it also provides a level of identification, almost a substantiating accreditation of ethical, ‘business honesty’ (Dodd and Seaman 1998). The rise to prominence of the Amway Corporation in middle class America based on relationship (Network) marketing within certain religious groups (Xardel 1996) is an example of the utilisation of religion based networks rather that religion itself being the reason for success.

Acceptance of a religion is not a prerequisite in the social order of being in business. However if you are a member of a large religious organisation, and you achieve a relatively high profile, research would indicate that you are in a position to successfully market your entrepreneurial concept (Dodd and Seaman 1998). Within the Indigenous Australian religious network, a sustainable population does not exist that would provide a marketing base for potential entrepreneurial activity. However the Hawaiian population is of a sufficient number where this could be effective.
The Indigenous entrepreneur in the Australian example would have to look outside of their minority network. If the entrepreneur is excluded from mainstream society, access to professional advice and services through the wider religious network may be invaluable (Dodd and Seaman 1998). Within the wider religious contact base increased opportunity may exist for networking and support, however this is provided from another cultural base. The dilemma arises again as the Indigenous entrepreneur must be able to manage an existence within two social and cultural realms (‘white’ and ‘black’), with resultant exposure to differing value concepts.

Entrepreneurship literature does not provide any consistent support for the development of an understanding of the level of religiosity in the entrepreneur (Dodd and Seaman 1998). Dodd and Seaman (as previously mentioned) have indicated that levels of religiousness are lower amongst entrepreneurs and in some samples inordinately close to that of the non-entrepreneur (1998). It would appear that this has yet to be examined in a study specifically on Indigenous entrepreneurs. Does religion have an influence on the successful Indigenous Australian or Native Hawaiian entrepreneur? This question will be reviewed in the analysis of the case studies.

The next Indigenous ‘value’ topic to be discussed is literature on the family.

3.9.6 Family
The existence of family bonds in certain cultures can be a tremendous resource to the aspiring entrepreneur. Casual observation of Mediterranean migrants to Australia post WWII has discovered a trend amongst Italian, Greek and Maltese families (as examples) to work as a tight family unit in small business concerns, often sponsoring other family members to come to Australia, then providing a network of support for them (Bonutto 1994; Jordens 1997). A cycle of entrepreneurial activity develops and continues within these cultural groups. Similar findings are evident in America (Waldinger 1996). Mediterranean families are often referred to in literature as families from collectivist societies (Georgas, Christakopoulou, Portinga, Angleitner, Goodwin and Charalambous 1997; Hofstede 1979).

Tight family groups develop a capital base from pluralist activity maximising income and minimising expenditure so that the family nuclei becomes the core element of the business.
The patriarch/matriarch and older children become the unskilled (or semi-skilled) workers, with second-generation siblings learning the skills of the new culture, its language and cross-cultural exchanges through the host countries’ educational programs (Waldinger 1986a, 1986b).

The family is perhaps the most vital element of society (Winch 1971). Without the family it is apparent that Indigenous groups in Australia or Hawaii would not have social order. Within the Australian Indigenous society this is even more profound with respect to kinship structures (Lawlor 1991). The transmission of culture, of family ‘values’ is achieved and reinforced within the formal (and informal) family structure thus the social development and social behaviour of the individual is achieved within the family (Georgas, Christakopoulou, Portinga, Angleitner, Goodwin and Charalambous 1997). Family dynamics influence the development of its members. This is illustrated in the family’s ability to adapt to social change, and in the case of Indigenous families to environmental change, which can affect the psychological differentiation of its members (Georgas, Christakopoulou, Portinga, Angleitner, Goodwin and Charalambous 1997). This could be an important influence on a potential entrepreneur, especially an Indigenous entrepreneur.

Studies by Georgas, Christakopoulou, Portinga, Angleitner, Goodwin and Charalambous (1997) look at the conceptualisation of family bonds to be used as context variables in proposed design and analysis of the cross-cultural study of psychological variables. This study has relevance to study into Indigenous families, for the authors looked at the kinship network across cultures. The ultimate aims in application to family cross-cultural research were to enable them to:

- study the variation of family structure and functions across cultures,
- explore the interrelationships between societal changes in the family system, and
- test existing cross-cultural models (eg. Kagitcibasi’s model) (Kagitcibasi 1990).

The results indicated that the ‘family bonds’ within cultural groups can be conceptualised as a multidimensional construct that reflects the cognitive, emotive, and behavioural elements of a family. The three dimensions of the study that involved emotional closeness, geographic proximity and extent of interaction produced no correlation in relation to the nuclear family verses the extended family. This was also evident in Kagitcibasi’s model (Kagitcibasi 1990,
1994, 1996). The results indicate that sociological myths were more evident than reality in many of the previously determined relationships between the nuclear and extended family (Georgas, Christakopoulou, Portinga, Angleitner, Goodwin and Charalambous 1997).

As the study looked at only five European family structures, its findings are of limited use for this study because of the ethnographic similarity that exists in many European countries. It has little application outside of limited European comparisons. The findings of the research confirmed other theoretical considerations and findings on family structure and functions that include Bengtson and Schrader’s (1992) dimension of effectual solidarity, family structure and association solidarity.

The research indicates that family bonds can be used to assess the strength and forms of interdependence between individual entrepreneurs and their family network. The family structure and function across cultures may provide attributes conducive to entrepreneurial activity (Georgas, Christakopoulou, Portinga, Angleitner, Goodwin and Charalambous 1997). Previous research (Foley 1999) has indicated that family bonds in providing for children are an instigating factor in entrepreneurial activity amongst Indigenous Australians. Future research should revisit the context of extended family support in the entrepreneurial activity. Initial research indicated that extended family support was negative and in fact it was the bonds within the nuclear family that were strongest. Perhaps this is an environmental situation resulting from the oppression that Indigenous Australians and Native Hawaiians face from within their respective mainstream societies. External pressures negate wider-family support due to poverty levels and preconceived wealth sharing concepts of the wider Indigenous community (Foley 1999).

It has already been mentioned that family bonds are determinants possibly linked to success. This leads us into the theoretical discussion on social theory, as the Indigenous entrepreneur is to an extent a phenomenon, which is a disruption to the status quo. There is a need to discuss the development of social theory within the literature review as it applies to this study. Before this is done however comparative literature needs to be reviewed on Pacific Island research, which has an influence on the overall discussion of Indigenous entrepreneurship of the Pacific that links Indigenous entrepreneurship in Australia to Native Hawaii. Drawing on
literature in this area will enable the reader to understand the concepts of Indigenous entrepreneurship in adjoining areas.

3.10 Comparative Pacific Island Entrepreneurial Research

Whilst the initial aim of this thesis is to view Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs, Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs are also examined as a comparative based on the acceptance that there are numerous colonial and post-colonial similarities between Indigenous Australia and Hawaii. Although similar in some ways, these two democratic capitalist countries, Australia and the United States of America are also very different. An academic examination of literature would be incomplete if entrepreneurial studies of those Indigenous groups that are geographically spread across the adjoining Pacific Rim linking these two study groups were not examined. Literature will be examined on the Pacific archipelagos that include Micronesia, the Marshall Islands, Cook Islands, Samoa, Fiji and Tonga.

Pre-colonial and post-colonial entrepreneurial activity within New Guinea, Fiji, Cook Islands, New Zealand, the Torres Strait Islands, Samoa and Tonga has already been briefly discussed in Chapter 2. This literature provides a review of Indigenous entrepreneurship in a broad arc across Pacifica from Australia to Hawaii to allow the reader to understand the differences and or similarities in contemporary literature with that examined on Indigenous Australia and Native Hawaii.

3.10.1 Micronesia

Recent research within the Pacific Business Centre Program at the University of Hawaii has reviewed the United States federally funded Micronesia Entrepreneur Development Centre Program. The results indicate several outcomes that are aimed as lessons to non-Indigenous administrators and funding agencies in their quest for entrepreneurial development with Indigenous entrepreneurs (in this study the Micronesian entrepreneurs) (Cheshire 2001a).

The study’s outcomes revealed the following:

- a good business plan cannot make up for the absence of business assets and business experience,
- the classroom is an inadequate substitute for the actual experience of setting up and operating a business, and
• the standard (off the shelf) type business plan is inadequate as a blueprint for successfully operating a business (Cheshire 2001a).

The majority of nascent Indigenous entrepreneurs in Micronesia lack capital, supportive collateral and business experience (Cheshire 2001a). Business development programs to date do not recognize this and financial institutions are only prepared to finance those with the required collateral and/or experience that invariably results in wealthy family groups obtaining more power through their borrowing capacity. This results in oligopolistic control of small business endeavour (Cheshire 2001a). Ironically when businesses are able to obtain funding, the burden of 80% to 85% loan to capital ratio invariably reduces the liquidity of the businesses resulting in the failure of ventures (Cheshire 2001a).

Solutions have been recommended that include a micro-credit system (Attahir 1995), that lends funds for start up capital and initial operating costs similar to the Grameen Bank of Bangladesh (Cheshire 2001a, Teare 1997). Another possible solution is bootstrapping management practices whereby the entrepreneurs maintain supportive employment from another source so that they are not reliant on the income from the business venture for living costs, utilize family to run the venture, or run it part-time, so that in time capital will be generated internally from profit accumulation (Cheshire 2001a).

Other problems are evident within the current funding programs (Cheshire 2001a). Participants are given assistance to produce a business plan but no practical experience is provided in the actual running of a business venture. The required ‘hands on training’ needs to include cultural considerations that address credit management, staff absenteeism, and duty to family, to the head of the family, in time or goods. For example the wealth of the business is seen by some family members as a shared resource with no concept of repaying drawings, or the need to achieve a profit to ensure the longevity of the venture (Cheshire 2001a). The classroom business plan compilation does not cover these issues. Funding organizations need to look at participatory ‘action’ learning programs and ‘mentoring’ involvement long after the business has commenced (C. L. Cheshire personal interview 17 September, 2001).

Previous literature supports similarities between the Indigenous Australian and Native Hawaiian entrepreneur in regards to lack of capital, business plan requirements of the peak
funding bodies (Alu Like 1998; Foley 1999, 2000a; OHA 2003). The ATSIC and state run small-business mentoring programs supporting the nascent Indigenous Australian entrepreneur have been a development in Australia in recent years which is similar to the desired approach in Micronesia as outlined by Cheshire (2001a).

A recent study of successful Indigenous entrepreneurs in Micronesia (Cheshire 2001b) has revealed some interesting facts that complement the earlier research of Cheshire (2001a). The characteristics of the successful business entrepreneur in Micronesia are:

- Successful Indigenous entrepreneurs commenced business with very little or no debt. They purchased inexpensive former government controlled businesses, or in some cases they were given them. Otherwise they are engaged in small-scale retail, or small-scale export.
- Many have non-indigenous partners who bring additional skills, experience and network connections. These partners are often non-indigenous spouses or their spouse’s family.
- Their success is linked to diversification (or family spin-offs) where several small businesses are started after a successful (profitable) core business has been established. The profit of the core business is reinvested with minimal or no borrowings in the establishment of inter-related ventures. For example one business went from a travel agency to a car rental to a multi-unit apartment building. Then they added a twenty-five-room hotel and a restaurant, after a period of time an adjoining bar was added. Now a dive shop is planned. Another example went from selling cigarettes out of a van to a general retail store, then a hardware store to a construction company. Now they have a company developing land for multi-unit housing complexes. All of these businesses developed along diversification lines that were self-supportive, offering economies of scale and shared resources. They are integrated in their assets, cost and shared management skills to maximize profit and minimize costs.
- The successful business has a dual perspective and dual strategy to offset the dichotomy of cultural verses business values that allows for differing perspectives on issues that include ‘credit’ and employee absenteeism for cultural commitments such as attendance at funerals. The strategy enforces the need to know local customs and observe them. It is also important to constantly remind family as well as employees that this is a business. Micronesian culture
is observed and western business practices are also observed in a marriage of convenience prolonging the life of the business (Cheshire 2001b).

Another important aspect revealed in Cheshire's work (2001a, 2001b) is that when businesses are successful or show signs of success, local competitors will find ways of creating problems. The stronger a partner or a partner's family in political, social or financial networks, the less chance the business will suffer from competitor sabotage (Attahir 1995; Cheshire 2001b). Many of these networks extend to the United States, Japan or the Philippines, which is a major supplier of retail goods to Micronesia.

Cheshire's (2001b) findings appears to be contradictory to the general understanding within mainstream literature which supports the positives of free open market competition (Dollinger 2003, Lambing and Kuehl 2003). Cheshire's research (2001b) has described a market phenomenon that may be difficult for mainstream business analysts to initially comprehend. Micronesia at the retail services market level is to some extent a closed market economy where competition in the western concept such as in the example of Michael Porter's (1991) 'competitive advantage' does not exist. Competition is socially and culturally controlled. It is your political or family connections that determine your competitive advantage. Due to the high level of copy-cat retail businesses, sustainable market advantage is maintained in an environment of not showing success. For as soon as you do show signs of business success, competitor sabotage will limit your ability to trade. Such sabotage may be competitor connections with trade suppliers, import officials or other services that the businessperson relies on for goods and or services. The sabotage may restrict or slow down access to the goods or services allowing the saboteur to supply the initial client. The oligopolistic nature of the Micronesian retail economy is incestuous to some extent and unlike the generally accepted western free market.

The Republic of the Marshall Islands although on the eastern side of Micronesia warrants examination in its own right due to the individual problems that they experience in their quest for economic development through entrepreneurial activity.
3.10.2 Marshall Islands

The Republic of the Marshall Islands is an archipelago of twenty-nine small atolls and five coral islands that add up to only some 192 sq. km (74 square miles). The Republic has experienced a population explosion since the 1930s. The population has tripled in that time to in excess of one hundred and sixty people per square mile, two thirds of which are urbanized on only ten percent of the land (Carroll 1988).

In the last one hundred years the islands have experienced cultural change with the colonial exploits of Germany, Japan and America. The U.S. administration was the most recent and has been accused of lavish spending allowing the economy to languish in order to ensure a continued relationship that preserves its military control and privileges (Carroll 1988). Indeed the local economy is boosted by rent from Kwajalein atoll or compensation money paid to nuclear-affected people. The Marshall Islands Development Bank is seen by many as a non-player in the local economy supporting foreign investors and foreign companies’ joint ventures with government owned instrumentalities (Carroll 1988). The government has a history of poor competency with:

- a record of Auditor General reports highlighting its inability at financial management to collect monies for utilities and other services,
- its discrimination against locally owned corporations by providing assistance to foreign owned corporations over its domestic private sector,
- its inability to privatize public sector enterprises by not assisting local private sector development, expecting that private sector entrepreneurs will capitalize on government-sponsored businesses, and
- a history of reactive government voting on legislation without any written analysis of a project’s financial, environmental or any other impact. No cost benefit analysis has been conducted for numerous business ventures that include a shipping company, an airline, a milk factory, offshore banking, a copra-processing plant and a fuel farm (Carroll 1988).

The result is an economy that is troubled by uncertainty and by poor institutional planning. It is also an economy that is heavily reliant on American military, nuclear compensation monies and
foreign investment (Carroll 1988; Cheshire 2001a, 2001b). Add to this the ambivalence of the Marshallese population with respect to the traditional and contemporary way of life (Carroll 1988) and it becomes a complicated environment for entrepreneurial study.

Traditional Marshall Island society is an ascription-based authority system perpetuating feudalistic stratification in society of commoner class and the traditional leaders and their extended family (Carroll 1988; Cheshire 2001b; Kiste and Marshall 1999; White and Lindstrom 1997). This system has been allowed to continue to date and it stifles entrepreneurial development as the commoner-class entrepreneur does not have access to land or money as land is controlled by the iroij’s (traditional chiefs). Any compensation or rent money from the United States in most cases is still controlled by the chiefs or their family members (Carroll 1988; Cheshire 2001b). Under traditional law, alab, land is not owned rather it is held in trust for future generations (Alexander 1978; Kiste and Marshall 1999; White and Lindstrom 1997). Rent is therefore deemed payable by the entrepreneur under traditional beliefs to the chief or anyone within this wider family. This ‘rent’, or tribute can be money or merchandise and the amount payable can be related to the perceived success of the business creating an atmosphere of uncertainty for the entrepreneur as rents or tribute are variable, not fixed (Carroll 1988; Cheshire 2001b). Within Marshallese society there are also two other stifling aspects that hinder business. The first is the assumption of Indigenous entrepreneurs to expect greater returns than a business can make with business proprietors spending cash received as if it was personal income with no concept of cost of stock. The second is the social system of reciprocity that is equivalent to communal ownership amongst family members. Similar research findings have been made in Samoa (Croulet 1988; Croulet and Sio 1986), and the Cook Islands (Carroll 1988; Cheshire 2001b; Fairbairn 1988b; Fairbairn and Pearson 1987). This results in it being extraordinarily difficult for a businessperson (or their staff) to withhold goods or services to family members. Over-extension of credit invariably results in debtors ledgers that consume the business liquidity resulting in insolvency and eventual business failure (Carroll 1988; Cheshire 2001b).

Interestingly: ‘credit abuse was cited as the single most likely reason for business failures’ (Carroll 1988: 131).
The literature reveals research on established Indigenous enterprises in 71 ventures, predominantly in the trade and service sectors (Carroll 1988). Most of the businesses controlled at least three other ventures, their net worth for over two thirds of them was less than US$50,000. Generally family members staffed the ventures, the majority of whom did not get paid. Family members were expected to work as a part of their family responsibility (Carroll 1988). Enterprises were typically small and very few had been established longer than five years. The average age of the entrepreneur was forty-three years with a grade twelve education, with approximately half having received some sort of short course or training out of school. Six of the seventy-one entrepreneurs examined were women. However this figure may not be a true representation as is the case in Fiji (Hailey 1988; Ingram 1990). The researcher felt that in many cases the woman was the real entrepreneur with the husband being the socially accepted ‘front-person’ (Carroll 1988).

The Indigenous entrepreneurs on average had work experience of twenty-seven years with many maintaining public sector positions that were most likely financing their business to some extent (Carroll 1988). Some four fifths of the Indigenous ventures were established by the entrepreneur interviewed with half of them commencing with initial start up capital of US$1,000 or less. None had received any small business advice from the banks or government and there appeared to be a reluctance to do so even if it was available (Carroll 1988). Over one third of the businesses kept no accounting records at all (Carroll 1988). A sobering aspect of this research was that many entrepreneurs felt that Marshallese entrepreneurs of mixed ancestry were less tied to the culture and were socialized in such a way that they were disposed towards a business-style competitive business environment giving them a better chance of being successful (Carroll 1988).

Literature on Indigenous entrepreneurs in the Marshall Islands is limited to some extent. The work by Carroll (1988) is supported by recent studies and publications (Cheshire 2001a, 2001b; Lee 1988; USA General Accounting Office 2000; USA Congress Committee on International Relations 2000). Even though the initial studies are twelve to fourteen years old, the recent findings by Cheshire (2001a, 2001b) together with work undertaken by the Pacific Centre Program at the University of Hawaii support the relevance and applicability of the earlier research (Carroll 1988). The next area of study examines literature on Western Samoa.
3.10.3 Western Samoa

Western Samoa was first colonized by Germany in 1899 and then New Zealand in 1914. From the 1830s to colonization, the traditional economy was influenced by missionary administration. In 1962 it became the first independent Pacific Island country (Croulet 1988). The intense pre-colonial trade between Fiji, Samoa and Tonga was mentioned in Chapter 2 (Fairbairn 1988a). The contemporary economy is characterized by a thriving subsistence sector that coexists with a modern cash sector (Croulet 1988). Samoans have maintained a traditional family system based on the extended family system under the authority, ‘pule’ of the ‘matai’ (head of the family) (Croulet 1988). The inter-island and intra-island entrepreneurial activity pre and post-invasion has flourished under the ‘matai’ system.

The Pacific Islands Development Program undertook a survey in 1985 of seventy Indigenous entrepreneurs (Croulet 1988; Croulet and Sio 1986). These survey results revealed that the Western Samoan entrepreneur was male, in the upper twenty to thirty percentile of the general population in age and has on average nine dependents. Businesses were in trade professions, service industries, manufacturing or agro-business. Business locations generally were in the rural area near Apia, the only major town. The ethnic heritage of the entrepreneur is Samoan however there is a high correlation between success and growth where the entrepreneur has mixed parents. Average business size has one to five employees, turnover less than T50,000 and the business is a sole proprietorship. The venture has been established for less than ten years with start-up capital and original capital likely to be from family sources and not exceeding T10,000. The entrepreneur in general has a higher education than the average Samoan and entered business due to the lack of other money-earning employment opportunities. Usually the entrepreneur has less than five years technical training and limited overseas exposure. Once again there is a correlation with increased travel and experience with success and business growth. The entrepreneur generally has more than one income generating activity and generally views the government as the biggest ‘obstacle’ to the progress of the business (Croulet 1988; Croulet and Sio 1986).

As in the study on Micronesia (Cheshire 2001a) some entrepreneurs in Samoa particularly if their business is located in a rural location may experience difficulty with the
extended family, in their family members buying goods on credit with no intention to repay (Croulet 1988; Croulet and Sio 1986). The ‘matai’ system makes the Samoan study unique in comparison to other countries and is seen as a positive social position by the entrepreneurs. Studies by Croulet (1988) and Croulet and Sio (1986) revealed a criticism by the entrepreneurs of the Samoan government. These criticisms include direct government subsidization of government controlled businesses, high tariffs on imports of goods used in their business, little or no capital assistance, poor infrastructure on programs such as business advisory assistance, high taxes, unfair competition by government controlled enterprises, government red-tape, non-enforcement of price control and lack of overseas export market development (Croulet 1988).

A more recent study (Attahir 1995) identified four critical success factors as identified by entrepreneurs. These are:

- good management skills,
- access to financing,
- personal qualities, and
- satisfactory government support (Attahir 1995).

Once again government support is viewed as crucial for small business success (Attahir 1995; Croulet 1988; Croulet and Sio 1986) with the government’s perceived role being the promotion and support of enterprises by the provision of facilities, incentives and cultivation of small business opportunities (Attahir 1995). Entrepreneurial success in Samoa has many similarities to success in Micronesia (Cheshire 2001a, 2001b) that includes an above average education, overseas experience and political connections (Attahir 1995). The stronger the political connection or influence the greater the chance for success in business (Attahir 1995). The implication here is the political connection may create opportunities for low cost capital funding and access to government programs, more importantly it distracts direct competition (Attahir 1995; Cheshire 2001a, 2001b).

At the same time whilst ‘connections’ assist as a determinant of success:

... as in the ideal Western capitalist free enterprise system, acquisitiveness, hard work, productive use of resources, and specialization are very important values in Samoan society ...[that] contribute to Samoan entrepreneurship (Croulet and Sio 1986: 25).
Samoan entrepreneurs may suffer social ostracism in the interest of allowing the business to grow. It was noted that: ‘the more an entrepreneur is ready to sacrifice prestige and status in the ‘matai’ in the interest of the business, the more likely the business is to succeed’ (Croulet and Sio 1986: 24). Hard work in Samoan society is regarded as a virtue as it is compared to the hero-chief Taeinu’u who worked hard in his gardens and achieved the highest recognition (Pitt 1970: 47). If Samoan entrepreneurs maintain the ‘matai’ their business must plateau yet their hard work is culturally accepted (Croulet and Sio 1986; Pitt 1970). Here we begin to understand the cultural dichotomy that the Samoan entrepreneur must traverse; work hard in the business (which is culturally accepted and encouraged) thus sacrifice their ‘matai’ position that ensures growth and success of the business and suffer social ostracism. It is a ‘damned if you do and a damned if you don’t’ situation which illustrates the unique cultural position of the Samoan entrepreneur (Croulet and Sio 1986).

Whilst Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs have no ‘matai’, (chiefly social obligations), research has shown that their involvement in income producing, capitalist business enterprises results in social ostracism (Foley 1999, 2000a). They are no longer active in the Indigenous community organizations due to their investment of time in the business which can create misconceptions by the wider community regarding their purported new found wealth from the business enterprise (Foley 1999, 2000a). Similar outcomes and comparatives are evident in the Samoan research.

To the east of Samoa lie the Cook Islands which are the next entrepreneurial society to be examined, which is also unique in the cultural problems experienced by its Indigenous entrepreneurs.

3.10.4 Cook Islands

Economic development in the Cook Islands relies heavily on the performance of Indigenous entrepreneurs to raise living standards and promote greater economic independence in the private sector (Fairbairn 1988b). Since independence in 1965 the Cook Islands have experienced an exodus to New Zealand and an increase in expatriate control of the private sector. The Government of the Cook Islands in 1984 began to contribute to the private sector to foster
greater local participation and strengthen a weakening economy. They acknowledged that small business and entrepreneurial activity was a possible solution (Fairbairn 1988b; Ingram 1990).

Like other Pacific Island groups (Diamond 1999), the Cook Islands' traditional people in their chiefdoms, enjoyed extensive entrepreneurial trade with other Polynesian communities pre-European contact (Ingram 1990). During the post European contact until New Zealand annexation in 1900, several of these chiefs were so successful in their entrepreneurial activity that they were able to purchase schooners which they then used to trade throughout the Cook Island archipelago, Tahiti and as far away as New Zealand (Ingram 1990). This Indigenous economic independence ceased with the ensuing colonial subjugation by New Zealand in 1900 (Ingram 1990). The Cook Islands have gone from a once vibrant Indigenous economy, to a contemporary society where the descendants now struggle to establish commercial activities and enjoy an acceptable standard of living (Fairbairn 1988b; Ingram 1990).

There have been several in-depth studies on entrepreneurs in the Cook Islands in recent times (Fairbairn 1988b; Fairbairn and Pearson 1987). The findings in one study of one hundred Indigenous businesses revealed that generally entrepreneurs:

- were active in church organizations,
- had a high level of education, several having tertiary qualifications,
- all had large families and were married,
- had businesses which were family ventures employing few if any outside persons,
- had other business ventures, wage employment and/or other forms of income producing work,
- kept good accounting records, and they were more advanced in this area than other parts in the South Pacific (possibly due to the stringent turnover tax that is payable monthly),
- had experience in the same type of business and/or had a close correlation between work experience and the current business,
- had extensive travel experience, and
• had business ventures in many diverse areas, Hotel (seven), manufacturing (seven), crafts (eleven), restaurant (seven), transport (fourteen), professional/technical (eighteen), construction (seven), retail stores (eighteen), agriculture (eleven), (Fairbairn 1988b; Fairbairn and Pearson 1987).

The amounts initially invested to set up or acquire the businesses varied widely, the majority were self funded with as little as a few hundred dollars start-up capital, most without commercial funding. Those that did require loan funding were modest borrowings with the largest local funded loan being only $24,000 NZD. The largest joint venture capital was from an international partner and only totalled $80,000 NZD (Fairbairn 1988b). Low capital start ups and modest lending is indicative of the lack of business finance available, the result is under-capitalized businesses with low stock levels and poor purchasing power (Fairbairn 1988b). The study also revealed that the private sector suffers from poor servicing from transport systems, both shipping and air services, inter-island and international together with poor commercial and development banking, business training and advisory facilities (Fairbairn 1988b; Ingram 1990).

In conclusion the studies revealed that most of the entrepreneurs: 'appear to be in business to make money to improve living conditions and or foster the economic interests of their families' (Fairbairn 1988b: 65).

To the west of the Cook Islands lies Fiji which is the next entrepreneurial society to be examined. Fiji is somewhat unique in the cultural (and racial) problems experienced by its Indigenous entrepreneurs.

3.10.5 Fiji

Fiji is unique in its political turmoil and ethnic composition, the legacy of a plantation culture implemented by the British in colonial times (Hailey 1988). A country of more than 300 islands, Fiji’s traditional inhabitants are a mix of Melanesian and Polynesian that engendered a highly developed society long before the arrival of Europeans in the 19th century (Diamond 1999; Hailey 1988). To support the colonial plantation economy, indentured Indian labourers were introduced to the country between 1879 and 1916. With the abolishment of indentured labour many of the Indian workers remained as independent farmers or businesspersons. Over several
decades the Fijian based plantation economy of copra, sugar and cotton suffered by fluctuations in world prices. With the increased costs of labour following the cessation of indentured Indian workers, Fijian exports were no longer viable and the plantation culture has disappeared to be replaced by smaller farms and/or sharecroppers (Hailey 1988). By Independence in 1970, Fiji prided itself on its harmonious multi-racial society with Indian-Fijians comprising approximately 50% of the population. In May 1987 a military coup overthrew the elected Indian-Fijian government and racial divisions have surfaced (Hailey 1988). It was estimated that in 1987 Fijian-Indians controlled commercial activity with Indigenous Fijians only controlling three percent of the corporate/commercial activity. This in turn fuelled the racial divide between Fijian-Indians and Indigenous Fijians (Ingram 1990).

Literature on Fijian entrepreneurship is often clouded with generalizations that do not identify differences between native Fijian and Indian-Fijian entrepreneurs (Attahir 1995; Baldacchino 1999; Hailey 1987, 1988; Chandra and Hailey 1984; Watters 1969). Some researchers specifically exclude Indian-Fijian content (Hailey 1988; Ingram 1990). To ensure that the Indigenous entrepreneur is correctly identified and studied this literature review is only concerned with literature on the native, Indigenous Fijian.

Indigenous Fijians traditionally view Islanders who emulate European commercial practices as social outcasts, deviants who are culturally impure in what they do (Finney 1972; Hailey 1987). This is a marked difference to the social acceptance and success of Micronesian, Samoan and Cook Island entrepreneurs, illustrating the cultural differences exhibited in Fiji (Fairbairn 1988a; Ingram 1990).

Fijian Indigenous society is about sharing. Commerce is about selling, individualism and acquisitiveness, suggests Hailey:

- In traditional Fijian society success and profit were intangibles measured in terms of the status and self-esteem derived from fulfilling inherent social commitments, and
- Contemporary Fijian entrepreneurs appear to be motivated as much by personal gain or social recognition as by financial reward ... entered business
as a means of freeing themselves from traditional bonds and thereby asserting their individuality (Hailey 1987: 39).

The interests of the individual entrepreneurs need to achieve and succeed in business. Their conflicts on entering business are based in the dichotomy between their cultural concept of sharing within their cultural sphere or group and succeeding (Ingram 1990).

Traditional Fijian economic systems were socialist. They operated within paternalistic societies with an emphasis on the extended family as a cohesive community centred on chiefdoms (Ingram 1990). The traditional economies were based on the exploitation of the land and sea, yet in pre and post-colonial times entrepreneurial activity was evident in the surplus production of goods enabling considerable trade between coastal and inland areas that extended as far away as Tonga (Diamond 1999; Fairbairn 1988a; Ingram 1990). After contact with the West, some Fijian chiefdoms began to change from a socialist economy to a more individualist capitalistic economy producing a surplus of goods in order to trade with visiting ships and adapting to the capitalist cash economy (Diamond 1999; Fairbairn 1988a, 1988b; Ingram 1990). In fact numerous entrepreneurial chiefdoms flourished until their subjugation by colonialists and missionary powers, when trade ceased (Fairbairn 1988a, 1988b; Ingram 1990).

Contemporary attempts to analyse Fijian entrepreneurs often results in contradictory interpretations and definitions (Hailey 1988). This is shown in research that concluded that prosperous economic activity was related to the individual entrepreneurs’ personality, education, religion and their ability to detach themselves from local society (Belshaw 1964). This is disputed in studies of farmers in the Sigatoka Valley. The most successful farmers were those who were staunch supporters of traditional ceremonies and community obligations. Those farmers who isolated themselves on their farms and became separated from their community were the least successful (Rakoto 1979). The Fijian community is a source of capital, labour, support and a market for Fijian small business people (Hailey 1988). Isolating themselves from the local community and all its concomitant obligations becomes self-perpetuating with the cultural/community ostracization of the individuals as they cut themselves off from capital/labour and support mechanisms (Hailey 1988).
Despite these constraints, the Fijian business sector is dominated by small business (Hailey 1988). The Fijian entrepreneur tends to be located in rural areas and outer-island groups, which support strong rural ties, which Indigenous Fijians exhibit, as they tend to live away from urban centres. Fijian-Indian entrepreneurs (Hailey 1988) dominate the urban and peri-urban businesses. Businesses examined owned by Indigenous Fijians included small trade stores, transport and service businesses, commercial farming and fishing ventures. There is an inward orientation with entrepreneurs only servicing their local markets in saturated copy cat style businesses in the service industry, which requires less start-up capital and technical knowledge. Many areas have numerous businesses that are clones, over-servicing their markets (Hailey 1988). No manufacturing businesses or exporting businesses were examined as Fijian-Indian entrepreneurs dominate these business sectors. In general the Fijian-Indian has technical skills, greater access to Fijian-Indian capital, network systems and expatriate Indian resources. They are also prepared to migrate away from their place of birth unlike the Indigenous Fijian (Hailey 1988). In recent years numbers of Indigenous Fijians are also moving to urban centres seeking tourist-related employment (Hailey 1985).

The Indigenous Fijian business community is patrilineal (mirroring traditional values), with limited opportunities for women (Hailey 1988; Ingram 1990). Despite these constraints, well-educated Fijian women have businesses in urban areas in businesses that include hot bread kitchen shops, hairdressing and seamstresses. Often the husband of the entrepreneur acts as the ‘front’, whilst the wife is the driving force and manager of the enterprise (Hailey 1988; Ingram 1990).

In general most Fijian entrepreneurs are aged forty, and are well-established members of their communities with strong family ties and social responsibilities together with a long history of involvement in industry. On average they have been in business for themselves for less than two years which indicates an experimental approach to involvement in business (Hailey 1988). There is no correlation between education and success in the literature on Fiji. Most Fijian entrepreneurs had higher levels of education and had travelled overseas more than their Fijian-Indian counterparts. Yet the Indigenous Fijians business performance did not reflect these perceived advantages (Hailey 1988). At the other end of the scale, the least educated Fijians
operated the least sophisticated ventures in the retail and transport sector, a possible reflection of their limited skills and aspirations (Hailey 1988). Another interesting aspect of this research revealed that the Indigenous entrepreneur averaged approximately sixty-seven hours per week active involvement in their business for very low rewards, which indicates a low return on investment. In contrast Fijian-Indian entrepreneurs tend to remain in the core business longer, passing the business down to family members and enjoy a higher return on investment with lower hours invested on a weekly basis (Hailey 1988).

In summary, Indigenous Fijian entrepreneurs are identified by:

- their lack of capital and start-up funds,
- their lack of management experience and business skills,
- the lack of second generation entrepreneurial skills,
- the lack of co-ordinated business training,
- the lack of marketing skills and understanding of simple business operations that includes budgeting and costing,
- the lack of market and resource networks that includes networking skills, and
- their inability to maintain family obligations that does not result in erosion of business stock or capital (Attahir 1995; Hailey 1988; Ingram 1990).

The lack of government infrastructure and/or the reverse racism of government policies will not be discussed. Fiji is unique, with many differences to other neighbouring Pacific Indigenous entrepreneurs that are relative to its specific culture, demographic differences and social-economic position that is intensified by racial disparity, both real and perceived, overt, covert and institutional (Ingram personal interview 21 August, 2001).

The next nation to be discussed is Tonga, which is south of Fiji and Samoa, to the east of New Caledonia.

3.10.6 Tonga

Tonga is a small Polynesian Kingdom consisting of 150 islands with a total land area of 699 sq. km with a population of over 100,000 (Ritterbush 1988). Like many other Pacific nations, Tonga enjoyed intensive trade with neighbouring islands and nations that included Fiji and Samoa pre and post-European contact up until colonization (Diamond 1999; Fairbairn 1988a; Ingram
1990). Contemporary Tonga is characterized by its deeply religious and conservative society: ‘which is largely composed of semi-subsistent farmers and noble elite’ (Ritterbush 1988: 137). As seen in other Polynesian business studies (Carroll 1988; Cheshire 2001a; Croulet 1988; Fairbairn 1988a; Hailey 1988) the demands of kinship and collectivism in Tonga places a cultural burden/obligation on the Indigenous entrepreneur that has no comparatives in the non-Indigenous entrepreneurial world. Early theorists (Finney 1973a, 1976; Parsons and Smelser 1956) have suggested that even though capitalist principles and practices were introduced into the economy over a century ago, the ascribed-status society of Tonga is not culturally pre-adapted to entrepreneurship (Finney 1973a, 1976; Parsons and Smelser 1956). The research (Ritterbush 1988) shows that the Tongan entrepreneurs can and do work around their status and their obligatory contributions. Indigenous academics would include ‘early’ theorists such as Finney (1973a, 1976) and Parsons and Smelser (1956) as practitioners of Race theory without empathy to the adaptability of Indigenous entrepreneurs to their changing environment.

The obligatory contribution of *fua kavenga* to the family, the church and the government affect nearly all Indigenous entrepreneurs in Tonga (Ritterbush 1988). A few had abandoned it which is seen by many as more harmful to their business for without social obligation, society has no reciprocal obligation to support your business. Some had worked skilfully to devise financial strategies that simultaneously fulfilled their customary obligations and generated business profit (Ritterbush 1988). The demands of the extended family together with the Tongan social convention of reciprocity were also other areas of potential concern for the aspiring Indigenous entrepreneur as the daily family interaction of sharing goods communally also ensures a balance of material possessions amongst the entrepreneur’s wider group (Ritterbush 1988).

Generally Indigenous entrepreneurs had less formal education, fewer business management skills, their businesses were more undercapitalised and less financially stable than non-Indigenous or part-Tongan entrepreneurs (Ritterbush 1988). The majority had commenced business with start-up capital from personal savings and required outside income to keep the business viable. The more successful Indigenous entrepreneurs inherited the businesses, were or have been government employees and closely related by marriage or blood to senior government
employees (Ritterbush 1988). Most successful operators had been trained in bookkeeping or worked close with a family member or friend that had accounting training. The majority of Indigenous entrepreneurs lacked the government or social contacts of their more successful counterparts (Ritterbush 1988).

A dominating characteristic of the Indigenous entrepreneurs was their tendency to be: 'poor innovators but good imitators' (Ritterbush 1988: 148). The Indigenous entrepreneurs tended to copy what they perceived as successful businesses which result in an over-supply of certain businesses resulting in high venture failure statistics (Ritterbush 1988). This copycat practice is similar to previous mentioned situations in Fiji (Hailey 1988; Ingram 1990), Marshall Islands (Carroll 1988; Cheshire 2001), and Samoa (Croulet 1988). From the literature it would appear that in general the Tongan Indigenous entrepreneur lacked business knowledge, experience or training (Ritterbush 1988). Tonga suffers from a smallness of local markets, limited local resources, expensive and often unreliable international and/or intra-national transport systems, limited banking facilities and a lack of government small business development or management programs (Ritterbush 1988).

Those entrepreneurs that did prosper exhibited a:

... fierce determination and a surprising tenacity to get the job done in spite (or because) of existing constraints ... most were disciplined and worked hard at their jobs, not so much for status mobility as for improving their families' standard of living (Ritterbush 1988).

In conclusion, 'the ability to synthesize and incorporate various aspects of the traditional culture with modern business practices was an essential difference between successful and unsuccessful Indigenous entrepreneurs' (Ritterbush 1988) in Tonga.

3.10.7 Summary of Pacific Entrepreneurial Studies

The struggling Indigenous entrepreneur in contemporary society has pre-colonization role models. There are similar stories recorded throughout the Pacific, of strong economic independence between Island nations and trade that intensified with the procurement of European clientele such as the then prosperous whaling industry of the 1800s. Increased access to western technology that included schooners and other sailing ships also assisted in the entrepreneurial trade as illustrated in the Cook Islands. The Pacific Islands in general went from
thriving economically independent Chiefdoms pre 1900, to welfare dependent societies during colonial management. Colonial subjugation and destruction of Indigenous economies has been repeated from the America's, Africa, India to Australia, and as illustrated; throughout the Pacific and New Zealand (Diamond 1988; Ingram 1990; Ingram personal interview 21 August, 2001). Following independence in the 1960s and 1970s, the Pacific Island communities (that in many cases had their traditional beliefs and economic systems destroyed), now seek to economically rebuild. They must do so in a capitalistic world in which they suffer through isolation, lack of capital, poor government infrastructure and business training, high tariffs and poor transport infrastructure systems to name a few of their collective problems (Fairbairn 1988a, 1988b; Ingram 1990). In addition the contemporary entrepreneurs are struggling to balance customary social obligations with obligation to family and chiefdom land tenure systems (Carroll 1988; Cheshire 2001a; Croulet 1988; Fairbairn 1988; Hailey 1988).

In the review of this literature, several comparatives are evident with research on Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs (Foley 1999, 2000a). This includes relationships between education and training to success in business, the positive-ness or determination of the individual to succeed and the need to provide for one's family. The review of literature on Pacific Island entrepreneurs noted that borrowing initial capital to set up the business was not perceived as a positive aspect of business, it may in fact be a detriment due to small profit margins and marketplace pressures (Cheshire 2001a, 2001b). It would appear that business success and business longevity could be correlated with nominal capital borrowings and the ability of the business to generate its own capital investment base. In many instances, this forces the entrepreneur into several ventures for economies of scale and maximum utilization of a small capital base or a mix of employment and entrepreneurial activity to ensure secondary income whilst the capital base is developed.

The lack of capital causes many varied stresses on the business and the entrepreneur. Predominantly this involves limited working capital which results in a lack of stock, poor purchasing power, and pressure on cash flow. There is a need for credit provision of working capital similar to that which the Grameen Bank of Bangladesh provides (Cheshire 2001a; Fairbairn 1988a; Ingram 1990). ‘Credit for self-employment should be recognized as a human
right that plays a critical role in attaining all other human rights’ (Yunus 1987: 73). Banks and commercial lending institutions in general are not providers of entrepreneurial working capital unless the entrepreneur has sizeable liquid or real estate/tangible assets. It appears that to an extent, Pacific Island entrepreneurs also suffer ‘welfare shackles’ similar to the Indigenous Australian. Large start-up capital loans are not the answer as the cash-flow burden in repayments stifles business development. What is needed are small ‘micro-economic’ revolving working capital facilities that are flexible whereby the credit provision grows with the business profitability. Lateral thinking is the required business-funding attitude, not the conservative bureaucratic environment of government agencies and trading banks (Cheshire personal interview 17 September, 2001; Ingram personal interview 21 August, 2001).

3.11 Summary of Literary Review

In view of the cross disciplinary nature of this work, the literature review has been extensive covering eight specific areas of relevant literature. These areas included:

- Indigenous Small Business theory
- Ethnic theories
- Social Identity theory
- Co-cultural theory
- Conventional/Contemporary Entrepreneurial Discourse
- The Cross-cultural Environment of the Indigenous Entrepreneur
- Cultural Values, and
- Comparative Pacific Island Entrepreneurial Literature.

The initial aim of the literature review was to examine the perceived void in literature on Indigenous entrepreneurs which was explained in the discussion on Indigenous Small Business theory. This was followed by a review of literature on Ethnic Small Business theory which included Cultural theory, Ethnic Enclave theory, Middleman Minority/response to Cultural Antagonism, Opportunity/Ecological Succession theory and Interactive theories. This discussion provides knowledge of a theoretical base that could or could not be applied to Indigenous entrepreneurs. Social Identity theory was then briefly discussed examining the dynamic and inter-generative interdependence of self-concept and inter-group relations. Co-cultural theory
followed examining its five epistemological assumptions as a preliminary area of literature that allowed the discussion to progress to conventional/contemporary entrepreneurial discourse. Conventional/contemporary discourse highlighted amongst many things discrimination and the ethnocentric ideological bias of mainstream entrepreneurial literature. Race based literature revolving around empirical research in the United States was also examined. This then provided a platform from which to discuss the cross-cultural environment of the Indigenous entrepreneur. Racism and social acceptability were key issues in this literature. Several models were also developed showing application of literature to a thematic model that illustrated the Indigenous entrepreneurs position as different theories were applied.

Cultural values were the second last key area of literature to be discussed. Culture and values were reviewed, defined then discussed in business literature and in wider areas of study. Discussion then focused on the concepts of religion and family. Lastly Pacific Island literature was reviewed to enable the researcher and the reader to understand the complexities of Indigenous entrepreneurship in countries that span a bridge between Australia and Hawaii linking this area of Pacifica. The motive behind this review was to provide possible commonalities or cultural differences that may arise in the subsequent field research.

The development of the research questions or hypothesis will also be addressed. Developments within the literature review has focused this research into two aims, firstly address relevant literature. The literature reviewed has been addressed to focus on the research questions which are:

1. As Indigenous entrepreneurs experience enlightenment, empowerment and emancipation through success in business, do they identify less with Indigenous culture and more with the Anglo-European values of the dominant Australian or American culture?
2. Do successful Indigenous entrepreneurs, in effect, need to adopt or conform to the value system of the dominant Anglo-European culture to remain successful in business?
3. Are there existing impediments/inhibitors that restrict business growth and subsequent success to the Indigenous entrepreneur?
4. Is the Indigenous entrepreneur different to the non-indigenous entrepreneur?

5. Does entrepreneurship free the Indigenous business person from the welfare system?

The second aim of the research is fill the gap in available literature on the urban Indigenous Australian entrepreneur that follows a research comparative on Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs which also adds to literature for this Indigenous group. The outcomes from the literature review and developments in the thematic model appear in the following section integrating relevant aspects from the reviewed literature.

3.11.1 Outcomes from Literature Survey

The following model illustrates the interaction and effect of Ethnic theories on the Indigenous entrepreneur (see Figure 6).

**Figure 6  THE INDIGENOUS ENTREPRENEUR: APPLICATION OF ETHNIC THEORY.**
The thematic analysis is further developed in a review of literature on Ethnic theory. Ethnic theory, relates to the environment of the business market. It is illustrated in the diagram (Figure 6) as the phenomenon that allows the Indigenous entrepreneur to access ethnic markets. The ethnic market has two possible applications and is illustrated by the two dot outlined cubes at the bottom of the diagram. Market one to the left is aligned to the free enterprise market. Recall Figure 3 which depicted the Indigenous entrepreneur after the inclusion of the Bulhan model (1980). The entrepreneur has two choices in this model; 1) be absorbed into the dominant culture and access free enterprise 2) remain Indigenous and endure the socio economic barrier and societal constraints in the quest to achieve their personal needs. The ethic market number one follows the Bulhan model (1980) in that the entrepreneur seeks out the ethnic market which is a niche that is connected to the dominant culture. This allows the entrepreneur to access ethnic market assets such as human capital, general business resources, buildings, financial capital, access to stock and sales in both the retail and wholesale sectors of this niche market.

The alternative scenario is ethnic market two, found on the bottom right hand side of Figure 6. Ethnic market two is accessed directly after the socio-economic and societal constraints are navigated. Social stratification may determine the fate of the ethnic market. If it is socially acceptable it will have access to market resources. If not it will suffer marginal exclusion.

The model provides for investigating basic cognitive mechanisms underlying the processes of the Indigenous entrepreneur, whereby the entrepreneur identifies with a minority group or groups, or the dominant group and in the process of identification produces behavioural inter-group differentiation (Hogg and Mullin 1999). If the Indigenous entrepreneur maintains the same identification level with their cultural group during their time in business (which is illustrated in the model as the ethnic group two) then they suffer negative social constraints. If they identify with the dominant group as in group one then they will have improved access to market resources.
From the literature review another variable that should be addressed in the thematic analysis is the application of values and how this may influence the Indigenous entrepreneur. The effect of values is illustrated in Figure 7.

**FIGURE 7 THE INDIGENOUS ENTREPRENEUR: APPLICATION OF INDIGENOUS VALUES.**

The inclusion of values creates a decision process that could impede the Indigenous entrepreneur’s efforts to align with the dominant culture. In Figure 4 the application of the Bulhan model (1980) included a concept of radicalisation. Although oversimplified, it allowed the thematic model to develop illustrating a possible alternative for the entrepreneur. It does not however allow for the cultural value retention of the Indigenous entrepreneur in complicated matters that include kinship obligations and/or family obligations. In addition it disregards social
and business restrictions that include and are not limited to the effects of racism, bigotry in
business and the cost of funds. The Bulhan model simplifies the shift from Indigenous culture to
non-indigenous culture in the search for an easier existence in business. With the application of
the Shook (1992) model (see Figure 5) dissonance occurred with the cultural confusion and
conflict possibly taking effect with the entrepreneur moving back and forth between the original
position and their repositioning in the dominant culture. Initially the moving back and forth was
represented by a two way arrow, now it is represented at the top of the model with two flow
arrows, either to the right or to the left. From the literature, the interaction of values of religion
and family when included in the model may act as a buffer to either stimulate or hinder
movement from the Indigenous position to that aligned with the dominant culture.

The interaction and development of personal and social identity and the degree of
identification are complex issues with many variables (Hogg and Mullin 1999; Long and Spears
1997). The purpose of this research and the thematic analysis is not to try and measure the
entrepreneurs’ reactions. Rather it is to acknowledge their existence in order to broaden the
knowledge base and level of understanding of the Indigenous entrepreneur’s environment. In
Figure 7 the aim is not to measure the effect of values, instead the model illustrates that values
may be a force in the decision making process of the entrepreneur and lead to their alignment
with the dominant culture in their maintenance of the Indigenous pursuit of personal needs.

The thematic analysis need not include comment on conventional contemporary
discourse which highlighted amongst many things discrimination and ethnocentric ideological
bias or race based literature as these are already included in the generalized socio economic
barrier and societal constraints. The Pacific Islander literature produced almost identical
scenarios of socio economic barriers and societal constraints. Any inclusion or comment of this
literature would complicate the thematic model.

3.12 Research Question Development

3.12.1 Introduction
The research project has two aims. Initially it is to examine the socio-economic environment of
the urban Indigenous Australian entrepreneur, exploring any change or loss of cultural values on
the Indigenous entrepreneurs’ prolonged involvement in business. Case study analysis of
Indigenous Australians and their Hawaiian Indigenous counterparts is the preferred process. The analysis will question do Indigenous entrepreneurs become (in effect) culturally non-indigenous whilst engaged in entrepreneurial activity? Or are the individuals’ cultural values maintained, transformed, subdued in some other context? The second aim of the research is to fill the gap in available literature on the urban Indigenous Australian entrepreneur.

Several propositions have been considered. This has resulted in a specific research hypothesis. A research hypothesis is the proposition, which is advanced for testing or appraisal as a generalisation about a phenomenon (Jary and Jary 1995). In remembering that the research topic is ‘Understanding Indigenous Entrepreneurship’, to understand Indigenous entrepreneurship the study will be concerned with the mesh or conflict of Anglo-European business values and Indigenous cultural values (if Indigenous cultural values exist)? The study will also view the entrepreneur’s intrinsic motivators. Are they different from Anglo-European entrepreneurs? Or are they similar? The literature review explored conventional entrepreneurial discourse highlighting the Anglo-European biases and racial dominance of not only entrepreneurial discourse but also the dominance of mainstream society with developments in minority-immigrant literature on racial stratification (Light and Rosenstein 1995; Min 1996; Ogbor 2000; Park 1997; Waldinger 1996; Yoon 1997).

The cross-cultural environment of the Indigenous entrepreneur was also explored providing a positive measurement of Indigenous identity into the mainstream discourses and praxis. A definition of what constitutes an Indigenous entrepreneur was also established (Foley 2000a). The definition of an Indigenous entrepreneur included discussion on desirable economic outcomes (Tiessen 1997), the pursuit of opportunity, the creation of new market opportunities and the dynamics of change (Smilor 1997; Zimmerer and Scarborough 1998).

3.12.2 Explicit statement of propositions

In qualitative research based in Grounded theory, the hypothesis often follows the study, which in turn provides the formula to construct the questionnaires of quantitative research (Glaser 1992). To maintain focus in this study a research proposition is espoused which is not intended to retract from Glaser’s (1992) view that the researcher does not force the data; rather with patience (and correct application) the hypothesis will emerge, in the perspective of the people
studied. The research will remain flexible allowing for both scenarios to develop; that is a research proposition and an emerging hypothesis in accordance with the research topic and the initial research questions set out in Chapter 1 and Chapter 3.11.

In the investigation of these research questions the social identity and self-esteem of the entrepreneur (Hogg and Mullin 1999) become intertwined with ensuing enlightenment, empowerment and emancipation (Fay 1987). At no time in the research are these experiences deemed measurable. They are substantiated, rather than an attempt made to measure them. The purpose of this research is not to measure Indigenous Entrepreneurs social identity and/or self-esteem. Any attempt to grade, scale or measure these self-reflective attributes is outside of the parameters of this study.
4 METHODOLOGY

This thesis is a qualitative case study utilizing a semi-structured interview format comparing two Indigenous groups, Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs and Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs. The aim of the study is to examine why the Indigenous entrepreneur experiences enlightenment, empowerment and emancipation through success in business and to enquire as to whether they identify less with Indigenous culture and more with the Anglo-European values of the dominant Australian or American culture? Or do successful Indigenous entrepreneurs, in effect, need to take on or adopt values of the dominant Anglo-European culture to remain successful in business? Are there existing impediments/inhibitors that restrict business growth and subsequent success to the Indigenous entrepreneur? Lastly, from case study analysis and literature review, is the Indigenous entrepreneur different to the non-indigenous entrepreneur and does entrepreneurship free the Indigenous business person from the welfare system?

The study is undertaken acknowledging an Indigenous epistemological approach to research, developing and adopting an Indigenous Standpoint theory (Foley 2002a, 2003a, 2003b). The methodology is discussed in two parts, firstly a justification of the theoretical application and secondly a description of the case study procedures.

4.1 Theoretical Approach to the Methodology

4.1.1 Introduction to Indigenous Research Concepts

From the Indigenous Australian’s research perspective, the crucial difference between the emic and the etic data is the applied cultural sensitivity of the researcher and how this can have a direct effect on the research outcomes. For example, field data based on verbal responses rather than other forms of observation is emic in its application. Using this approach the grounding of the data recorded is then done in an Anglo-European anthropological application without providing for adequate accounts of non-mainstream lives (Marcus and Fisher 1986).

The soundness of the methodology supporting case study analysis needs to ensure that rigour is not sacrificed by emic approaches which can stifle the interpretation of data by using only one dimension of evaluation (Pelto and Pelto 1978). The etic method of behavioural observation, identifying systems and patterns of behaviour through qualitative analysis must be based on the cultural generalizations of the observed, not the cultural standards of the observer.
From the Indigenous standpoint, the researcher must elicit the terminology, the cultural domains and the societal values of the individual being examined and realize that these qualifications may be different for each and every Indigenous Australian group encountered. Research with Indigenous participants that possesses an Indigenous standpoint and a methodological approach of holistic observation and interaction has the potential to be a true reflection of the Indigenous situation without bias (Nakata 1998; Rigney 1999). Due diligence must be exercised as the complex nature of identity can also create divisions between the researcher and researched even when they are ‘racially matched’ (Connolly 1998). Therefore there is a need for an Indigenous approach to the recording of Indigenous knowledge that is flexible and accurate in its application.

4.1.2 The Epistemology Argument

The Council of Australian Postgraduate Associations (CAPA) and the National Tertiary Education Union (NTEU) have examined the dominance of the ethnocentric approach to Indigenous research for several years. The debate concerns the exclusion of Indigenous Australian pedagogical approaches to research and the inability of academia to acknowledge the differences between the two cultures (NTEU 2000). The majority of research to date in Indigenous cultures and values had been done from an ethnocentric pedagogy, with an epistemological application from this same realm, without mechanisms to differentiate the Indigenous values. The epistemological application to research in general does not allow for Indigenous pedagogy or Indigenous epistemology to be considered (Nakata 1998; Rigney 1999). The forceful application of western approaches to postgraduate study has resulted in numerous Indigenous Australian students abandoning their dreams of a higher degree (Budby 2001). The oppression of Indigenous Australian pedagogy and research methodologies within Higher Education institutions needs to be acknowledged (Budby 2001).

The Indigenous Australian entrepreneur could (subject to the results of this research) prove to have a dichotomy of values; from two very different cultures; Indigenous values and those of the dominant Anglo-European society (Trudgen 2000). Observational and/or interventionist research on Indigenous Australians has up until now, been based in the ethnocentric values of academia. This is flawed as the researchers are basing their observation
on the values of their society, not the values of the Indigenous participant that they are researching. If interventionist research crosses the gap of cultural difference, then from an Indigenous standpoint this research must be from an Indigenous perspective otherwise we are supporting ethnocentrism that will within knowledge construction traditions, continue the production and reproduction of colonial ideologies (Rigney 1999) and not Indigenous ideology. The goal of academic inquiry is to challenge, develop, possibly improve and or change thinking, ideas, understanding and knowledge. If this is correct, then an Indigenous epistemological approach to research is justified.

In this process however Indigenous standpoint is often a painful journey for the Indigenous researcher. The non-indigenous researcher does not wear the cultural weight that the Indigenous researcher endures (Brady 1992; Nakata 1998; Rigney 1999). Mainstream social scientific knowledge about racial minorities still dwells on the pathological and on the sensational, and within Universities these are often grounded in a racially biased episteme (Stanfield 1994). As Rigney states:

[r]esearch practices, protocols and epistemologies in modern Australia remain racially biased towards the dominant cultural ideologies ... racialised research epistemologies produce and reproduce via dominant discourse, academically generated ideas of superiority regardless of faculty, school or discipline (1999: 9).

The challenge for this research is to allow the researcher to work within an ethnocentric institution yet maintain the flexibility in research ontologies, epistemologies and axiologies that conform with Indigenous application and thought processes, as explained by Rigney:

... Indigenist research is research by Indigenous Australians whose primary informants are Indigenous Australians and whose goals are to serve and inform the Indigenous struggle for self-determination. It rejects the notion that research on Indigenous people is for the sake of knowledge itself and is for the academy, by the academy and in the interest of the academy (1999: 14).

If Indigenous Australian researchers do not pursue an Indigenous epistemology then to an extent, their work will reinforce the concept of capitalist racial order (Foley 1991) as they will condone by their actions the continued subjugation of Indigenous epistemology. In this interpretation conformity involves the use of an ‘accepted’ research epistemology. Non-conformity however is the pursuit of an Indigenous epistemology in a grounded theoretical approach, which adheres to
the concept of the application of Indigenous Standpoint theory. The metaphysical and physical concept of ‘being’ (Heidegger 1994) and ‘belonging’ (Read 2000) will not be discussed as they could possibly cloud the issues. However the ontological application of the study philosophically involves reality in determining what is an Indigenous entrepreneur. What values determine their actions and whether they retain cultural values yet exist as an Indigenous entrepreneur are the questions that the researcher is asking. This is the reality of the research. The structure of reality, of: ‘how things really are’ (Guba and Lincoln 1994: 108) must remain objective. This objective realism can be maintained through critical realism with the application of social constructivism and positivism (Bhaskar 1978). The Indigenous approach to research has many ontological and epistemological similarities as it has differences to western science. Scientific or critical realism allows intangible and what may seem to be unobservable concepts to be a part of reality (Devitt 1997). It has a subject-object dualism approach similar to social constructivism that allows the study to occur within its own context (Crotty 1998; Sayer 1992). Scientific realism provides the flexibility and to a degree the sensitivity that this proposed study demands (Miles and Huberman 1994).

The philosophical stance that informs the methodology, providing a context in the process and grounding it in its own logic and criteria (Crotty 1998) are found within Social theory. Social theory, Critical, Standpoint and Insider-Outsider theories are discussed in the following chapters as they apply to this study.

4.1.3 Social Theory

The fields of critical sociology and poststructuralism are popular for Indigenous researchers for their criticism of grand theory, positivism, the functional perspective and classical theories (Sargent, Nilan and Winter 1997). Some would argue that sociology is a ‘colonizing discourse’ to the Indigenous researcher (Brady 1992; Morton-Robinson 2000; Nakata 1998; Sargent, Nilan and Winter 1997; Smith 1999; Rigney 1999) as is poststructuralism especially when it involves Feminist theory (Sargent, Nilan and Winter 1997). Postmodernism attempts to criticize the dominant order; it denies objective truth and culture as it proposes that there are no intrinsic universal human values. The postmodern discourse espouses the importance of hearing different voices, the minorities. Yet it is a non-indigenous Anglo-Eurocentric and middle class voice that
dominates this literature (Jary and Jary 1995; Sargent, Nilan and Winter 1997; Weedon 1987). Postmodernism disregards the Indigenous standpoint concept and will not be deconstructed due to its sheer volume of literature and differing views.

In western discourse, theory requires a philosophical stance that informs the methodology. The methodology subsequently provides a context that is grounded within its own logic and criteria. This illustrates the association between the discourse in theory and methodology (Crotty 1998). The relationship between theoretical discourses has stifled the participation of Indigenous epistemology in western academia. As Rigney states:

... Indigenous Peoples in Australia and the Pacific must look to new anti-colonial epistemologies and methodologies to construct, re-discover and /or re-affirm their knowledge and cultures (1999: 10).

To the Indigenous scholar Critical theory, Standpoint theory and Insider-Outsider theory are emancipatory and liberating epistemologies in their deconstruction process. They are guided by a vision that there is more than just one worldview and interpretation (Moreton-Robinson 2000; Rigney 1999; Smith 1999; Weiler 1988). Before Indigenous Standpoint theory is discussed in detail, it is pertinent that the emancipatory theories that have allowed the rebirth of Indigenous standpoint (Foley 2002a) be discussed from the Indigenous perspective. They form the foundation of the reconstruction of Indigenous approaches to knowledge in a format and argument that the non-Indigenous scholar is familiar with.

4.1.4 Critical Theory

The first emancipatory theory to be discussed is Critical theory. Critical theory stimulates self-reflection in order to free those being researched from the restrictions and repression of the established social order with its repressive ideologies (Fay 1987, 1996; Ogbor 2000). A fundamental goal of Critical theory is to: ‘free individual groups and society from conditions of domination, powerlessness and oppression, which reduce the control over their own lives’ (Rigney 1997: 633). In the acceptance of Critical theory as a liberating epistemology in its commitment to human emancipation through its reformation of society, positivist scientific methods are rejected. Yet Critical theory still maintains a racialised epistemological approach, as do all dominant theories in its overtly political intentions (Rigney 1997; Weiss Hanrahan 2000). These same political intentions suit the Indigenous perspective as they allow the Indigenous
researcher a process to tackle colonialism with its inherent characteristics of oppression and power (Rigney 1997). In the historical development of emancipatory theory, Feminist Standpoint theory has also evolved with a liberating agenda similar to Indigenous epistemological development.

4.1.5 Feminist Standpoint Theory

Feminist Standpoint theory allows a different approach to be taken to examine a construct such as 'Indigenous discourse'. In doing so there is a need to ensure that Feminist epistemology is not seen as singular (Harding 1991). Feminist epistemologies include feminist empiricism, feminist standpoint and feminist postmodernism (Harding 1991; Wuest 1995). The development of the theoretical paradigms of feminist standpoint has been instrumental in the development of the new humanities and social science over the last few decades (Fuery and Mansfield 2000). Feminist standpoint discredits sociology's claim to constitute an objective knowledge that is independent of a sociological situation, in that the only way of knowing a socially constructed world is to know it from within (Smith 1974). Feminist standpoint is the evolutionary base of Indigenous standpoint; and refers to a position in society, be it in the women's or in this interpretation the Indigenous position. This position in society is a way to make sense of what is affected by the dominant discourse and society in general. The application of feminist standpoint can help shape structures of power, work and wealth when it is conceptualized into reality from the vantage point of women’s lives (Hennessy 1992). Moreton-Robinson (2000) and Smith (1999) have taken feminist standpoint to another level in relation to a standpoint within Indigenous research.

Smith (1999) writes of *Kaupapa Maori* research which involves a collectivist (holistic) approach encouraging the researcher to work together with the community on an equal basis to reach a shared understanding. The researcher negotiates at all levels of the research design with the community participants as well as during the implementation, data collection and analysis stages to obtain cultural and political integrity in the research findings (Rigney 1999). The development of this reciprocal research approach has parallels in feminist application as it challenges the neo-colonial dominance of research that historically has been based on the
researcher dominating the 'subject' where the findings benefit the researcher. This is reversed in the Kaupapa Maori application (Rigney 1999).

Kaupapa Maori maintains intricate cultural aspects that are positioned similarly to earlier developments in feminist research. Moreton-Robinson (2000) recasts Feminist Standpoint theory and looks at the Indigenous women’s position, which is different from that of the ‘white’ feminist, as it also is based on racial oppression. Huggins (1991, 1998) espoused a concept of non-gender Indigenous standpoint that both Smith (1999) and Moreton-Robinson (2000) have developed. From the feminist standpoint we have witnessed the development of the Indigenous women’s standpoint. From this development ‘Indigenous Standpoint theory’ is the theoretical paradigm that follows. It has its foundations in the works of numerous Indigenous female scholars that include (and are not restricted to): Bin-Sallik (1990), Brady (1992), Huggins (1991, 1998), Ingram (1990), Meyer (1998, 2001), Moreton-Robinson (2000), Smith (1999), and Trask (1999). From the writer’s matriarchal lineage, this development is significant as within the writer’s cultural space, women have the sacred skills of the keeping and teaching of knowledge (Foley 2001). The development of the Indigenous women’s standpoint strengthens the argument of Indigenous epistemology.

4.1.6 Insider-Outsider Theory
The last theory discussed is Insider-Outsider theory, which is an approach used to justify many wrongs in social science research. It is not to be confused with Social Identity theory which is a psychological version of Insider-Outsider theory. The social base of insider doctrine derives from the non-indigenous male Anglo-European elite (Merton 1996). In its extreme, it moves towards a doctrine of social solipsism where the collective group has a monopoly on knowledge about itself and/or individual solipsism where the individual has absolute privacy of knowledge (Merton 1996). Merton (1996) illustrates this in the person with a toothache; he/she is the only one in reality who can experience the pain. This is similar to the standpoint of Smith (1999) Moreton-Robinson (2000) and Huggins (1991, 1998) that the purity of the research outcomes is enhanced if the Indigenous is researched by the Indigenous. The social epistemology of Insider theory may seem extreme and in generalizing it would appear that only black can study black and only ‘white’ can study ‘white’ (Merton 1996). From an Indigenous perspective, this
rationale is justified when applied to the study of Indigenous peoples as western discourse has already been identified as discriminatory, Anglo-European determined and ideologically controlled (Ogbor 2000). Insider theory when combined with the logic of Grounded theory allows the data to emerge without forcing it (Glaser 1992), without inhibition from the Indigenous participant (when combined with an Indigenous researcher). In contrast, minority researchers: ‘have noticed how the white skin of dominant researchers adds to the authoritative posture of European-descent ethnographers’ (Stanfield 1994: 176), which must effect the validity and objectivity and create bias in the research outcomes.

The insider doctrine also holds that the outsider has a structurally imposed incapacity to comprehend alien groups, their status, their culture and societies. The outsider has neither been socialized within the group nor engaged in the run of experience that makes up the groups life, and therefore cannot have the direct intuitive sensibility that makes empathic understanding possible (Merton 1996). In its application to this paper, Outsider theory supports the view that non-indigenous Australia cannot and possibly will never understand the complexities of Indigenous Australia at the same level of empathy as an Indigenous Australian researcher can achieve (Foley 2002a). This is ratified by the Indigenous standpoint of the researcher’s ‘idenstity’, which cements the approach to methodology that is culturally neither confronting nor disrespectful (Rigney 1999). Western discourse from the Indigenous perspective has been examined, the logical progression is to now examine Indigenous philosophy developing an Indigenous discourse before Indigenous ‘standpoint’ is considered. This doctoral thesis overall investigates human values in Indigenous entrepreneurial activity, which explores both Indigenous community values and business values. It would be imprudent of the researcher not to explain Indigenous philosophy as Indigenous philosophy is the basis of Indigenous value concepts and is the crucial, core component of the matrix that is Indigenous Standpoint theory. Indigenous Philosophy as an integral area of discussion is therefore outlined in the following paragraphs.

4.1.7 Indigenous Philosophy
Indigenous philosophy has three interacting worlds; the Physical World, the Human World, and the Sacred World (Institute for Aboriginal Development 2000; Lougher personal conversation
September 1964). The inter-relationship of these worlds is illustrated in the diagram shown in Figure 8:

**FIGURE 8  INDIGENOUS PHILOSOPHY.**

These three worlds are best explained as follows:

- **Physical World:** The physical world is the base that is land, the creation that is the mother. The land is food, culture, spirit and Indigenous identity. The physical world encapsulates the land, the sky and all living organisms.

- **Human World:** The human world involves the knowledge, approaches to people, family, and rules of behaviour, ceremonies, and their capacity to change.

- **Sacred World:** The sacred world is not based entirely in the metaphysical, as some would believe. Its foundation is in healing (both the spiritual and physical well being of all creatures), the lore (the retention and reinforcement of oral history), care of country, the laws and their maintenance.

Aboriginal philosophy is the triangulation of the Physical, the Human and the Sacred worlds (Institute for Aboriginal Development 2000; Lougher personal conversation September 1964). Indigenous pedagogy is often misunderstood and not an issue in the education agenda (Andrews and Hughes 1993). The possible application of the Indigenous philosophy into contemporary Indigenous discourse in approaches to knowledge is still a somewhat novel concept however it is the basis of Indigenous value concepts and is the crucial, core component of the matrix that is
Indigenous Standpoint theory. The application of Indigenous philosophy into Indigenous academic rigour has been strengthened by the development of two Australian Indigenous perspectives; the Japanangka Paradigm (West 1998) and the Indigenist research perspective (Rigney 1999). In illustrating these two concepts the Native Hawaiian epistemological approach is also discussed by adopting Dr. Manulani Aluii Meyer's (1998, 2001) interpretation of Indigenous epistemology. Collectively these works provide differing views that enhance each other in the explanation of a difficult subject, Indigenous philosophy. The cumulative result of these views is the construction of a model of Indigenous epistemology and a preliminary framework of what is Indigenous Standpoint theory.

4.1.8 Contemporary Indigenous Approaches to Knowledge

The first of three Indigenous approaches to knowledge is the Japanangka approach, the Japanangka paradigm.

4.1.8.1 The Japanangka Paradigm

The late Professor Japanangka errol West's work on Aboriginal philosophy is complex, a complexity that resides in an ontology that treasures mother earth beyond human life itself (West 1998). This understanding is as follows:

Our Ontology, as I understand it, is the reverential connections between the spiritual realms of operations of the universe and the material operating platform or the physical earth, of the treasured Mother; acting in accord beyond peaceful co-existence. The beyond is, I believe the unalienable tenure of relevance to life, birth, and death that engulfs the spiritual and material Mother in a cyclic pattern of perpetuity (West 1998: 2).

West's (1998) view supports the trilogy as discussed in the previous section concerning the Physical, the Human and the Sacred worlds. Aboriginal Australian ontology is based in these realms. Aboriginal philosophy about why we are and what we do is the nexus, the bond that is defined via our continual contacts to and with our ancestral spirits and Mother Earth (West 1998).

West explored the western schools of methodology, metaphysics and theory of value. In discussing methodology he acknowledged that epistemology is a branch of philosophy that investigates the origin, nature, methods and limits of human knowledge (West 1998). Subsequently, western epistemology differs to Indigenous Australian epistemology in that
Indigenous Australians already know the origin, nature, methods and limits of their knowledge systems. Yet because of their spiritual sense, (and respect for that knowledge) unlike the Anglo-European academic they lack the capacity to flaunt that knowledge as a badge of intellect in public (West 1998).

To the Indigenous Australian: ‘our ontology is the inherent meshing of the spiritual events and the material world. This includes literal geographical connections and related events that occur regularly in our lives’ (West 1998: 3). It is this ontology that explains how and why things are so, which forms the basis of the Japanangka paradigm.

The eight subsets of the paradigm are the cultural, the spiritual, the secular, the intellectual, the political, the practical, the personal, and the public dimensions that construct the metaphysical. Each of these dimensions is critical in the establishment of the comprehensive holistic philosophical discourse developed by West (1998) under the direction of a Walpiri elder. A summary of these eight dimensions is follows:

- **The Cultural Dimension**
  Daily situations and circumstances (that relates to any Koori person), that defines and articulates responses, emanating from an Indigenous individual who positioning him/herself in the past, immediate past, present, instant future and immediate future in planning a response.

- **The Spiritual Dimension**
  The personal globalization of metaphysical theocratic personalities that authorize the internal and interpretative responses and reasoning, equating an experience or circumstance, anticipated or unanticipated outcomes with ontological explanations not requiring public domain or extra-personal definitions and discrete understandings.

- **The Secular Dimension**
  The personal and public domain experience and circumstance, conflict situation experiences and global cosmological directionalism, that are defined in the ‘timeless’ sense that congeals an Indigenous individual’s cultural dimensions, similar to the regular state one finds oneself in, in the context of issues of the spiritual dimension or sub-paradigm.

- **The Intellectual Dimension**
The sphere of Indigenous cosmos that contains the ethereal tapestry of thought divination established through the continual and contiguous application of all eight Japanangka sub-paradigms on a life cycle continuum. The cycle is self-rejuvenating, continually healing the fabric of life of an individual and collective Aboriginal humanity. It is the Intellectual dimension that confounds everyone, Indigenous or not because there is little belief and less living awareness and almost no recognition of this dimensions. It requires nurturing from all of the other seven dimensions for it to become an established dimension in its own right.

- The Political Dimension
This dimension applies in the context of the research sub-paradigm matrix of eight dimensions of a social conscience logistic that projects across the twin worlds of Indigenous and non-Indigenous universal paradigms. It draws on applicability and integrity, as benchmarks for all action, in speaking towards an Aboriginal philosophy in pursuit of the research paradigm. The dimension requires the expenditure of some or all of the individual energies contained in all of the other seven dimensions, including its own dimension; if a holistic outcome or set of outcomes is to occur.

- The Practical Dimension
There is no place or time for hypothetical or ontological/theocratic posturing beyond the circumstance of the moment. The fact that the human body is principally constructed from water does not prevent thirst from extinguishing a human life. So too with knowledge unless it serves a purpose of significant immediacy it seems of little use to an Indigenous mind.

- The Personal Dimension
This encompasses the notion of satisfaction or purpose for living and should be the bread of activity. The purpose of life is indeed life itself the primary obligation for Indigenous peoples in that the personal dimension of this philosophy/research paradigm is to maintain life essence. An Indigenous person’s life essence is within the metaphor of the dimension the equivalent to the individual wattage that when combined to produce a force of energy, that energy is powerful enough to provide a power source capable of lighting and powering a major global village.

- The Public Dimension
A construct of a series of artefacts of cultural pluralism that configurations into the holism of the philosophy of the Japanangka Research Paradigm in much the same way that Uluru is an alignment of cosmic and human experiences compacted into a solid icon of overwhelming spiritual import and physical dominance. This icon is a monolithic symbol of eternity expressed in ephemeral and literal symbolism and, as such, is a beacon of enlightenment for Indigenous peoples for many and varied secular and ontological reasons (West 1998).

West's (1998) research paradigm is complex and contiguous in its vertical and horizontal thought process. In its design it eliminates the need for any cultural universality amongst differing Indigenous Australian nations as the user determines the intensity and content of application. The user seeks self-actualization in the process of applying the paradigm (West 1998). West (1998) outlines a process that is effective for Indigenous research to develop in a holistic learning environment. It provides a three-dimensional approach to Indigenous research in its application and process.

The next view examined is Indigenist Research, which is an approach in a different context to that of the Japanangka paradigm (West 1998). Irabinna Rigney (1999) provides an Indigenous justification for Indigenous research whereas Japanangka West (1998) provides the Indigenous process.

4.1.8.2 Indigenist Research

Lester-Irabinna Rigney's (1999) views on Indigenist Research follow three fundamental and interrelated principles that form a strategy to research rather than a research process. They are:

- resistance as the emancipatory imperative in Indigenist research,
- political integrity in Indigenist research, and
- privileging Indigenous voices in Indigenist research (Rigney 1999).

- Resistance as the emancipatory imperative in Indigenist Research

This is research undertaken as part of Indigenous Australia's struggle for recognition and self-determination. This is justified in the statement: 'whilst the primary goal of Indigenist research is self-determination and the resistance of radicalization, it can also be used for quantitative or qualitative research for self-benefit' (Rigney 1999: 13).
This approach rejects the dehumanizing characterization of Indigenous peoples as the oppressed victims in need of charity by challenging the power and control that traditional research has had on knowledge over the ‘other’ (Rigney 1997).

**Political Integrity in Indigenist Research**

Once again this is research that is undertaken to assist the Indigenous struggle; it must be by the Indigenous researcher. For far too long the Indigenous struggle for self-determination has been indebted to research undertaken by the non-indigenous researcher (Rigney 1997). This function must entail a social link between ‘research’ and the political struggle of Indigenous Australia. Then the research serves and informs the political struggle making the researcher responsible to the Indigenous community (Rigney 1997).

**Privileging Indigenous voices in Indigenist Research**

The privileging of the Indigenist voice is shown in the following:

... Indigenist research is research which focuses on the lived, historical experiences, ideas, traditions, dreams, interests, aspirations and struggles of Indigenous Australians. It is Indigenous Australians who are the primary subjects of Indigenist research. Indigenist research is research which gives voice to Indigenous people (Rigney 1997: 118).

Rigney (1997) qualifies this by acknowledging that there is not cultural homogeneity among Indigenous Australians and the minds of Indigenous researchers are not free of colonial hegemony (colonial internalization), or that being Indigenous will make the researcher a better representative of Indigenous Australia (Rigney 1997). Indigenous researchers have the potential to be (and are in many instances) more aware and respectful of each other’s cultural traditions. Above all, they are accountable not only to their academic institutions but also their Indigenous communities. From an Indigenous epistemological standpoint it is culturally appropriate that Indigenous Australians speak through Indigenous researchers (Rigney 1997).

Whilst Rigney’s position has great merit, unless objectivity is maintained the Indigenous researcher could easily fall prey to criticism previously outlined in the negative aspects of western discourse in Indigenous research. Bias could be a problem if the researcher is responsible directly to the community. That pressure could influence outcomes. The connection
between researcher/researched and position in the ‘skin group’ could determine or subjugate
discussion to the inexperienced Indigenous researcher (Foley 2002a).

It is possible that few of the existing or the next generation Indigenous researchers are
aware of the cultural complexities of Indigenist Research. The Rigney (1999) approach possibly
raises more questions than answers. As Indigenous researchers are trained in western praxis it is
easy to understand why they may inadvertently follow the western standpoints/stereotypes
especially if they are subjugated (shackled) with non-indigenous supervision (Budby 2001).
Both the Japanangka West (1998) and Rigney (1999) approaches indicate seniority, possibly
maturity and experience, as essential Indigenous researcher attributes.

To enrich this discussion another Indigenous perspective needs to be visited. The third
approach discussed is a contemporary narrative on Native Hawaiian epistemology (Meyer 2001,
1998).

4.1.8.3 Indigenous Hawaiian Epistemology
Hawaiian epistemology is both an ancient and modern idea that is both central and marginalized
within Hawaiian and Anglo-American cultures (Meyer 2001). It is a distinct feature of Hawaiian
culture that cannot easily be distinguished from the fabric into which it is sewn (Meyer 2001).
The context of the traditional, the ancient, can be explained in the modern context, and the
reader should not be seduced into the negative definitions that Western discourse implies in
trying to define what is traditional verses contemporary on Indigenous matters. Ownership in a
concepts in a mixture of Meyer’s own Native Hawaiian language and the subjugating colonial
language, English.

The environmental imagery that includes stone, water and forest serve as both metaphor
and inspiration for the theme they represent. Each image holds multiple truths and is filled with
kaona, multiple meanings. The Hawaiian epistemology is based on the multiple meanings and
understanding, (or rather significance) of ocean, land, stone, water, wind, forest and lastiy sky
(Meyer 1998).

The importance of Meyer’s (1998, 2001) work is in the almost identical overlay of
Hawaiian metaphors to the Aboriginal Gai-mariagal metaphor of the writer (Foley 2001).
Meyer's (1998, 2001) work may appear convenient in its application. The critic could argue that a published Indigenous view has been adopted to 'fit' the Indigenous standpoint discussion. However in its correlation within the Indigenous Gai-mariagal position of the author, the Meyer (1998, 2001) epistemological position is accurate in its overlay as the metaphorical conduit that is respectful in its explanation as shown in the following model.

4.1.9 Indigenous Standpoint Theory

Considering this epistemological stance of Indigenous Australian standpoint, the philosophy of the Physical, the Human, and the Sacred World, together with the Japanangka West (1998) and Rigney (1999) Indigenist 'strategy' approach, the complexities and possibly an underlying position pertaining to the subject can be understood. An interpretation of these varying positions is shown in the following diagram (see Figure 9), which is simplistic and interactive in that the West (1998), Rigney (1999) and Meyer (1998, 2001) positions inter-relate with the Indigenous philosophy of the three worlds.

The interpretation of these is apparent in the following model:
There is a connection between the strategy of the Rigney Indigenist view (Rigney 1997, 1999), which justifies the resistance associated with the Physical World, political integrity in the Human World, and the Indigenist voice emanating from the Sacred World. The application of the Native Hawaiian epistemology as illustrated by Meyer (1998, 2001) provides a metaphorical sphere that encapsulates the three philosophical worlds of the Indigenous Australian philosophy providing the Indigenous researcher with a foundation to explain the physical and metaphysical aspects of Indigenous knowledge. Within this understanding, include the Japanangka Paradigm (West 1998) which is a conceptual framework, a process that enables the Indigenous researcher to act within their Indigenous ‘space and place’ participating in their Indigenous ontology (and Indigenous epistemological position).
Meyer’s (1998, 2001) work may appear convenient in its application. The critic could argue that a published Indigenous view has been adopted to ‘fit’ the Indigenous standpoint discussion. However in its correlation within the Indigenous Gai-mariagal position of the author, the Meyer (1998, 2001) epistemological position is accurate in its overlay as the metaphorical conduit that is respectful in its explanation as shown in the following model.

4.1.9 Indigenous Standpoint Theory

Considering this epistemological stance of Indigenous Australian standpoint, the philosophy of the Physical, the Human, and the Sacred World, together with the Japanangka West (1998) and Rigney (1999) Indigenist ‘strategy’ approach, the complexities and possibly an underlying position pertaining to the subject can be understood. An interpretation of these varying positions is shown in the following diagram (see Figure 9), which is simplistic and interactive in that the West (1998), Rigney (1999) and Meyer (1998, 2001) positions inter-relate with the Indigenous philosophy of the three worlds.

The interpretation of these is apparent in the following model:
Wherever possible the traditional language should be the first form of recording. English interpretation should be the secondary method of recording (Foley 2002a). These four criteria and the application of the model form the basis of what is Indigenous Standpoint theory. They have arisen from discussions with Indigenous peoples of several lands, from Indigenous academics, the ‘educated’, the non-educated in western formal schooling (but well versed in Indigenous knowledge), and seniors including ‘Elder’ Indigenous advisers. Above all, comment was sought from the grandfathers and grandmothers who have lived through colonial subjugation and who have a desire to teach the young of their culture (Foley 2002a). From this basic outline, an Indigenous Standpoint theory has been formulated and the fieldwork for this thesis, ‘Understanding Indigenous Entrepreneurship’ may now commence. The fieldwork is now based on a theory that until recently was an arbitrary concept. The application of this theory in the case study procedures will be discussed in the following section.

4.2 Case Study Procedures

4.2.1 Introduction

The case study research strategy focuses on understanding the dynamics present within a single setting combining data collections from several sources including archives, interviews, questionnaires and observations.

The case study process involves personal introduction by an intermediary to the business owner, informal contact to explain the interview and establish a suitable time and venue that is comfortable for the participant. This is followed by research into recorded data (available documents) on the enterprise or individual if available. This resulted in an initial interview of one to two hours which was then followed by a transcription of the verbal interview and notes into hard copy format. In numerous instances the initial interview was followed up by a further interview that often lasted as long as four hours. A copy of the basic interview format can be found in attachment one. The hard copy of the interview was subsequently coded, analysed, and data cross-compared and follow up meetings held to clarify areas requiring further study. Finally, feedback is provided to the participant to ensure that they agree with the transcripts and note taking. This then allows for any possible subsequent amendments.
4.2.2 Case Study Parameters

The participants of the study must be Indigenous, self-employed entrepreneurs engaged predominantly in small business undertakings, operating individually as sole traders, partnerships or Proprietary Limited Companies. Aboriginal Corporations (incorporated under the Aboriginal Councils and Associations Act 1976 or the Hawaiian counterpart) are not included as they obtain taxation benefits and status as non-profit organizations.

The literature review is possibly critical of the geographic limitations of previous research into Indigenous Australian business. What some see as the remote stereotyped ‘outback Aboriginal’ will not be interviewed in this study which is confined to research on ‘Urban Aboriginal’ based enterprises. The study samples the bulk of the Indigenous Australian population (72.6%) (ABS 1999), which is the east coast urban Indigenous Australian. Two exceptions to the study include a commercial farm and a large accommodation/cultural enterprise on the outskirts of Adelaide. These were included because of their city based Indigenous management. It is accepted that the bulk of successful Indigenous businesses are also in the urban setting yet as mentioned previously, the majority of literature on Indigenous business to date is concentrated on the rural remote.

Unfortunately, some view the rural remote Indigenous Australian as the ‘exotic’ Aboriginal which is reinforced by segments of popular media and tourism literature. Sections of the disciplines of Sociology and Anthropology have also for far too long seen the remote Indigenous Australian as a ‘cash cow’ in their research and publication endeavours. This is arguably evident in the concentration of literature that is available on this group (Foley 2002b, 2003c). The writer does not wish to belittle the importance and validation of existing literature on rural remote Indigenous enterprises. To the contrary, this study has been undertaken to expand the knowledge base on Indigenous Australian business undertakings to include the urban entrepreneurs as a necessary addition. In addition, the Hawaiian enterprises were either city based or within a short distance of major urban centres and were included for similar reasons as are the ‘urban’ Indigenous Australian. Native Hawaiians also suffer from exploitation from some sectors within academia and the media that do not portray the contemporary societal issues of
the urban environment. Rather it is the ‘exotic’ and often sexually inferred research that dominates Hawaiian literature (Trask 1999).

4.2.2.1 Australia

In the Australian study, all participants comply with the definition of an Indigenous Australian in that they must satisfy the definition of an Indigenous Australian as adopted by ATSIC: that is, they are Indigenous by descent, by self recognition and by recognition of their community. The Australian sample will be limited to the eastern seaboard, Tasmania and the Southeast area of South Australia, primarily capital cities and major regional centres. This covers as a basic framework the environs of; Cairns, Brisbane, Newcastle, Sydney, Wollongong, Canberra, Melbourne, Adelaide, Launceston and Hobart. Preliminary investigation in Darwin, Alice Springs and Perth were undertaken however satisfactory community introductions were not obtained at that time to ensure that this research became a national study.

Participants were sought from all areas of the community. Introductions came from existing networks that include ATSIC, government agencies, chartered accounting firms that have Indigenous business development sections, Chambers of Commerce and other small business contacts. With such a small sample base of Indigenous entrepreneurs, biases in participant selection are not applicable, as all willing participants were studied. The names and pertinent demographic details of the business enterprises and the participants will remain confidential in keeping with the requirements of the University of Queensland Ethics Committee. In addition, those businesses that are not more than 51% Indigenous owned and managed, together with businesses that gain income from illegal means and businesses that are Aboriginal Corporations and/or obtained recurrent funding from ATSIC will not be included in the final study.

Twenty five studies were snowball selected (Weiss 1994), twenty two were interviewed based on a semi-structured format, the other three were also interviewed on the same format however the writer had the opportunity of working in these organisations for periods ranging from a few days to several months to observe interaction and discuss relevant issues in depth. Participatory based action research methodology was applied to these three participants. The
data collection process of interview and participatory action research is explained in more depth in following sections. The data collection in process in Hawaii is outlined next.

4.2.2.2 Hawaii

A possible problem arose on the initial comparison of definitions for Native Hawaiians and Indigenous Australians. As mentioned in Chapter 2, the definition of who is an Indigenous Hawaiian is more complex than the Australian definition. The United States federal government defines a Native Hawaiian as having at least 50% or more Native blood quantum (Trask 1999). This creates many difficulties for the researcher in determining who is Indigenous. For simplicity and standardization (and following consultation with academic staff at the School of Hawaiian Studies, University of Hawaii and senior Hawaiian community leaders) the Australian definition (as defined in Chapter 2.1) has been adopted in the Hawaiian field research. Therefore, for the purpose of this study a Native Hawaiian is Hawaiian by descent, by self-recognition and by community recognition. It is accepted (following community consultation) that delineation by blood quantum percentiles is racist and will not be applied to this study.

The Hawaiian case study is limited to the major islands of Oahu, Hawaii, Maui, Kauai and Molokai, as these islands have large commercial centres and the majority of the Native Hawaiian population. Participants were actively sought from all areas of the community. Introductions were gained from existing networks that included the Maori Ministry of Economic Development, Hawaiian Alliance for Community-Based Economic Development, Office of Hawaiian Affairs, government agencies, and the University of Hawaii’s Pacific School of Business Studies.

4.2.3 Case Study Protocols and Ethics of the Research Methodology

The void in academic writings on Indigenous entrepreneurs has resulted in a lack of ‘standardized’ ethical research procedures specific to this specialized area of study. In undertaking this study it is crucial that an ethical approach be established that is both acceptable academically in an anthropological approach (Yamada 1991) and acceptable academically within Indigenous epistemology (Rigney 1999; Smith 1999). The methodological approach has resulted in the adoption and development of the ethical standards of both the academic and indigenous paradigms. Ethical standards prevalent in the fields of anthropology,
Ethnomusicology contained within the parameters of academic codes of conduct have been adopted (Bird and Frankel 1998: 35–38; Society for Ethnomusicology 1994: 53–58). The foundation for this approach to the study is found within the Manual for Ethnomusicologists and the Australian Archaeological Association Code of Ethics. These established codes and ethics provide an honest approach to Indigenous research, respecting the informants’ beliefs and traditions, maintaining confidentiality, cultivating an honest relationship with the informants, avoiding secrecy, and providing intellectual rigour of an ethical standard. Data collection has to be sensitive to ensure that relevant facts of a personal nature are suitably addressed without offending the participant (Broome 1994).

The second protocol is the University of Queensland’s Code of Conduct, in particular adherence to the principles of ethical conduct of research in that:

1. The ethical principle of voluntary informed consent to research participation by human subjects should be respected. The ideas, information or intellectual contribution of others should be acknowledged appropriately and the intellectual property of others respected (University of Queensland 1997: Sec.4.14, HA1, and Vol.1).

Consent to participate in research has been obtained formally in writing. Interviews were in settings that were comfortable for both the interviewer and interviewee, allowing for flexible time frames to ensure that the respondent did not tire, which could reduce the quality of the recording. It was recommended that interviews were carried out in the comfort of the respondent’s normal surroundings (Weiss 1994), be it their workplace or their residence. Initial interviews were scheduled for thirty minutes to one hour. It was anticipated based on previous experience, (Foley 2000a) that the second interview would take between one to three hours. Follow ups to check transcripts and accuracy of data collection were also allowed for and the participant had this explained to them at the first meeting.

It is important that a level of understanding is established with the respondents, enabling them to become comfortable with the writer on the first visit, allowing the interview process to run smoothly on subsequent visits. If there appeared to be tension or a problem following the initial visit, the situation would be resolved or the interview cancelled.
4.2.4 The Analytical Processes

In the collecting of data there were two distinct processes, firstly the interview and secondly participatory action research. Data collection is discussed first, then the process of coding the information, which is then followed by explanations of the interview process and participatory action research.

4.2.4.1 Data Collection

Data collection was oral, which conforms to the cultural norm of Indigenous society. Interviews were recorded on audio with supporting notes. A process of cross comparison of data analysis of coding was used to ensure correct classification and recording of outcomes (Denzin and Lincoln 1998), together with the application of Fay’s (1987) interpretation and format which assisted in the overall reliability of the project.

4.2.4.2 Coding

Substantive Coding (open coding and constant comparative coding) (Glaser 1992) was used in the analysis of the interview data. Attention was given to recognizing data and relevant underlying patterns of incidents of data, fixing attention on obvious patterns or common incidents in data (open coding). Once a category was established, the data was examined to discover any emergent properties by constantly coding and analysing the data (constant comparative coding) (Glaser 1992).

4.2.4.3 Interviews

A semi-structured interview was the preferred format. This places a heavy reliance on the personal intuitive skills of the interviewer in using probing techniques to build an understanding as the interviewee reveals additional information about themself or their business.

Procedures in the actual fieldwork involved:

- sourcing participants,
- conducting the initial interview in a comfortable non-threatening venue to establish the credibility of the interviewer and the participant’s acceptance of the interview process,
- ensuring that participants met the specifications of the project,
- transcribing the interview, including coding and recording outcomes,
• conducting subsequent visits and contacts with the participants to follow up on outstanding points that require clarification, and
• analysing data, recording of outcomes and further comparative analysis.

4.2.5 Participatory Action Research

Three of the Australian participants were studied and interviewed using a technique that is referred to as participatory action research (PAR). This method of data collection involved the researcher actively working within the participants businesses. Case study research involves normally places the researcher in a passive observer note taking/interview function. PAR is interaction within the organisation (Locke 2001). In the three Australian studies, the researcher had the opportunity to experience the flexibility of the methodology of PAR to experience the empowerment of the participants and their self-determination (Reason 1994). PAR is an ‘openly ideological research [method]’ Lather 1986: 6) that is a liberatory inquiry in that its purpose is to create personal and social transformation (Smith 1997). Any transformation is achieved through action and the production of knowledge for the immediate use of the participants in a ‘process of self-awareness through collective self-inquiry and reflection’ (Fals-Borda and Rahman 1991:16 cited in Reason 1994:328)). PAR has also been described as research through action and/or activity within the organisation that allows the exposure of valid knowledge through positive social change (Huizer 1979). PAR is both an instigator of action (and possibly change) together with being a subversive activity that challenges the status quo (Fals-Borda 1991; Smilor 1997).

Action research had its origins in Europe in the early 1900’s and was developed as a methodology by the social psychologist Kurt Lewin in the United States during WWII (Lewin 1946). It is a valid methodological approach that is recognised as a form of collective self inquiry, it is participatory and problem posing (and solving) (Locke 2001; Kemmis 1999; Kemmis and McTaggart 1988; Smith 1997). It is collaborative, engages the critical recovery of circumstances by the researcher with the participant, it is non-intrusive in that it moves along with the participant rather than confronting them and can have a positive outcome for the participant by capacity-building and confidence-building (Atkinson 2001; Kemmis 1999; Locke 2001; McTaggart 1991).

In conclusion the legitimacy of using PAR is that:
[p]articipatory action research is one of the few Western research methodologies to have received acceptance amongst Indigenous Australians, at a time when Indigenous researchers are calling for research which serves and informs the Indigenous struggle for self-determination, and are increasingly developing their own methodologies to encompass Indigenous knowledge and Aboriginal worldviews (Bennett 2005: 65).

It was never envisaged that PAR be applied to all of the participants studied. The researcher maximised an opportunity to enrich the study by its inclusion after being invited to work for three of the Australian participants. The utilisation of PAR is defended in Bennett’s (2005) thesis.

4.2.6 Summary of Case Study Procedures

The case study approach has been chosen (beyond the inclusion of participatory action research) for this research as in general the case study is a preferred strategy when ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions are posed especially if the focus of the study is within a real-life context (Yin 1991). This research approach involves exploring patterns of behaviour within specific social organizations (Eden and Huxman 1996; Glaser 1992; Yin 1991). In this case, it is the social and psychological organization of the Indigenous entrepreneurs.

To maintain objectivity, the data collecting methods and research approach has been cross-validated by a senior Indigenous academic on a regular basis. In these sessions it was not simply the data recorded that was important. Rather it was the way the researcher approached the participants and the manner in which the data was recorded that was important. This can be explained in that the majority of research to date in Indigenous cultures and values has been conducted from an Anglo-European pedagogy and epistemology that is without mechanisms to distinguish Indigenous values (Rigney 1999; Smith 1999). This epistemological approach to research in general does not allow for Indigenous pedagogy or Indigenous epistemology to be considered as appropriate (Nakata 1998; Rigney 1999). By being randomly vetted, or audited by an [Indigenous] Elder, the researcher has been able to maintain an Indigenous epistemological approach to the study’s methodology.

Before the Indigenous approach to knowledge (epistemology) and the development of Indigenous Standpoint theory is discussed the nature of Indigenous behaviour is first examined.
4.2.7 Explaining Human Behaviour (i.e. Indigenous Australian Behaviour)

To record the values of Indigenous Australians, the criteria of an anthropological application of observation will be considered in the construction of an inclusive system. Emic and etic approaches will be considered in the explanation of human behaviour. The emic approach to observation is an anthropological method with its origins in the Boasian school of thought (Pelto and Pelto 1978) stemming from Franz Boas teaching in the 1940s.

The criticism of this methodology is that by Boas’s own admission: ‘the very rigidity of definition may lead to a misunderstanding of the essential problems [data] involved’ (Boas 1943: 314). To record value systems of the Indigenous Australian entrepreneur with the emic method is to assume that there are formal patterns of mechanical models within the kinship system. This is incorrect for in its extreme application, it ensures that most members of a given society display cognitive semantic homogenecity (Pelto and Pelto 1978). The emic method does not allow for variances within the Indigenous kinship system. The assumption of the excessive idealistic application of human behaviour of homogenecity verses heterogeneity has been criticised by notable researchers such as Marvin Harris (1974) and Pelto and Pelto (1978). This criticism has led to uncovering emic views. For theories to be valid they must be qualitatively grounded (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Guba and Lincoln 1994; Strauss and Corbin 1990). The grounding is crucial following criticism of the social sciences in failing to provide accounts of non-mainstream lives or provide material to support criticism of Western culture (Guba and Lincoln 1994; Marcus and Fischer 1986)

The ideology and belief systems of Indigenous Australians cannot be denied; neither can the varied content of their different beliefs be simply qualified in the emic approach. Adequate description of value systems involves careful consideration of variables that include non-language factors, material conditions and influences on the individual or family group, social relationships and the impact of technology and/or the cultural ‘modernity’ of contemporary Australian society. Such variables would have to be included in a frame of reference in understanding the value systems.

Any assessment instruments or ‘value scales’ used by a surveying party (or observer/analyser) in a Western country such as Australia, would be subject to standardised and
Western conceptualizations. The emic approach is a biased assessment as the instruments of comparison and their inherent classifications are inadequate to recognise the complexity of the Indigenous group (Wright and Kaluai 1994).

Marvin Harris, one of the most outspoken critics of emicists, proposed a new ethnography of his own in the study of human behaviour. Harris looks at the effect of multi-environmental factors on body motion, which may be in contradiction with or be above the threshold of the observer's auditory and visual senses (Pelto and Pelto 1978). The eticists understand that unlike the emic approach, you cannot rely on verbal behaviour as evidence to determine culture outcomes. The etic research methodology must be intense allowing for complex observation on all the cultural variables of human behaviour to determine the outcomes of the behaviour. As an example, the variables in such areas of study as authority require inordinate time commitments of observation.

Confirmation of this can be obtained from previous research in this field by Del Iavenon, Erickson, Johnson, Silverberg and others (Pelto and Pelto 1978). Yet the outcomes of this research are culturally limited, the results cannot be generalised and applied to homogenous groups due to the cultural variables in the study groups. This is despite the large allocation of resources applied to this research.

From the Indigenous Australian's research perspective, the crucial difference between the emic and the etic data is the applied cultural sensitivity of the researcher and the outcomes of the research purpose. In the gathering of field data, if structured interview schedules are applied based on verbal responses rather than other forms of observation then the interview process is emic in its application. The data recording is done in an ethnocentric anthropological application. How does the researcher allow for the theoretical definitions of reality (from the Indigenous Australian perspective) of indices of modernisation, of cosmopolitisation and of technology? A case study participant may often be the first member of their family to seek self-employment divorcing themselves from the subjugating cycles of 'safe' public service type jobs or at the other extreme, 'welfare dependency'.

The soundness of the methodology supporting case study analysis needs to ensure that rigour is not sacrificed by emic approaches stifling the interpretation of data to only one
dimension of evaluation. The etic method of behavioural observation, identifying systems and patterns of behaviour through qualitative analysis must be based on the cultural generalisations of the observed rather than the cultural standards of the observer. The researcher must elicit the terminology, the cultural domains and the societal values of the individual being examined and realise that these qualifications may be different for each and every Indigenous Australian group encountered.

A previous case study from a consultancy that the author was involved in that is relevant to these issues concerns a family group in Cherbourg, Queensland (Department of Education 1999). Within this one small family group there are several opposing cultural variables of Wakka Wakka, Gurang Gurang, Birra-Gubba and Gubbi Gubbi language groups that make up the family structure. These language groups cover an area on the eastern coast of Queensland beginning north of the town of 1770, south to the northern outskirts of Brisbane, and west to include the Bunya Mountains. Siblings within this family group, depending on their association with certain family members, their gender, age and their contact with external environmental factors, can and do display different behavioural patterns of cultural association. These behaviours may have a direct influence on the extent of their interaction within contemporary Australian culture (Department of Education 1999).

Negative characteristics of certain individuals can have a direct influence on other family members. In the field research situation, the writer's cultural connection is Gai-mariagal/Wiradjuri. (Gai-mariagal being the northern suburbs and beach areas of Sydney, and Wiradjuri the western plains of N.S.W.) To the novice this may appear culturally acceptable, in that an Indigenous researcher is studying an Indigenous case study. Contrary to this, the researcher's dominating culture is matriarchal, whereas the group being studied is patriarchal. This involves complex cross-cultural issues of salt-water lore and freshwater lore that must be considered between the observer and the observed.

Within Australia there are over 450 individual Aboriginal nations, perhaps 650 pre-European contacts (Flood 1995; Willey 1979). One Indigenous Australian interviewing another does not create a homogenous situation. To graphically illustrate this, place a map of Australia over Europe. In the example of the writer interviewing the Cherbourg family, in the European
illustration it would appear as a Russian from the Black Sea area interviewing a group of Sámi from around the Arctic Circle. Not only in the European context is there little commonality, but in the Australian example there is perhaps less. As mentioned, the interviewer is from a matriarchal society. In this scenario the interviewer is hypothetically interviewing a member of a patriarchal society. They are in effect, two people with no commonality in language, gender roles or other cultural interactions. To be effective, the Indigenous interviewer must therefore adhere to strict cultural standards, utilising third-party introductions, cultural validation, and acceptance of kinship positioning that follows correct gender protocol (Lawlor 1991). This provides an insight into the complexity of Indigenous Australian society. A complexity that has been misinterpreted and misunderstood by non-indigenous researchers since research and observation began in this country 217 years ago. It is not the intention of this thesis to explore in detail the reasons why Indigenous Australia is so complex. Rather it is important that the non-indigenous reader be aware that research on Indigenous Australia must come from the Indigenous Australian perspective. It is important to accept the Indigenous standpoint (Nakata 1998) and methodological approach of holistic observation and interaction; to avoid the research becoming another ethnocentric paper, culturally inept and ethnographically flawed (Rigney 1999).

To some degree Pelto and Pelto (1991) reached a similar conclusion in that emic studies or other semantic analysis can provide guides or indications of realistic Indigenous definitions of observation, however, the cross-cultural (etic) concepts of the non-indigenous researcher result in general propositions about human behaviour. The evident problem from the Indigenous perspective is that such general propositions are based on the non-indigenous researcher's own value systems or stereotypes from within their own society. Any perceived shortcomings of this argument are supported to some extent by Gestaltist theory and existentialism in that if we are to look at value systems, and try to understand them within Indigenous society, the research must be undertaken at a level of commonality. Human existence in a social system such as Indigenous Australia cannot be compared, judged or calibrated to a western model.

Far too often Indigenous Australia has been the private laboratory of social anthropologists and other scientists, which is an extension of the western model of one group being superior over another. This is a common view shared by many Indigenous Australian
leaders that has been noted in community rallies and presentations by notable activists such as Gary Foley and Professor Marcia Langton. This sense of superiority of the western scientist often results in an ‘expert’ or missionary attitude being displayed by the ethnocentric researcher. Indigenous communities are increasingly becoming annoyed as being the subjects under the scientists’ microscopes or: ‘culture, when noticed at all … relegated to the entertainment/recreational category’ (Trask 1999: 154). Any study should be of a benefit to the Indigenous group (Diener and Crandall 1978). An example of this is the criticism given by the Indigenous participants in studies where anthropologists studying Native Americans had no intent in helping them develop (Deoria 1968). Similar situations exist in Australia, however if such ‘help’ is in the missionary context or is given from pity, then is it help or a guilt payment? If so it would reinforce the dichotomy of value systems between the ethnocentric and Indigenous community. The Indigenous researched, need to maintain ownership and dignity together with an open honest dialogue with the researcher.

Debbie Wright and Tracie Kaluai in their comparative American and Pacific Islander studies in 1994, highlighted that the researcher should be aware that the assessment instruments or ‘value scales’ used by them [in the non-indigenous researcher application] are subject to standardised and western conceptualisations. They are biased assessment instruments (Wright and Kaluai 1994). The methodology to this research should be (and is) from an Indigenous epistemological position, using an Indigenous standpoint (Foley 2002a, 2003b). It is the writer’s intention that the work does not become another work entrapped by biased Western Conceptualisations (Wright and Kaluai 1994).

An Indigenous Standpoint theory has been applied in both the Hawaiian and Australian case studies. The results and summation of these studies are provided in the following chapter.
5 RESEARCH RESULTS

5.1 Introduction

The research was undertaken in three distinct phases:

- preliminary Australian study,
- Hawaiian Study, and
- finalisation of Australian field studies.

The preliminary Australian research was to ensure that the attached semi-structured interview format (attachment 1) provided sufficient scope and direction of questioning to ensure clear outcomes.

The Hawaiian study was an intensive eight-month in-situ research project and included the establishment of a literature review, a culturally acceptable methodology, field research on Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs, and the coding of data. The Hawaiian study also comprised a control study of non-indigenous Hawaiian minority entrepreneurs to ensure validity and objectivity in the Hawaiian results.

The final Australian study entailed the completion of Australian interviews. It also included testing of academic rigour to ensure the acceptance of the methodological approach by double blind refereed journal publications and the delivery of double blind refereed conference papers to allow for peer discussion and feedback on the acceptability of the methodology used. Double blind referred papers were delivered at the Critical Contexts and Crucial Conversations: Whiteness and Race Conference, hosted by Griffith University at Coolangatta in April 2002 and the Australian Studies National Conference, Flinders University, in July 2002.

Double blind referred papers published at the time of writing on the methodology and this study includes:

Other refereed academic papers given at conferences resulting from this research are:


A brief summary and comparison of the demographics of the Hawaiian and Australian studies will be presented first. This is followed by the Hawaiian study which is then followed by the Hawaiian minority comparative studies with comment. As mentioned previously, the comparative studies have been undertaken to ensure validity and objectivity in the Native Hawaiian findings. The Australian study results will be discussed last.

Both Indigenous groups have similar peak supportive/representative bodies: OHA in Hawaii and ATSIC (its functional capabilities replaced in 2003 by ATSIS, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Services) in Australia. Any references to OHA or ATSIC refer to these two representative bodies.

### 5.2 Demographics

A comparison of the twenty-five Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs to the twenty-five Australian Indigenous entrepreneurs is given in the following columns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian</th>
<th>Indigenous Australian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td>57% Male</td>
<td>84% Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43% Female</td>
<td>16% Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married:</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn overs:</td>
<td>USD $10K to $10m</td>
<td>AUD $20K to $600K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Native Hawaiian | Indigenous Australian
---|---
Average start up Capital: (after deducting large start ups, one at $100K USD and 5 Australian start-ups with capital greater than $25K AUD) USD $2,500 AUD $6,350 (the mean is approximately AUD $5,250)
Commenced business with borrowed capital from families: 50% 33%
Use credit cards to supplement working capital in tight cash flow periods: 75% 40%
Sought government agency advice on entry into Business: 60% 60%
Sought business plan preparation advice: 66% 60%
Negative experience with the peak Indigenous funding body: 47% 64%
Positive experience with the peak Indigenous funding body: 27% 24%
Second generation entrepreneurs: 52% 16%
Average years in business: 11.7 years 10 years
Years of business experience: 12.6 years 16.5 years
Average age: 43 years 43 years
Indigenous spouses: 63% 58%
Non-indigenous spouses: 36% 42%
Tertiary qualifications: 50% 52%
Trade qualifications: 25% 20%
Year 12 graduation: 50% 88%
Minimal to no schooling: 25% 12%

The basic demographics of the two groups highlights that the two groups have been in business for around ten years (11.7 years in Hawaii). They have 12.6 and 16.6 years respectively of business experience. The average age of the entrepreneurs are forty-three years of age. They are more likely to be male in Australia (84%, only 57% in Hawaii), the majority are married, 64% Hawaii, 72% Australia. Their turnovers vary dramatically, USD $10,000 to USD $10 m. per annum in Hawaii, AUD $20,000 to AUD $600,000 in Australia. After deducting large abnormalities, the average start up capital is small, only USD $2,500 in Hawaii and AUD $6,350 in Australia. Subject to exchange rates and purchasing power the start up capital required is relatively similar between the two groups. The Hawaiian entrepreneurs borrowed more from family on entering business and used credit cards more often for working capital. Perhaps the availability of ready credit in the United States gives an advantage to the Hawaiian entrepreneur over the Australian Indigenous entrepreneur which explains this difference in credit card
utilization. The search for government assistance on entry into business is identical. The request for business plan advice is also very similar. The Australian entrepreneur experienced slightly higher negative dealings with their peak Indigenous funding body (64 to 47%). Those who experienced a positive experience with their Indigenous governing body were very similar 27 to 24%. The Hawaiian entrepreneurs enjoyed a much higher percentage of second generation entrepreneurs in comparison to Aboriginal Australia, 52% to 16% which could indicate a maturity in Hawaiians dealings with their colonisers. The Australian entrepreneur is predominantly a single generational experience which also highlights the history of cultural freedom in Hawaii whereas Australian Aboriginal culture may still be in a state of repression.

Hawaiian entrepreneurs tended to marry Indigenous partners 63% in comparison to Australian Indigenous 58%, with the Australians marrying 42% non-indigenous in comparison with their Hawaiian counterpart at 37%. Both groups experienced high levels of tertiary qualifications 50% and 52%. Trade qualifications were also similar 25% and 20%. Indigenous Australians experienced higher levels of grade 12 graduations, 88% in comparison to only 50% of their Hawaiian counterpart. The Hawaiian study group were also twice more likely to have had no formal education than the Australian group, 25% in comparison to only 12%.

When the demographics of the two groups are reviewed it is interesting to note that a recent Australian government publication advises that a Koori (Aboriginal) business enterprise is: 'a private or community owned entity involved in providing a good or service in the marketplace. Such a business is independently owned, wholly or partly, by Koori interests and is often also operated by Koori people' (Aboriginal Affairs Victoria 1999: 3). As mentioned previously this thesis is focused on privately owned enterprise that are at least 51% Indigenous owned and operated.

The government publication referenced advises that Koori (Indigenous) business enterprises are likely to:

- be operated by Koori males aged between thirty and fifty,
- have management or staff who have completed some form of business education and/or training,
- have a business plan,
- have been in operation for five years or less and
- have obtained their finance from government sources (Aboriginal Affairs Victoria 1999: 3).

In contrast the Australian research that forms the dominant part of this study indicates that Indigenous Australian business enterprises are:

- operated by males aged on average forty-three years of age,
- 52% of which have tertiary qualifications with most of these having some exposure to business training,
- 60% have a business plan,
- the average time in business is ten years, and
- 40% obtained government finance.

Based on the findings of this research thesis, when it is compared with the Victorian Government publication, the Victorian publication may not appear to be a valid representation of independent Indigenous entrepreneurs in their state. The difference may be to the fact that they include community based organisations that obtain taxation benefits and arguably are not-for profit organisations in addition to CDEP enterprises (Aboriginal Affairs Victoria 1999: 3) which are federally funded work for the dole schemes. The same publication estimates that there are seventy to one hundred Indigenous Australian business enterprises in Victoria which includes the CDEP and community not-for profits (Aboriginal Affairs Victoria 1999: 3). It would appear that the figure of seventy to one hundred Indigenous business enterprises is inflated by the inclusion of non-commercial enterprises and is possibly underestimated by the non-inclusion of other groups defined as Indigenous entrepreneurs.

The Victorian information has been included as a comparison to highlight the different definitions and possible misconceptions in publications concerning Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs and Indigenous business undertakings.

The research results of the thesis are now discussed in detail, commencing with the Hawaiian study.
5.3 Hawaii

The Hawaiian study involved twenty-five participants across a wide range of enterprises that included:

- An Attorney
- Taro Farmer
- Giftware and Artefact Manufacturer and Retailer
- Art Gallery Operator
- Book Retailer and Wholesaler
- Artist
- Commercial Building Contractor
- Farmer
- Agricultural Advisor and Farmer
- Auto Spares
- Recycled Auto Parts
- Aquaculturalist
- Sound/Audio Hire
- Information Technology Consultant
- Nursery Supplier, Farming, Welding Shop and Truck/Machinery Hire
- Commercial Fisherman
- Taxi Trucks and Transport Company
- Accommodation and Retail Hospitality
- Construction Industry
- Restaurant
- Surf wear Retail
- Apiarist
- Kava Bar/Coffee Shop
- Ukulele Manufacturer and a
- Poi Mill.

To maintain confidentiality these participants are quoted using an alphabetical system of $H$ as a prefix to denote Hawaii and a following prefix reference known only to the writer,
eg HM12 which does not equate to the twelfth entrepreneur. It may be any one of the twenty-five case studies. Quotations may involve duplicating the reference numbers and shuffling them to minimize the likelihood of a reader identifying the participant through any sequence of quotations.

5.3.1 Hawaiian Study Demographics

At the time of writing, twenty-three of the twenty-five Hawaiian case studies were still trading; two ceased trading, one after seven years of trading, and the other after four years. The first venture was reliant on the international tourist industry and its demise was due to the economic downturn after September 11, 2001 (9-11). Hawaii suffered extreme economic difficulties for several months immediately following the September 2001 terrorist attacks in New York. The result was a dramatic reduction in international airflights to Hawaii. The other business experienced a change of landlord, a hostile lease arrangement plus a redevelopment of the adjoining industrial area, which effectively reduced their clientele base by seventy percent.

Of the total entrepreneurs studied 57% were male, 43% female. 64% percent of the participants were married. Turnovers per annum varied between $10K USD to over $10m USD, only three had turnovers greater than $1m per annum. After omitting one singular start up which has a paid up capital base of $200,000 USD, the average start up capital was approximately $2,500 USD.

Over half of the participants commenced business with capital borrowed from their families. They periodically continued to borrow from their families as their business grew and they experienced periods of tight cash flow. The rest commenced business with savings using credit cards to supplement their capital requirements. The use of credit cards for short-term cash flow needs is a common occurrence practised by three quarters of the study group.

60% sought government agency advice on commencing business; two thirds (66%) sought assistance in business plan preparation. Of these 47% have had a negative experience with the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) (the peak Indigenous body for Native Hawaiians). Only 27% reported a positive experience in seeking business advice from OHA. One third, (33%) did not feel that the advice they received from agents or representatives of the U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA) on commencing their
business was satisfactory or was tailored to their needs. Conversely 13% experienced a positive relationship with the SBA on seeking business advice for the commencement of their business. Four of the case studies (16%) have had dealings with the Hawaiian Community Loan Fund (HCLF) or its sister organization the Hawaiian Alliance for Community-Based Economic Development (HACBED). All of these dealings have been positive, with a positive relationship evident between this agency body and the Indigenous business operators.

Finally the average years in business for the Hawaiian case studies were 11.72 years and 52% of the entrepreneurs interviewed are second-generation entrepreneurs.

5.3.2 The Hawaiian Study
The Hawaiian study was completed midway through the Australian study using a semi-structured interview format identical to the Australian study.

Data was recorded identically to the Australian study and analysed using Substantive Coding (open coding and constant comparative coding) (Glaser 1992). In coding the research results, the process of triangulation of the coded data created a potential problem due to the originality of the data involved. In the application of a grounded theoretical approach (Glaser and Strauss 1965, 1967; Strauss and Corbin 1990; Glaser 1992; Strauss and Corbin 1998) the potential dilemma arose in the establishment of and the setting of an outcomes benchmark to ensure that results were viewed in a standardized terminology. Anything outside of a standardised framework would obviously be recorded accordingly. After wider consultation with faculty staff experienced in qualitative studies it was decided to use a previous set of research result headings derived from a previous Australian study (Foley 1999, 2000a) as a guide or benchmark from which to analyse the Hawaiian entrepreneur. The benchmark study used (Foley 2000a) has been referred to by other researchers in this field as: 'a seminal study' (Hindle and Rushworth 2002: 41). The application of a benchmark study strengthens these results, as there is now a commonality of terminology that forms the basis in summarizing and understanding the outcomes. This involved analysing the Hawaiian entrepreneurs using seven constructs. These are:

- **Positivity**: the vision, the driving force to make personal sacrifices in the pursuit of business.
• **Image**: the formality of the business structure and the use of a non-indigenous accountant.

• **Adversity**: the catalyst that instigated entry into entrepreneurial activity.

• **Education and Industry Experience**: the relationship that education and industry knowledge has with entry into business.

• **Networking**: the development of networking channels for the business and business contacts.

• **Family**: the relationship between family and business.

• **Discrimination**: the level of public and institutional discrimination that affects the entrepreneur.

With these seven parameters, the results of the Hawaiian study attained a benchmark (framework) from which to compare and study the research outcomes. It is argued that the Hawaiian study remains based in a grounded theoretical approach as the data remains open and is only applied if positively cross compared (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Strauss and Corbin 1990; Glaser 1992; Strauss and Corbin 1998). In applying a benchmark process emerging results can be gauged and collectively associated, which adheres to the concepts of constant comparative coding (Glaser 1992). The ideals of a Grounded theory approach have not been compromised; rather it is argued that their findings have been strengthened by a semi-formal benchmark from which to measure.

### 5.3.3 Hawaiian Study Results

Twenty-five Indigenous Hawaiian entrepreneurs were examined in a qualitative case study analysis linked to the parameters and methodology of the Indigenous Australian qualitative case study analysis. The Hawaiian study used an Indigenous Standpoint theoretical approach (Budby 2001; Foley 2002a, 2003b; Moreton-Robinson 2000; Rigney 2000; Smith 1999; Nakata 1998). The Indigenous entrepreneurs were snowball selected (Weiss 1994) following an Indigenous protocol of community introduction and open interview. All interviews followed a semi-structured question format to assist in correlation of data with an open question line taken in the probing of issues that pertained to the individual participant. A copy of the interview format is found in attachment one. As mentioned previously, participants covered a broad range of industries that included: Agriculture (various crops including product added manufacturing), Gift-wear (arts and
craft/artefact manufacture), Fine Art Retailing, Retail/Wholesale Education and Cultural Products, Hospitality, Industrial Building Contracting, Retail Automotive Parts, Aquaculture, Nursery, Fishing, Transport, Domestic Building Industry and several participants in the Service Industry. The farmers were included as they were seen as entrepreneurial in their approach to market development and utilization of resources. They created new business in the face of risk and uncertainty for the purpose of profit and growth. Above all they identified opportunities and assembled resources (resources previously not seem within their cultural circles) and capitalized on these opportunities and resources (Zimmerer and Scarborough 1998).

The research revealed many similarities between Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs and Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs. Based on the seven control study parameters; Positivity, Image, Adversity, Education, Industry Experience, Networking, Family and Discrimination the result findings are detailed below.

5.3.3.1 Hawaiian Positivity

In the comparison, positivity in the Hawaiian entrepreneur’s situation was similar to the previous Indigenous Australian study (Foley 2000a) in that entrepreneurs were driven by a general desire to provide for their family and they could not fail. This is shown in the following statement: ‘no we survive, we have to survive, we are here for the long term, we understand, we have to create our life so that we can provide for our family’ (HM01, interview November 14, 2001). The positivity of being in business reverberates in the following quotation:

... Now we have choices ... we have choices in life and what we do with our life, what we can give and share, what we do! ... You ask does business make us less Hawaiians? Sometimes yes, sometimes no. If we can have choices and we can provide, I think sometimes we can be more Hawaiian cause we can give and do Hawaiian things that without income we can’t do and I think people once were too embarrassed to do these things. Now we can live and do things, we have that choice (HM12, interview November 14, 2001).

The choice of being successful is HM12’s positive application to their business, they have a choice to work hard and this gives them choices in lifestyle. This positivity is also illustrated on another island where HH17 has:
... seen volcanoes erupt, tsunamis, cyclones, drought, the economic collapse of the rural industry and we survive. It's all about people ... it's all about being part of the community ... my wife when 8 months pregnant once drove the 22 wheeler around the island when we were down on staff. It's nothing ... to put in a 20 hour day [when needed] ... when something needs to be done we do it. We all work together ... no such thing, as "oh that's not my job". If it's to be done anyone of us do it (HH17, interview December 20, 2001).

HH17 shows a positive application that even in the worst natural disasters their business has maintained a standard. They joke about one time when their now 67-year-old delivery driver got an urgent package through to one of the Island's army bases in a blizzard when the US Mail could not deliver. Their positive application to client service (which is a core aspect of their business acumen) has ensured that the military has since been one of their major clients. The positivity to succeed in business is shown by the participants’ application to work long hours. This is illustrated by the following statement: ‘this is an acceptable honest way of life where to an extent you are in control of your life, if you work hard you have positive outcomes’ (HM08, interview November 14, 2001).

Once again HM12 reinforces the positivity of being in business as the ability to control their lives to some extent, because they now have choices. ‘That is a good thing. Business, a bit of success, a bit extra money, we have choices in our life and what we do in our life ... now we can live and do things’ (HO12, interview November 14, 2001).

HM15 also support the concept of a positive outcome: ‘I had to generate a second business’ (HO15, interview December 13, 2001). He had ten children; there was an economic reason, however failure was not an option. To illustrate this entrepreneur’s risk sharing: ‘I use my knowledge of what can sell and what can make money and work my resources to get there, and then move on to the next project but always have two or three things on the go’ (HO15, interview December 13, 2001). Not only is the positivity apparent that he has to generate a second income, the risk factor is minimised by several projects being on the go simultaneously maximising the resources and minimising costs and overheads in economies of scale.

The concept of positivity in the Hawaiian application to business is illustrated by the following remark: ‘Even if I went broke I would do it again; I don’t know any other way’ (HH17, interview December 20, 2001). Another highlighted a stronger aspect to the
positivity: ‘this is sovereignty in action … self-determination, yeah that what we are. Hawaiians in control of their life, no more welfare’ (HIK25, interview February 6, 2002). The strength in the participant’s conviction to success and business longevity is illustrated in these quotations. The next determinant is Image.

5.3.3.2 Hawaiian Image

Contrary to the findings of the Australian study, the determinant of image or 'face' was not significant in the Hawaiian findings. Face as according to the Concise Oxford Dictionary, is the ‘outward show, to judge by appearances, the image that is projected’ (1977:370). In the referenced Indigenous Australian study, face was of extreme importance (Foley 1999, 2000a, 2003). In addition to the intrinsic benefits of self-accomplishment and looking good, image also refers to the way that people are perceived by those around them (Brown and Levinson 1987). In the Australian situation it centred on legitimacy and accountability offsetting entrenched negative racial stereotypes (Foley 1999, 2000a). Image to the Hawaiian entrepreneur was not so much a racial stigma in stereotyping but a societal obligation for the family interest to act honestly and honourably in business. This was illustrated in their work ethic, based on a love to work as given in the following quotation: ‘hard honest work equates to a blessed happy lifestyle’ (HO15 interview December 12, 2001). The need to: ‘feel well in what you do’ (HM12, interview November 14, 2001) was a common response in interviews and community discussion.

The use of a non-indigenous accountant was apparent in most Hawaiian businesses that had a turnover which exceeded $250,000 pa. The appointment of a non-Hawaiian accountant was similar to the Australian entrepreneur's perception of accountability to offset social stereotypes. One twist on this was that within the more sizeable business most of the Hawaiian entrepreneurs also used non-Hawaiian accountants in the management of debtors. This was to ensure that it was a non-Hawaiian chasing up the outstanding debts and setting credit terms to ensure there were no overriding kin-obligations of Hawaiian sharing and giving in the sales/debtor relationship. This was practiced to ensure that the business transaction of supply and demand was separated from cultural obligations of having and sharing (HO05 interview October 23,
2001).

Having said this, the opposite situation occurs on another island with a sizeable business. In this case the female partner (of a Hawaiian husband and wife team) handles the office work. The husband summarizes his wife’s telephone technique as follows:

… No one likes to pay [on time]. My wife she is a local girl, she has the sweetest voice, she rings and says “Auntie we need you to pay the bill” and so on. She is good at getting money in and keeping the debtors ledger very low (*HH17*, interview December 20, 2001).

These two examples demonstrate that sometimes Hawaiian entrepreneurs use non-indigenous staff to chase debtors and avoid cultural conflict. *H005* uses Hawaiian staff to speak to Hawaiian debtors at a very personal level to ensure debt is recovered through a sense of cultural obligation, as in *HH17*.

*HK21* employed both accountant and attorney based on merit. Their skills, track record and price were the basis of her decision, not their ethnicity. If there were Hawaiians with these skills she would have employed them regardless of debt collection circumstances. As it turned out there were no suitable Hawaiian applicants in her area at that time. The concept of image as it applies in the Australian context is obviously not applicable in the Hawaiian comparison due to the variety and inconsistency of replies.

A different concept to image was the strong moral and family ethic found in *HK21*’s business. This includes a retail arm that sells women’s fashion clothing. The entrepreneur states her case as follows:

… There are a lot of really hot lines like Comstar, you know. There are a zillion lines but I don’t like what they teach. We have enough pregnant 16 year olds with bruises on their faces. I am completely unwilling to promote lines that are a class line and have a very funny campaign. But because it’s clever it’s all that more really destructive of the girls and their self-esteem. We also strive for a non-drug culture. We have a lot of that in our town so I really try not to do anything that lifts up drugs. Those two things are really important to me; I would rather close my shop than give up on that … So far I feel so fortunate as it’s really worked (*HK21*, interview February 5, 2002).

This participant has taken a moral stance on the image her store and its products display. She mentioned that she is very squeamish over the advertising approach taken by Quicksilver for women’s thongs; however she allows this line in her boutique store
because it promotes the sensual side of women and Quicksilver promotes women in sport. Plus thongs are popular with tourists. A contradiction in values supported by ideals, this participant shows strong conviction to her beliefs. These beliefs are not based in any idealistic value system of an organised religion. The participant feels that her moral beliefs are within the concept of what comprises Hawaiian women. It does not involve a stereotype. It does however involve a concept of the female looking good and the way that people are perceived by those around them (Brown and Levinson 1987). \textit{HK21} has taken a moral stance based on her cultural beliefs as to what constitutes image. In the referenced Australian example it was about accountability and legitimacy (Foley 1999, 2000a), \textit{HK21} also values accountability and legitimacy however her stance also includes the accountability and legitimacy of the moral portrayal of the Hawaiian women image.

5.3.3.3 Hawaiian Adversity
Approximately one fifth of the Hawaiian entrepreneurs entered business following an adverse situation that became a catalyst to pursue self-employment. The rest progressed into entrepreneurship as an extension of their lifestyle and family situations be it as second-generation entrepreneurs or as a spin-off of their then occupations. This is illustrated by \textit{HM13}: ‘it just happened from something in the backyard’ (\textit{HM13}, interview November 14, 2001). It began as a hobby, as something in the backyard. When asked about the transition into business the same participant replied: ‘I think [business] was just inbred in me … in high school I had a job … at 16 I had a job’ (\textit{HM13}, interview November 14, 2001). He always had a job and illustrated the basis of this work ethic: ‘my grandfather used to say, if you can stay up all night and drink then you should be able to go to work the next morning. We did stay up and did not have an excuse, so we work next day. We try and keep that’ (\textit{HM13}, interview November 14, 2001). This example of a strong work ethic is perhaps tied into a moral code when one bears in mind the stereotypes generally placed upon Indigenous people both in Hawaii and Australia. This result and the majority of others go against the Australian findings (Foley 2000a) that form the basis of this comparison, in that the entry into business is for the most part a progression with a strong concept of work ethic and an application to work.

One participant who was forced into entrepreneurial activity due to economic reasons was \textit{HO15}. ‘I could not support my family. I had to generate a second business. I
always had cattle, I started that a long time before that. I started the nursery business to generate a third income, send my boys to college and if the kids want anything, they no go without’ (HO15, interview December 13, 2001). Since then he has also commenced goat farming, a wholesale flower business, compost and woodchip supply to the nursery industry wholesaling business, a trucking company with bulk tippers, a backhoe hire and a steel and welding fabrication business. All this developed from supplying bundles of firewood as a supplementary income when he was first married. This entrepreneurship is outcome driven by initial adversity. It is economically driven from having ten children. He is a first generation entrepreneur with several of his children following him into businesses.

HH17 entered business as he saw the existing non-Hawaiian howlie [a non-indigenous/non-Hawaiian] competitor overpricing and inefficient in what was then a monopoly business on his island. Whilst attending University in California he studied and gleaned information from major, mainstream freight and storage operators in the dream of duplicating this for the mainly Hawaiian consumers in his birthplace. From the modest beginnings of one truck, he has built up a sizeable operation, exceeding the operation of his main competitor. This entry into business has been a planned entry based on establishing a niche within an existing market (Beaver 2002).

When questioned regarding commencement in business and Hawaiian involvement in enterprise, HK21 like several other participants before him stated that: ‘you have to remember, it’s a plantation mentality that we come from’ (HK21, interview February 5, 2002). This concept made an impact on the writer as in Australia many Indigenous Australians could also be generally accused of having a ‘welfare’ mentality or ‘mission’ mentality. There are similarities in these statements, which to the Indigenous person is fundamentally shocking. In a postcolonial era Indigenous people still bear the effects of colonisation. This is sobering for the Indigenous researcher, after all these years there is still so much pain and restricted vision, low aspirations and lack of self-esteem.

5.3.3.4 Education and Industry Experience
Almost half of the Hawaiian entrepreneurs have tertiary education. A quarter of the remaining has industry experience ranging from seven to thirty years. The remaining entrepreneurs interviewed have only limited education (none finished high school) and
they have only nominal trade/industry experience.

The lack of formal education for some entrepreneurs was not a deterrent as illustrated in the following quotation in that the participant has no formal training [education] but a receptiveness to learn: ‘I enjoy learning new things, learning is good, it is fun to do things better and have control to some extent’ (HM08, interview November 14, 2001). This participant equated learning, education and new skills with control. They could do things better. Another illustrated the possible outcome of institutional racism in their education, which in effect stifled educational pursuits. The outcome of a low level of educational levels resulted in poor literacy which in turn restricted employment opportunities:

... I think a lot of me and my brothers problems come from school. We no read or write too good. I no speak as good as say you, you speak educated. I think that a problem, perhaps as kids you get treated maybe different. You get treated like some dumb poor kid who is islander, school not nice when I was a kid. Used to run away [from school] as much as I could. Was always in trouble and they send me out of class to stand in the corner or something so I no learn (HOII, interview November 6, 2001).

Despite these shortcomings in basic education, this individual took over from his father in the used motor vehicle parts industry. He completed a trade qualification in panel beating and his brother is a welder and fitter by trade. Between them they have some 55 years experience in their industry. The shortfall in education has been compensated by the fact that they are second-generation entrepreneurs who obtained trade qualifications and extensive industry experience that appears to have offset a lack of formal education. A common factor within the Hawaiian study where male participants have low levels of secondary education is that their wives manage the basic bookkeeping. In most cases the spouses received college education or at least finished high school. Another commonality amongst those operators who have low education qualifications was their active participation in network groups.

An example of how poverty can affect the Hawaiian entrepreneur is illustrated in the following quotation:

... come from a big family, we very poor, [parents] try real hard they worked two jobs 7 days a week to feed us, but we grew up in hand me downs. Still the same. No one prepared to help you when you are in our group; we not encouraged to stay in school. When the Plantation laid our
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parents off they had to leave our house in town and we ended up on welfare. No one cares, you have to look after yourself... Would have got a good job in the city maybe over on Oahu, never been off this island, that’s poverty for you (HM19 interview December 2, 2001).

A result of poverty stifled HM19’s education yet he is still a streetwise entrepreneur as a bush carpenter without license, insurance or qualifications. Often using recycled material, as he has no capital to purchase materials, he specializes in house maintenance and house additions built from recycled materials. His other enterprise is a roadside stall from the back of his utility selling chilled coconuts, fresh organic fruits, farm produce and so forth. This participant regrets not having an education yet despite this he succeeds.

HO12 provides another example of institutional racism and discrimination in the classroom producing a negative education experience (HO12, interview November 14, 2001). In later years HO12 applied for alternative entry (due to living on Oahu in a low socio-economic area) to University, qualifying for a teaching degree, and taught for six years before moving back to their homelands on another island. Whilst at school HO12 did not perform and left at age 15. As a mature aged student she tried again and was successful and has continued education in that: ‘have since done other short courses on specific subjects that help me in my job and business’ (HO12, interview November 14, 2001). HO12 acknowledges that continued education has enabled her to achieve government positions and learn management skills vital in their current position in business.

In several instances the level of education attained was considerable; HH17 has a degree from UCLA and commenced business as an owner operator delivery van operator. HM18 has a Bachelor Degree in tourism and operates a roadside stall, HO20 has a Bachelor of Business Administration in international business and a Masters of Business Administration in international business and market analysis and commenced business in a fast food take away.

Previous research has indicated a strong link between entrepreneurial activity and industry experience and/or tertiary education (GEM study 2000; Foley 2000a, 2000b; Baum 1995; Hills 1995). Whilst strengths in education were strongly evident, anomalies of limited education can be explained by the strengths in industry experience and family network knowledge.
5.3.3.5 Networking

All the Hawaiian entrepreneurs valued networking and networking skills as an essential business attribute and unlike their Australian counterparts it was the networking within the wider Hawaiian community that gave them a market advantage. Native Hawaiians make up approximately 19.85 percent (mixed blood) (U.S. Census 2000) and 9.4 percent (50% or more blood quantum) of the population of the State of Hawaii (U.S. Census 1997), in comparison to 2.4% for Indigenous Australians (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare 2003). The advantages of population size, population densities close to or in major cities and a history of only limited disruption to family networks by forceful removal over two hundred years allows Native Hawaiians to have a perceived advantage in comparison to Indigenous Australians. In contrast Indigenous Australia has experienced substantial disruption to family networks and land association after two hundred years of government policies of extirpation, mission relocation, assimilation and welfare dependency.

Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs have been able to maintain strong cultural networks that are exceedingly important in their business pursuits, not only within the Hawaiian community, but also within other minority community networks as well. This is illustrated by the continuation in dealing with respected agents: ‘one buyer [non-Hawaiian] has been dealing with my mother then me for over thirty years, he almost family, no when you look at it, he is family’ (HM08, interview November 14, 2001). This participant is a second-generation businessperson, his daughter is now managing her own business and the importance of networking is reflected in the following quotation:

... We have a long-term relationship that started with my mother ... over 30 years of experience. Long association with market people ... Relationship it helps, I hope it help my daughter, this relationship is something I can hand down (HM08, interview November 14, 2001).

Another participant sees his Hawaiian Aboriginality as very important in the networking process stating that: ‘it allows me to network within the country, with suppliers wholesalers and retailers. A ready market is open for me’ (HM09, interview November 14, 2001).

In saying this, the relationship is multicultural as most if not all people who this participant deals with are American-Chinese or American-Japanese. The multiculturalism
in the wider Hawaiian community is less inhibiting in comparison to Australia due to an evident acceptance of mixed races in Hawaii where the Anglo-American is a minority. The dominance of Europeans in Australian society makes Australia a 'white' society (Bennet 1999; Neill 2002). Hawaii is multicultural; Australia from the Indigenous Australian perspective is far from multicultural (Bennet 1999; Neill 2002). Hawaiian entrepreneurs did not normally experience discrimination in their business pursuits. When it was experienced the participants became agitated: 'Chinese wholesalers traditionally screw you testing if you are awake ... this is immoral ... once you agree on a price you don't try and cheat the client' (HM08, interview November 14, 2001). HK22 provides a further example of disreputable operations: 'an entire crop of hydroponic lettuce was left to rot ... we had no storage and the wholesaler knew that and bought lettuce from Oahu just to screw us even though ours were cheaper' (HK22, interview February 5, 2002).

A further view of the importance of networking is shown in the following quotation: 'without friendships [networking contacts] we not survive, that's why it is important to know and work with other operators' (HO11, interview November 6, 2001). This participant is a second-generation businessperson in the used motor vehicle parts industry. Together with his brother (and business partner), they are high school dropouts. Given their basic trade qualifications they still have the business foresight to value and foster business networking connections. The development and utilisation of relationships with other organizations provides many opportunities for entrepreneurs. This includes building industry credibility as well as obtaining supplier and customer channels. Perhaps more importantly this gives the practitioner customer access (Paige and Littrell 2002; Zhao and Aram 1995). This participant uses their networking skills to build credibility and maintain supplier and customer channels:

... Christmas we put on a big party, plenty beer, pig, good Hawaiian food. We invite all our business contacts. It pays off and they are good to us. Without what you say networking, you have nothing! You just hope people drive up that dirt road and you pray, with other business people as friends they send people up that road; there is a big difference (HO11, interview November 6, 2001).

This participant illustrates the importance of networking as business associate referrals.
make up a large percentage of their floor traffic, which in their situation is the bulk of their cash trade. Without networking, people would not be referred ‘up that dirt road’ (HOI1, interview November 6, 2001). The importance of this statement is reflected in the remoteness of HOI1’s business premise which is approximately a mile off a main distributor on the edge of an old, rundown, semi-abandoned WWII industrial area. Whilst it is close to large housing centres and modern industrial areas, unless you knew about it you would have difficulty finding it.

Another interesting statement by this participant was that: ‘in business [meaning this industry] just cause you coloured no problem. Most people in [this] business coloured’ (HOI1, interview November 6, 2001). This implies another dimension to the extent of networking, the strengthening of networking amongst other Hawaiian networks and other wider minority networks. This concept was also found in similar businesses, including the building industry and associated trades. In fact most of the varied industries covered included a wide network of what HOI1 referred to as a coloured network. The commonality of these connections support cultural theory studies (Waldinger 1985). For example, several case studies reveal minority groups gain access to resources by exploiting contacts or customers.

Orbe (1998) refers to the central issue as a relationship between power and communication within the participant’s culture. Several participants in this study exhibit the concept of power in their communication ability, which is directly related to networking ability. This power is evident in dealing with coloured networks. Their business is positioned in niche to access resources necessary to exploit opportunities (Waldinger 1985) which supports the application of cultural theory in the dominance of a culturally accepted group with a resultant power and communication ability over non-coloured peers (Orbe 1998). The strength in the utilization of these resources and contacts from coloured networks allows a preferred alternative to mainstream, which is synonymous with aspects of Ethnic Enclave theory (Portes and Bach 1985). This is not suggesting that Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs follow Ethnic Enclave theory in their lack of conformity with mainstream society rather it is their ability to resource goods, services, labour and markets in both mainstream and minority markets that is their strength.
The experience of *HM13* supports this explanation. *HM13* is involved in a highly technical industry, yet is located on a relatively remote island away from the mainstream tourist flow on the island of Molokai. As he is undoubtedly the best in his industry on this island, and some would say on others as well, he has to maintain industry standards. He achieves this by accessing the web and trade magazines, and networking with technical crews of major rock bands who frequent the island for refuge. Because of his industry reputation he is able to obtain free consultation and industry advice from technical experts from groups such as Aerosmith and lesser-known groups who are active on the American hotel and casino circuit. In *HM13*'s domestic market he also markets his product and service by word of mouth, another important aspect of networking. Only twice, when he first began business and a few years after did he advertise. He is in a niche market whereby his reputation now precedes him, although he remains humble and ensures that the quality he gives is first rate (*HO13*, interview November 14, 2001).

The importance of networking within Hawaiian society is again reinforced by *HO20*:

... It's that whole relationship building that you see so prevalent in Hawaiian society. You know you can go to your family and they will be there for you and you in turn are there for them. I just comment from the side as not always working with community, what I have seen is networks that I have seen in the local Hawaiian community. It is this undercurrent; it is amazing how things get done. Because they pick up the phone, they know who to call ... its underground. More pervasive than it would seem. I have not been privileged to that coming from the mainland. Only recently have I been allowed to be a part of this (*HO20*, interview January 28, 2002).

The concept of networking is understood by *HO20* as an underground movement. It has taken *HO20* several years to tap into this network on her return from the mainland. Now she is being accepted into the community and is marvelling at the resources, and how quick the Hawaiian grapevine works and how effective it is.

*HK21* has an interesting application to networking. Her business involves retail outlets of two standards: one directly markets to tourists on a seasonal basis, the other targets the local trade and is more stable. They also have a small building contract business, a fibreglass factory and a canvas business, producing canopies for vehicles, tents and camping lines together with sailboard sails. All these businesses were started by
her and except for the retail outlets have been purchased by existing staff. This has spurned side industries that all interact and help each other. In effect this has created a horizontal market system of industries that have all proven to be successful. All these businesses combine to benefit from a particular purchaser-supplier network relationship based upon the buying power of several rather than a single business. It is like a franchise situation where the businesses through economies of scale can become a more attractive client for suppliers who are always on the mainland. At the other end of the scale HK21 has to compete against K-mart and Wal-mart on some lines and is very aware of the local community in her retail outlets. She has a surfboard shaping section in one outlet and encourages the:

... grommets to hang out there, it’s a tiny community, if you take care of them, they are a concierge somewhere or a waiter, run a restaurant, it flows back. We farm customers, they come back. We are very mindful of the lines we carry and look after the locals. We help with every school fundraiser, we sponsor a soccer team ... we care about the [community] kids, what greater way to advertise ... we run a surf program, have a surfer team, we have a shaping class at the high school and at another private school, we support the junior life guard, we have about 100 kids who actively participate ... we do a lot of youth focus (HK21, interview February 5, 2002).

This participant has adopted a novel marketing strategy by a concerted effort to give back to the community that supports her business by a well-organised sponsorship program. In her metaphoric terminology she farms customers, plants a seed by sponsorship, gets the youth involved in programs (watering and fertilizing) then reaps the rewards when parents buy Surf wear and boards etc from her business. This innovative marketing strategy has enabled her to maintain a niche market and degree of customer loyalty in spite of the market dominance of K-mart and Wal-mart discount department stores.

Market share is also obtained in maintaining competitive retail prices using economies of scale by purchasing in bulk with associated businesses and thus ensuring orders are attractive to mainland suppliers. Networking with consumers is a high priority in the management of this business. To maintain this HK21 has adopted another strategy of employing local staff in the principal retail outlet that is supported by the surrounding community. If she employees mainlanders, they are employed at the boutique store targeting the seasonal tourist trade.
The key ingredients for success appear to be networking, industry/market knowledge, and a ‘positive attitude’. They are within a cultural realm of excellence, for to work hard and succeed is *kupono*. Business success is therefore culturally acceptable and a contributor to social status in Hawaii. This is a contrast with the results of an Indigenous Australian study, which indicates that short-term community alienation may arise within the Indigenous community following an individual’s business success (Foley 2000a).

Native Hawaiians appear to have developed social networks that compensate for any shortfall in formal education if the entrepreneur has well developed social and people skills.

5.3.3.6 Immediate Family

The definition of what constitutes a family in the Hawaii study goes beyond the typical understanding as an example of a nuclear four generation family which would consist of two sets of grandparents, the parents, their children and the children’s spouses and their subsequent children. This is an extended four generation nuclear family in a vertical framework.

The Hawaiian family however may include in their understanding of the nuclear or close family a lateral approach. This may include other adopted aunts and uncles as grandparents or senior people within the community who are respected in a grandparent position, the parents siblings or strong family friends which take a dominant role in the life of the children and the grandchildren, the various spouses family and their respective extended families, and in several examples, people who have no blood contact with the family who are adopted. In one Hawaiian family this included an American-Vietnamese and an American-Thai family. On questioning the Hawaiian elder in this example he saw them as his children and had a responsibility to them and their offspring. The elder’s children in turn referred to them as family members and there appeared to be strong two way interaction. This was also experienced in four other case studies on two other islands. This is a pluralist form of wealth sharing that incorporates extensive networking and kinship ties. The Hawaiian motivator of ’family’ in business pursuit is based firmly around a concept of sharing which may involve providing for those that conventionally
would be seen as non-Hawaiian family members. This raises interesting debate over Indigenous services and land-rights issues however in each case studies, the non-Hawaiian did see them or their children as having any title to or claim on Indigenous funding/education or other resources. Their self identification was that they were the adopted children of 'x' but not a Native Hawaiian.

Any definition of what is a Hawaiian family is difficult, it possibly would alter between many of the Native Hawaiian families studied. To illustrate the conviction to support the family however the following quotation has been selected:

[The driving force [being in business] is to provide for my family . . . I use the land, the *aina* is strong, dis is what is culture, to provide for your people . . . it is respect for your *Kupuna*, respect for your people. Dis very important (*HM01* interview November 14, 2001).

The over-riding issues are that of respect to land, to culture and to people, your people. It seems that is what family is to the Native Hawaiians that were studied. The interaction with family by the Hawaiian business person is further illustrated by the following quotation:

... the majority of Hawaiian people in business are going day to day . . . if the business pays your bills and gets to send your child to college and you are happy then this is good. If you go surfing and no work hard and don't pay your bills and your phone no ring cause you are slack then you are no good in business and your family suffer. Business hurts your family ... work hard but weekends ... are for family. Family is sometimes more important than work (*HM02* interview November 13, 2001).

If the individual is unsuccessful in business it is their family that suffers. Likewise if they do not give their family time on weekends they also suffer. This quotation enforces a cultural concept that family are possibly more important than work, yet work is important for family, a dilemma in cultural values and work ethic. Business participation by the Hawaiian entrepreneur results in improved social positioning within their community, business activity may in fact enable the Hawaiian entrepreneur to interact and 'provide' for their cultural obligations as income is generated through work input which is consistent with a strong cultural work ethic. This is illustrated by *HM02, HM09* and *HO10*:

[s]uccess is the longevity of life, the happiness and stature that you can give and share ... In Hawaii wealth is determined by how much you can
give, you can share (HM02, interview November 13, 2001); and ... we Hawaiian's always share, profit is a western thing (HM09, interview November 14, 2001); Profit making is not ono [good] but I take profit off the howlie [non-Hawaiian] cause it goes to my Hawaiian staff and my family ... we Hawaiian's share and this I value, the ability to share (HO10, interview November 6, 2001).

The underlying motivator driving all Hawaiian participants was the sharing with family and community. The downside in the Hawaiian example was that business involvement took them away from family, social pastimes and cultural commitments as their time was devoted to the business. The loss of time was initially seen as a cultural loss, however the Hawaiian saw it offset by the added cultural values of being able to work and be in control of that work and the ability to provide for their 'family'. Success in business ensures that if the business individual cannot attend a cultural function due to work commitments, their business success allows them to provide for the function. In addition being able to provide for community functions, their established networks provide opportunity and resources for other family members to access the business world. This further enhances networks, strengthening the asset base of community resources in the continuous accumulation of new business enterprise contacts, which is a pluralist perspective in community development. This is well illustrated by HO11's experience:

... I think the good thing of being able to share and help your family and friends sometime we would not be able to do this if we did not have this business. You know I think this business helps us to be able to do this. Maybe without the business we could not what you say fulfil family obligations like Christmas, Thanksgiving, birthdays, funerals and weddings. We look after wife's Mother; no business could do that and be able to pay her medical bills. I think business perhaps strengthens the bonds (HO11, interview November 6, 2001).

In this example, business strengthens family bonds by being able to look after and provide for them.

HO17 employs mainly family, those who are not are still treated like family and have a say in the running of the business. They all work very long hours, are multi-skilled and can do each others' jobs. For example the Managing Director can be found in the cargo hold of a plane picking up urgently needed materials or on a loading dock loading or unloading a container; and his wife or employee found working at 2 am in a tropical
storm in the mountains delivering an urgent package. All staff are family to the business and the business rewards them all for their hard work (HO17, interview December 20, 2001). HM19 states his desire to provide for his children: ‘is a natural thing, this is traditional I would say yes, the want to provide and succeed’ (HM19, interview December 2, 2001). Another Hawaiian identifies success as:

... not what I achieve ... rather its what we can share and what the extended family can gain by being with me and working with me and what I can give to them. When we are all busy, working and our Kupuna are looked after and the little ones are well fed and not sick, this is success (HK22, interview February 5, 2002).

HO24’s response was likewise very positive about providing for family. He sees his success in business very important for the family structure; he has enabled cousins to gain work experience working for him, now they have moved on to secure jobs. He now has nephews and nieces coming in after school and working in lieu of wandering the streets or playing computer games. They are now working with their hands, learning about wood work, gaining skills that they can apply in their vocational aspirations. The business also gives him income to support regular family gatherings where the Kupuna can get together, the keikies can play, and more importantly, get to know their old people in a non-threatening situation. He now financially supports his wife’s mother and his older brothers:

... my older brothers ... they looked at me as the runt of the litter, a non-achiever and now they look up to me. Success [in business] it is about being Hawaiian and being able to work hard like a Hawaiian ... Success is also self-determination, to be able to work in a good way and be able to work your way out of poverty and welfare (HO24, interview February 8, 2002).

This participant aligns the capacity to provide for his family with his identity as a Hawaiian, and a Hawaiian cultural value. The claim that success in business is also self-determination is discussed at length in section 5.3.3.8 with regard to another participant’s experience. HO24 strongly states that providing for his family is self-determining because it gives him power as an individual. It also enables him to provide and care for future generations including his cousins, nieces and nephews. He is working himself and
his nuclear family out from welfare dependency; and sees his whole family benefiting from his endeavours. He went on to say:

... we [Hawaiians] been in business long time before the howlie come here. Coast people give fish to the inland people and they would give us taro and we exchange. I don’t see this any different. I am really following my heritage [by being in business]. Business is still Hawaiian (HO24, interview February 8, 2002).

His statement that business is still Hawaiian places no negative interpretation on the concept that business may be a western undertaking. This participant sees it as a natural evolution in his being Hawaiian. KH25 brings a wider view to the family provision:

... before we on welfare, we have frouble with food and clothes, place to live sometimes. Now not a problem, we look after our parents and family. We now grow more than we need and we look after others (HK25, interview February 6, 2002).

KH25 also looks for those less fortunate in the community and refers to them as family, the Hawaiian family.

Once again the strong theme of providing for children and family emerges. Baum (1995) saw this as an entrepreneur’s motivation manifested in their goals and behaviour. Entrepreneurship researchers often cite Goal theory as a possible explanation for entrepreneurial behaviour in that their vision is commensurate or rather correlated to their growth and goal setting, and venture growth has a venture variable which is determined by their growth-goal relationship (Baum 1995; Gartner, Bird and Starr 1992). In the Hawaiian study provision for children and family is a dominating variable that possibly determines the Hawaiian growth-goal relationship.

5.3.3.7 Discrimination

There are similarities when comparing Indigenous Australian and Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs. They have both suffered at the hands of colonial powers and find themselves at the bottom of the social stratification ladder. Both Indigenous groups are critical of the government organizations that were established for their well-being. These include OHA and ATSIC. Several participants believed that the bureaucracies of OHA and ATSIC were a product of post-colonial politics and hence were compromised in terms of their effectiveness.
In the Hawaiian interviews there is common mention of what was once a strong connection with traditional land ownership and usage. The loss of land tenure post colonisation has resulted in a strong division between Hawaiian and non-Hawaiian (Trask 1999). The loss of traditional land usage has created scenarios of deep-rooted discrimination during both colonialization and postcolonialization which has had a resultant discriminatory effect on business pursuits as shown in the following:

... more [Hawaiian] people are dependent on menial wages. Once the land was owned and managed and farmed, then they [the plantations] took over the fields reshaped them, destroying ancient sources of water, then employed the Hawaiians in menial seasonal jobs. Within a generation or two many of the skills [traditional farming skills] were lost. On places like Maui people undercut each other to trim lawns. The rich pay slave wages and the Hawaiians suffer ... a gap between the rich and poor (HM02, interview November 13, 2001).

This interview revealed that a disparity in wages occurred that was economically discriminative, in that supply and subsequent control of demand ensured lower wages for the Hawaiian businessperson in some instances. Others did not see discrimination as a current problem. For example HM09 argues: 'perhaps this was an issue back a few years, that happened for sure ... happened to my father for sure ... but think it is now more aimed at what industry you are in [rather than if you are Hawaiian]' (HM09, interview November 14, 2001).

Discrimination has had a detrimental effect on one entrepreneur's development and this was evident in his early years at school: 'you get treated like some dumb poor kid who is islander, school not nice when I was a kid' (HO11, interview November 6, 2001). HM12 likewise felt that the teachers, especially in literacy, racially discriminated against teaching him (HM12, interview November 14, 2001).

Comments concerning racism were conflicting on all islands. On Moloka'i for example, participants stated racism was very strong within the school system but absent in the business sector. For example: 'no [racism] not here ... the people here are hard, [but] they are honest' (HM13, interview November 14, 2001). Following further discussion this resulted in HM13 believing that covert racism did not exist as it was not visible. As a contradiction, the manager of the Hotel on Moloka'i that was used for accommodation during the Moloka'i study was less than tactful in their negative
comments on the Indigenous people of Hawaii which could limit employment and commercial opportunities for Native Hawaiians at that resort. Racist attitudes appeared in pockets, some were from mainland people, others from individual people who had connection to plantation families and management. Honolulu newspaper editorials in August 2001 indicated alleged racism within the Honolulu Police Department claiming that Hawaiian youth were at a much higher risk to be questioned by Police, searched and charged than youth from other nationalities. This followed a Police house invasion and the fatal shooting of a Hawaiian youth on allegations. Some participants on Oahu, Moloka‘i and Kauai provided alarming negative responses on racism questions however they expressed their desire that these comments not be recorded.

Racism or discrimination appeared in unlikely situations. For example HO15 stated he was racially discriminated against twice. Firstly by a rude hostess when he was travelling on the airline to the mainland and secondly in a restaurant when he was travelling on the mainland because both the hostess and the waitress assumed he was Mexican. He added that: ‘this was the only time in my life that I thought I was racially discriminated against’ (HO15, interview December 13, 2001). This quotation is significant as the speaker is a senior elder within the Hawaiian community, who has lived through some turbulent times in Native Hawaiian history.

Another significant statement came from HO20. She claimed: ‘it has been more as a woman than as a Hawaiian that has impeded me’ (HO20, interview January 28, 2002). She felt any discrimination received in business was gender discrimination rather than racial bias. As she was raised on the mainland spending her school years on the east coast she experienced for a short period cultural alienation on her commencement in business. Although well known within her family networking, beyond this circle she was seen as an outsider, a mainlander. She was treated in a similar fashion to that which Hawaiians treat howlies that is with tolerance but not affection as shown in the following:

... Hawaiians can isolate you when you come from the mainland you are viewed as an outsider even if you are Hawaiian ... Are you local are you not local? From the very beginning I saw myself treated as an outsider, [this] taught me to stand on my own, stand behind who I am, perhaps I talk faster, dress differently ... I am still who I am. You have to maintain your confidence, then all of a sudden I gained respect from the wider community, and it no longer became an issue ... I don’t know how it
happened but all of a sudden I was accepted (*HO20*, interview January 28, 2002).

This is reverse discrimination with a positive outcome that flows from a cultural acceptance often experienced amongst Indigenous groups. The maturity, the acceptance and the pooling of strengths for the community are explained in the following section. Once *HO20* displayed cultural strength and maturity in her actions as a Hawaiian women operating in business she received acknowledgement and acceptance.

*HK21* is fair skinned and small in stature, and it appears her experiences with racism are based on her gender and her size. She relates one story when enquiring about renting some space in what was then a new shopping mall. The receptionist said to the real estate manager: ‘there is a little girl here to see you, do you have any time’ (*HK21*, interview February 5, 2002). At that time she thought she was well known in the business community after winning a much publicised small business award. On another occasion she was told directly by her former Bank Manager that her ventures would fail, even after she traded in excess of one million dollars through her account with that Bank during the preceding year. She felt as though she was treated like a hippie, no respect was given to her for her business acumen. She now experiences considerable satisfaction when she declines her bank manager’s offer for loan or overdraft facilities. Whilst her industry is seasonal she finances cash flow shortfalls with mainland Factors. Her early dealings with individual lending people at the banks were intimidating and she feels sexist, gender as a discriminating factor she feels was displayed to her. Now that she is successful she does not need bank lending. She feels that the bank is: ‘a club, [run by] a group of males … I don’t have to deal with them anymore’ (*HK21*, interview February 5, 2002).

A different example of discrimination is given by *HO23* who experienced trouble with the police after he commenced business (he owns a licensed bar). The Police used to drive past too often and as his clientele are nearly all working class Hawaiians they felt nervous at the constant Police presence. This has since decreased because *HO23* has a clean record and does not deal with under aged drinkers. On the odd occasion when a patron has become obnoxious, he has asked members of the Hawaiian rowing team to escort the trouble makers out without incident (*HO23*, interview February 9, 2002). The Police have acknowledged this and now leave him alone outside of normal licence checks.
and assisting in other matters. What appeared to be a situation of racial discrimination against a Hawaiian owning and managing licensed premises has dissipated.

Overall discrimination, be it racial, gender or both, was experienced by almost two thirds of the study group. Perhaps this is a hindrance for the Native Hawaiian in business. The writer travelled extensively on public transport and shopped in low socio-economic areas and was stimulated at the lack of racism amongst the ‘coloured’ population. Arrogance/ignorance and racial slurs were only evidenced by or in the physical presence of Anglo-Americans over an eight month study period. From the writer’s understanding after living near the participants to the study, racism appears to be prevalent in and possibly a characteristic of Anglo-European American society.

5.3.3.8 Other Characteristics of the Hawaiian Study

The Hawaiian entrepreneurs have many characteristics that are difficult for the Indigenous Australian academic to explain without appearing patronizing; the writer will attempt an honest and direct approach to the findings. Above all, in general it was the Hawaiian entrepreneur’s open warmth, their oia’i’o that was obvious. In translation, this is their absolute truth, a sincere spirituality of truth and the happy way in which they gave this knowledge. This is also evident in the Hawaiian entrepreneurs’ business endeavours as shown in the following statement:

[m]oney is not everything, when you are Hawaiian you look out for other people that is what is important. You help them, they help you when you need it. It is important that you be honest to all you deal with, I teach you because I like what you are doing. That is why I spend time. Important that when you go back you understand how we think, yes? I learnt from my Grandfather [100% Hawaiian], old Hawaiian people everything was loved and shared. Those values still alive and I share them in my business (H015, interview December 13, 2001).

This openness and honesty was duplicated in almost every interview. For example:
‘traditional Hawaiian values, I live by them, my native roots ... I think to me the old Hawaiian style, the Kupunas and keikies, that’s what it’s all about’ [the elders/family and children] (H024, interview February 8, 2002).

This honesty is a Hawaiian value if shown in kukulu kumuhana; the pooling of strengths, emotional, psychological and spiritual for a shared purpose (Pukui, Haertig and
Lee 2001a). Perhaps this characteristic, evident by self acknowledgement in twenty four of the twenty five participants, is the most outstanding individual characteristic that sets the Hawaiian entrepreneur apart from the Indigenous Australian entrepreneur. This is highlighted in the following statement: ‘what we do is success ... dis is hard, I think your respect for other people, your respect to the land and to your Kupuna, old people, dis is important’ (HM01, interview November 14, 2001). The comments regarding respect for Kupuna (elders) were mentioned once again by twenty-four out of the twenty-five participants. In discussion with community leaders the concept of respect is interwoven in the daily life of the Hawaiian businessperson/entrepreneur. ‘Never shame your family’ (Pukui, Haertig and Lee 2001b: 294) was a concept applied by both participants and community spokespersons, both in business and daily lives.

It would appear from the field research and community interaction that behavioural models are embodied in a deep-rooted cultural concept, kanaka makua (Pukui, Haertig and Lee 2001b). Kanaka means person, makua means parent, the concept is that anyone (especially in business) acts as a mature person, and is a mature person. They are even tempered, think things through rather than jump to conclusions, take responsibility and care for other peoples’ happiness, are kind, unselfish, generous and forgiving, they are hospitable and accept hospitality with graciousness (Pukui, Haertig and Lee 2001b: 294; Interviews: HM01 November 14, 2001; HM02 November 13, 2001; HO05 October 23, 2001; HO06 August 18, 2001; HO07 October 19, 2001; HM08 November 14, 2001; HM09 November 14, 2001; HM12 November 14, 2001; HM13 November 14, 2001; HO15 December 13, 2001 and HO20 January 28, 2002). The concept of maturity is both a behaviour standard and an emotional standard (Pukui, Haertig and Lee 2001b). The research findings indicate that this is an intrinsic motivator for the Hawaiian entrepreneur. The concept of maturity combined with the qualities of self-effacement and cooperation, together with the social attributes of the soft voice and courteous manner are highly respected (Pukui, Haertig and Lee 2001b; Interviews HO05 October 23, 2001 and HO15 December 13, 2001). A quote that touched the writer and exemplifies this maturity is:

... all staff are Hawaiian, all locals, many have seen bad times. Drugs, the bottle, police, done time ... we give them a chance. They are like family ... we support each other ... we all share profit and all work hard ... my
idea of success? Well dat is paying my staff cash each week, seeing them take holidays, enjoy life with their families. Profit is not ‘ono’, it’s not everything. See my family grow [includes staff and wider families] and be happy, dis is what business is about! (HO10, interview November 11, 2001).

HO10 values the development of his staff, Hawaiian staff that he sees as family. Profit is not everything: HO10 puts the welfare of his family beyond profit. However he did state in conversation that staff happiness and a good work ethic would result in profit which they all share. This participant demonstrates the level of maturity and pluralist application in business towards his family and fellow Hawaiian employee.

From the case study interaction Hawaiians also respect, admire and aspire to: ‘courage, industry, and achievement’ (Pukui, Haertig and Lee 2001b: 295). Hawaiians admire achievement, be it as a fisherman, a taro farmer or a beekeeper, or any other business ventures. Community comment and participant comments reinforced the admiration of the warrior. Some see the entrepreneur, metaphorically, as a warrior in Hawaii. This is illustrated in the following extract from an interview:

... in business, respect and integrity are always traditional values ... they follow courage or bravery, maybe they are going into battle by being in business ... values like excellence are defiantly evident throughout Hawaiian culture. Time spent in hula, paddling, building family, work, they all cross over. This is spiritual training, warrior training ... I don’t punch in punch out ... I don’t distinguish between work, it’s all important (HO20, interview January 28, 2002).

To perform and succeed in business is seen by some participants as the attribute of the warrior. At the same time, the concept of honesty is reinforced constantly as mentioned in the following statement by HO15:

... I learned a lot about the values of life and of being honest [off my Grandfather – 100% Hawaiian] if you paid him too much I would have to take him back to give you back that dollar. I learnt from him and I learn how to work hard ... My Grandmother taught me the values and a way of life. My grandmother taught me that if you treat people well and you are good to people they will treat you well. If you treat them like crap they will treat you the same. If you learn one thing and have love and respect for people they will do the same, love one another and respect (HO15, interview December 13, 2001).
HO15 provides another example of kanaka makua, the even tempered mature person’s approach in business. HO15 is not a practising Christian; this is an Hawaiian value and concepts taught to him by his Hawaiian grandparents, concepts that he treasures and practises in his business endeavours. Two of the comparative case studies are his clients both as debtors and creditors. They both spoke highly of his business practices and wished that their howlie clients were as honest and reliable.

Honesty is also illustrated in the interviews with HH17, this time he refers to his bank manager who is also Hawaiian:

... my Grandmother and my mother and one of my old uncles [all Hawaiian] taught us kids to communicate, to speak the truth and not tell lies, or hold back. I think the same with our bank manager; he is a part of our business. He is the only one outside that I trust in letting him know what we do. I tell him I need him as a source of money for leasing or to cover shortfalls in cash flow for wages etc and I tell him, hey you need me as a customer to pay your wage and introduce other business to you. He laughs and now agrees we need each other (HH17, interview December 20, 2001).

Even the Hawaiian bank manager reciprocates truth and honesty.

Following on from this and the previous chapter, it would appear that in general Hawaiians respect the person who works and in turn the worker respects the concept that they should work hard and therefore not shame their family (Pukui, Haertig and Lee 2001b; Interviews HO05 October 23, 2001 and HO15 December 13, 2001). The worker is respected because: ‘it was reckoned a virtue for a man to engage in some industry’ (Malo 1951: 75). This respect for the worker is seen in both men and women. This has a strong cultural origin in that the Hawaiian women would stand with their men in battle (pre European invasion) [just as the writer’s mother’s people, the Gai-mariagal - Australian Aboriginal did] (Foley 2001).

There were confused results in some instances when respondents were asked specifically about the existence of traditional values within business practices:

... I think that most people have lost many [traditional values], or they are confused with what is a traditional value. I don’t really know myself; maybe it’s our recognition of place, respecting land, our Kupuna, our family. I am not sure we have lost that much! What we value is up to the individual, for me it’s my family, my children and my wife (HM09, interview November 14, 2001).
In general conversation, HM09 talked extensively about his father and his father’s values. In addition he spoke about the development of his own Hawaiian values growing up on Oahu as a boy, farming and his respect for land, family, neighbours and so on. Although several respondents commented negatively regarding the loss of values, within the next sentence they would strongly emphasis the existence of the very values that they thought may not exist. Perhaps this is a reaction to what are considered to be dominating contemporary American values effecting traditional Hawaiian culture? It results in confusion. One quotation that takes a strong cultural position is:

... when the magic dollar rules you; you are no longer an Indigenous businessperson, that’s the problem with other Indigenous people who go into business is that when they let the business rule their life; that’s when they stop showing or stop being Indigenous (HO05, interview October 23, 2001).

This participant and numerous others consider it is important to maintain their spirituality, and their Native Hawaiian values in business enterprises ensuring that they retain control over their life as otherwise the business will consume and possibly control them. (HO15, interview December 13, 2001 and HM04 interview November 13, 2001).

When HO24 talked about the impact of the dollar his statement was deep and thought provoking as shown in the following statement: ‘[business] success is keeping the family together. The dollar don’t do that, but the spin off of the dollar achieves it, that is important, don’t live by the dollar, use the dollar to help your family stay Hawaiian (HO24, interview February 8, 2002). Money can help maintain traditional values in this case by providing for family, in addition to helping young cousins, nephews and nieces to gain work experience. This improves their skills, reinforces work ethics making them in turn more employable. The advantages of money through profitable business undertakings has also enabled them to maintain traditional family get togethers where all the relatives meet, the Kupuna and the keikies, producing positive family interaction. The success of the business enables these practices to happen, this tradition is passionately maintained by HO24.

Talking about the concept of traditional values received varying responses. HH17 replied:
[y]ou define and determine what is traditional beliefs or cultural beliefs? We wear shoes, use telephones, drive cars, some say that is un-cultural. What is culture it's living, it changes every day. Our Ancestors learned new things, so this question is loco. No I live my life to God and what I was taught as a child. Do right by others, as you would like them to do to you ... I think family and family issues, caring for your Kupuna that is what is a value that is still very much alive. Respect, sharing. I provide for my family and my wife's family, and my bigger family is my customers, they are important too, you treat them like family and they pay you better. It's all about love, love for each other, can't get it into words; more about giving and you get richer for this (HH17, interview December 20, 2001).

Having said this, the concepts of kanaka makua or maturity and kukulu kumuhana, which is the pooling of strengths, emotional, psychological and spiritual for a shared purpose are evident.

HM12's response was similar to HH17 when they were asked about traditional values she replied: 'What is a traditional Value? Traditional, I do not know, we no longer live there [meaning in a traditional society] doubt if there is such a thing' (HM12, interview November 14, 2001). Yet they had stated previously: '[being in business] we can be more Hawaiian because we can give and do Hawaiian things that without income we can’t do’ (HM12, interview November 14, 2001). This is a person who leads protest marches, organizes the struggle against development and is a leader in the protection of sacred sites and language revitalization. On revisiting the question regarding traditional values she enthusiastically agreed that what she had said about choices and giving, or being Hawaiian were in fact forms of traditional values. To participate in community projects, to be able to give at christenings, weddings, funerals and so on, these were entrenched values that predated colonization. It's just that now we think of them in a contemporary sense not realizing that HM12 was in fact practicing their culture as a by-product of the affluence that capitalism had brought her. On stating this HM12 was quick to explain that the by-product of her labour now was no different to surplus goods and wealth in a pre-American economy.

A further example of the cultural applications in business can be found in the following statement:

... if there were no Americans here, if we were living here growing taro and fishing like the old ways, you think my father and mother and me and my brother any different. They would have the best taro fields and be the
best fishermen, they would work just as hard then as we do now. I think that business is just a change in how we do things, the world change, and Hawaiian change. We work hard back then, we work hard now. Different thing but same, you know what I say (HO11, interview November 6, 2001).

There is a common theme in this quote, which substantiates or reinforces a cultural work ethic; it also highlights an understanding of an evolution in this work ethic. From the Taro and fishing scenario of pre-colonisation to the contemporary business situation, the concept of hard work, to be the best to the maximum of their ability is a cultural pedagogy (Carrithers 1992). This is perhaps the creation of a cultural standard that is specifically dynamic in its outcomes (Premack 1984), arguably another example of Kanaka makua [acting as a mature person: a positive work effort]. HO11 summarises their viewpoint as follows:

... last thing I say, being Hawaiian and being in business not make you different but I think it gives you more opportunity, this is good. You have a chance and you must take care of that and build on it for your family, I don’t think we here for profit, though we need that. We here cause this what we know and we do it kinda good and we enjoy it. If I had to work for somebody I no like that, and I not take welfare, I would farm and fish for my family. I don’t think this any different to what old time like really (HO11, interview November 6, 2001).

The recognition of profit is an important issue however that is quickly supplemented by a comparative substitution that those without a business enterprise could and would embark on a subsistence style lifestyle. This raises the question does this indicate an ability (or a wish) to substitute one enterprise for another or does this indicate that even in what would appear to be a subsistence lifestyle, the participants would in fact be looking at creating a surplus economic cell within their community enabling them to trade surplus produce? The entrepreneurial spirit is perpetuated in this scenario given the trading of surplus produce.

On further questioning the participant referred me to two stories regarding Kamehameha the Great (a former Hawaiian King). The first story refers to a dubious trade of goods. An American sea captain traded a barrel of rum as one of many trade items in exchange for fresh stores. After the ship departed the rum was opened and tasted. The King found it was much lighter than the sample drum that he had been given,
indicating it was watered down or of poorer quality. Knowing that the American vessel would return for supplies, when they subsequently landed they were charged double. When the Captain protested he was shown two glasses of rum, one taken from the sample barrel and the other from the traded barrels. The captain paid the higher price. Another story relates to the sale of sandalwood to western entrepreneurs who resold it in China for enormous profit. On hearing this, the King bought his own vessel, the *Forester* and renamed it *Ka'ahumanu* and then sold direct to the Chinese market. On the return of the vessel the King was shocked to find the profit reduced due to shipping pilot fees and other payments to the Canton port authorities. From that day onwards all incoming vessels to Hawaii had a pilot landed on board and harbour fees were charged. These stories revealed: ‘Kamehameha was quick to adapt to Western entrepreneurial methods. The King was never known to have been cheated or fooled twice’ (Alu Like 1998: 24).

After telling these stories, *HOLI* was quick to confirm that this was a common trait among Hawaiian people in that they are an entrepreneurial people by nature, at least in respect to family and friends. They always strived to do deals, to make life easier. He prided himself in being a businessperson, perhaps striving to achieve the ideals set by King Kamehameha the Great. This goes against modern trait concepts which argue that entrepreneurial behaviour is a function of the individual’s personality (Beaver 2002). Beaver’s (2002) psychological, economic and sociological analysis of entrepreneurs simplifies the arguments regarding traits. However it fails to account for a pluralistic approach to entrepreneurship, which in the Hawaiian scenario may be a cultural trait. If so why are not all Hawaiians entrepreneurs? Perhaps this is determined by the Hawaiian class system. A detailed explanation of this would require an anthropological study which is outside the scope of this work. Perhaps the answer is the interconnection of psychological, economic and sociological perspectives as raised by Beaver (2002).

In an attempt to identify any possible cultural traits, the basic characteristics of the Hawaiian entrepreneurs were reviewed. Any commonality in education was viewed to discover any possible connection. The results revealed that participants to this study have two extremes of education; tertiary or next to no education. Yet the poorly educated have sound trade or industry experience combined with exposure within their families to second, third, fourth and beyond generations of entrepreneurs. One participant who had
almost no schooling and was a self-employed fisherman was first interviewed in 1999 when his business was buoyant and successful. Although highly geared his business at that stage was cash strong and his limited education was offset by industry knowledge. He had left school early and worked his way up from a deckhand to a skipper, then branched out with Hawaiian specific finance to purchase his own boat in 1994. When interviewed in December 2001 the participant was clearly distraught. The concepts of *kukulu kumuhana*, or the pooling of emotional, psychological and spiritual strengths for a shared purpose (Pukui, Haertig and Lee 2001a) and *kanaka makua* or the cultural value of maturity were gone. After two years without planning for contingencies or budgeting for repairs the once successful operator was on the verge of bankruptcy, living below the poverty line and unable to function as a business proprietor. Their emotional, spiritual and psychological loss was obvious, beyond measurement within the scope of this study (*HH16* interview, December 12, 2001). This exemplifies how a basic level of education, or business knowledge would have assisted the operator in his business functioning. The obvious lack of knowledge of the contents of his business plan, which was prepared by a third party and funded by the lending agency for the purposes of the loan application, highlight an error of judgement on behalf of the funding agencies. What was first interpreted as an entrepreneurial success was now doomed for failure. Admittedly there were external factors such as the closure of the Fishermen’s Cooperative, however the participant’s fate was already doomed given he had no knowledge or no allowances were made for contingencies such as repairs and maintenance.

In contrast when Hawaiians go into business: ‘maybe they follow courage or bravery, maybe they are going into battle ... that kind of translates to traditional practices. I think might be values like excellence that are defiantly evident throughout the Hawaiian culture’ (*HO20*, interview January 28, 2002). *HH16* had lost this courage, or bravery. They had lost the zeal for excellence. *HM18* certainly displays it in her dreams and ambitions; *HH17* displays it in his pursuit of client service and self-sacrifice. *HO15*, a respected and powerful elder, displays traditional practices in his diversification in industry and his excellence in honesty, as do *HM13, HM12, HO11, HO10, HM9, HM8, HO7, HO5, HM2, HM1, HK21, HK22, HO23* and *HK25*. Each entrepreneur mentioned has displayed attributes and skills of courage, bravery, a zeal for excellence: be this in
client service, in producing the best outcome, in working proud and honest. Each reached a standard of excellence in their own pursuit. It has not been for money as such; it has been for giving, for providing. Perhaps this is what it is to be Hawaiian: to engage in business is to practice a warrior trait? Within the writer's personal cultural circles, the process of identifying a warrior trait is the responsibility of the Elder of the respective culture concerned. It is therefore not the task of a Koori researcher. The research findings suggest the application of contemporary warrior traits. It is anticipated this proposition will be supported by future correspondence with Hawaiian community members.

HK22 engaged in Hawaiian entrepreneurship activities in small business in an attempt to achieve self-determination. He stated:

... small business is our way, the Hawaiian what I call Hawaiian Economic Sovereignty, this is our way of getting away from welfare and the negative pit of this. [i.e. the stereotyping, the negativity towards Hawaiian people] Business is our way of providing and living. It does not have to be profit driven, it should be product driven, profit comes late and can be measured in so many ways. It's about building for the community, your extended family ... This business is my family, it is Hawaiian Economic Sovereignty. The family has learnt, I have been able to teach them life by work, none of this is theory. That you teach them in University, my school is getting dirty and working hard. This is what I do and this is what I teach my kids. Business has given my family something; we work, share, eat, laugh and live. We have the fire, we can get together. Eat food and share; this is what life is about ... Our life, our aloha to our Kupunas this is a traditional value, and our aloha to our keike this is traditional value. Learning our language, sharing these things this is traditional. Walking with the goats in the peaks this is traditional. Learning place and space this is important. To be able to share to give to the less fortunate to help others, and they in turn will help you when you need it. This is Hawaiian. Sharing, giving and receiving gift in return, this is Hawaiian. I live by these values and I am judged by them. Look around this is my values, this is my life and this is how I am judged in this life and the next (HK22, interview February 5, 2002).

This was a powerful interview with a strong man, a leader. Business is Hawaiian Sovereignty. Success in business allows the Hawaiian to provide for their children and elders. Business does not have to be profit driven, it should be product driven and the profit will come later. Once again the quality of the product and service is stressed. HK22 reinforces the values of kukulu kumuhana or the pooling of emotional, psychological and spiritual strengths for a shared purpose (Pukui, Haertig and Lee 2001a) and kanaka
makua or the cultural value of maturity. He speaks of Hawaiian values, of giving and sharing linking these into business success and of the power of language. Hawaiian economic sovereignty or economic independence is measured by sustainability and the maintenance of traditional values. Sovereignty, it would appear, includes the quality of life which is closely associated with the contact of family, the love of elders, the love to children and sharing with the less fortunate. HK22’s involvement in business is an extension of the independent Hawaiian. He sees his strength, his independence, and his cultural sovereignty being linked to business success. The contents of this transcript are powerful and wide-ranging. Trask states:

... in an age of rapacious transnational capitalism, Hawaiians are beginning to think beyond the habitual boundaries of the State of Hawaii, even of the United States ... it is our duty, as Native people, to ensure this status for generations to come (1999: 39).

HK22 has begun the journey to Hawaiian sovereignty, independence through success in small business. His entrepreneurial pursuits are Hawaiian economic sovereignty. In private discussion regarding cultural issues this participant reinforced his belief that micro-economic reform will flow from Native Hawaiians after they apply the reform within a cultural place and space. He envisages and is working towards a cultural revival of the Hawaiian science of entrepreneurialism through the production and supply of food products. Yet he realizes he is building the family that is the extended family of Hawaiian entrepreneurs, into a diverse group so that connections will be in place to ensure they all prosper and control the market. He even plans to import fruit and vegetables that cannot be grown in Hawaii from the mainland so that retailers only have to deal with one co-operative for all produce. Throughout the interview there was a repeated recognition of giving, not receiving welfare. This was as extension of aloha, or the love for his fellow Hawaiians. His parting words were: ‘look around you at all the keike. I am responsible for their future, not only the Kupuna, but also the extended family’ (HK22, interview February 5, 2002). These are sobering words when you realise how many families he guides and looks out for.

Another interview revealed a similar sense of responsibility for youth and involvement in business as a form of self-determination. This participant also had control over his destiny, his ‘business is still Hawaiian’ (HO24, interview February 8, 2002).
There is a positive cultural stigma by being in business. When questioned if this because he had previously been on welfare, H024 replied that welfare was the product of America, of the plantations. He believed hard work and being in business was an honourable way, a Hawaiian way. A strong work ethic clearly has a cultural identification.

Two final examples of the application of Hawaiian cultural traits in business follow. HK21 has an Ava Bar in which everything they do is based in culture: 'the product how we serve it, we have to comply with health regulations so we use powder in lieu of fresh root and we are forced to use stainless steel in lieu of traditional bowls but this business is culture' (HK21, interview February 5, 2002). Limu farming (traditional aquaculture farming seaweed), taro farming, the Poi Mill and Ava Bar were the only businesses that were based on traditional products. Three of these businesses sold to a wide client base. HK21’s client base however remained stable as predominantly Hawaiian men now enjoy a cup or two of Ava after paddling or work in lieu of drinking alcohol. In this example it is the product that fulfils an important cultural role as it satisfies a void in contemporary western life. HK25 summed up the cultural connotations of being in business as follows:

... I think never forget respect for the land and its products. The spirits share their goodness with us; we must then share with the less fortunate in our community. This I believe it’s the ability to give to those who have little, this not mean money. It can mean food, a job, or training, help or advice. It can mean many things (HK25, interview February 6, 2002).

5.3.4 Summary of the Hawaiian Research

The research from both case study analysis and wider community consultation indicates that ‘traditional’ or cultural concepts are still evident, strongly held and valued in contemporary Hawaiian entrepreneurial pursuits. In stating this, the author is an Indigenous research outsider ‘looking in’ on the Hawaiian culture. The dominant issues/values evident in this study are: the love and respect for Aina [land], the love and respect for Kupuna [Elders], love towards future generations and the responsibility of being related to Keiki [children](as a parent or uncle or aunt), and the responsibility that goes with Kanaka makua [acting as a mature person: a positive work effort].
There is a link between education, skills and industry experience to success in business. Indigenous entrepreneurs are a small positive minority, maintaining cultural commitments and attachment to their Indigenous heritage. They survive in small business enterprises in an ethnocentric Anglo-dominated world of commercial activity and strive for self-determination and economic independence. Racism and discrimination is evident with one respondent believing it is diminishing, however it was agreed by several other participants that Hawaii will never be free of both Anglo-Hawaiian self interest and a belief in Native Hawaiian inferiority.

The cultural concepts of traditional values and being in business are mixed with colourful stories revolving around the participants' life experiences. For example, this included growing up in strong cultural Hawaiian speaking families, learning and sitting near the ocean, in the mountains near the rainforest with the breeze, the birds and nature: being close to the Kupuna, learning how to read the weather, the wind and the clouds. Being taught how to practise commonsense, learning what are traditional values. These are some of their experiences.

The participants in general spoke poorly of the government agencies, banks and minority business service providers. A high level of dissatisfaction was expressed at banks and finance companies in what they perceived to be negative lending practices that did not support small minority business. Extreme dissatisfaction was felt with government organizations whose mandate is supposed to support the minority entrepreneur.

In the Hawaiian study, twenty-three out of the twenty-five participants commenced business on capital start ups of less than $10,000 which was after initial rejection by their traditional banks/financiers and government organizations. More than half commenced business with capital outlays of only $5,000 from savings, family loans and credit cards. Case studies illustrated that small business operatives can be successful with nominal capital investment. Several such enterprises grew to relatively large Hawaiian controlled businesses. Business turnover of the participants ranged from $10K per annum USD to exceeding $10M. Hawaiian business acumen is shown in one business with a $10M USD turnover owned/managed by a person who commenced employment as a labourer on a Waianae pig-farm at age 14 with only basic education.
With almost thirty-five years experience, this individual has a wealth of business knowledge that he shares with his peers in community and government funded peer projects. Correspondingly, the $10K USD turnover relates to a young woman with a University education who is just starting out with big dreams. The participant’s time in business ranged from two years to in excess of thirty with the mean just under 15 years.

The Hawaiian study was a rich experience academically and culturally. The Hawaiian control study is now discussed.

5.3.5 Hawaiian Control Study

To ensure validity of the Hawaiian study findings, a control study of sixteen non-Hawaiian ‘minority’ entrepreneurs was undertaken. These entrepreneurs were considered to ensure that the Hawaiian study described Indigenous Hawaiian culture and not a generalised United States minority culture. The control study comprised people of many different cultural backgrounds that included Chinese-American, Chinese/Japanese-American, Hawaiian/Portuguese Japanese-American, Hawaiian/Tahitian-American, Japanese-American, Japanese/French-American, Philippine-American, Philippine/Portuguese-American, Portuguese-American, Portuguese/French-American, Samoan-American, and Western Samoan-American.

The businesses that they owned included: surfboard manufacturer and retailer, sea-shell importer retailer and wholesaler, Kava wholesaler and importer, agricultural consultant, greengrocer, artist, auto repairer, security business, hotel/motel, tourist retail, writer/artist, take-away food, women’s clothing retailer, food wholesaler, jewellery retailer, and arts and crafts retailer.

Selection of the comparative businesspeople was by convenience. Third parties introduced them when possible or they were cold canvassed. Most had dealings with the SBA, which ensured their status as a small business. As minority entrepreneurs, they were outside of the definition of the Indigenous Entrepreneur (Foley 2000a) therefore the definition of Raymond Smilor (1997) was adopted to confirm their status as entrepreneurs. This is:

entrepreneurship is a subversive activity. It upsets the status quo, disrupts accepted ways of doing things, and alters traditional patterns of behaviour. It is at heart, a change process that undermines current market conditions by introducing something new or different in response to
perceived needs. It is sometimes chaotic, often unpredictable. Because of
the dynamic nature of entrepreneurship and because of the entrepreneur’s
ability to initiate change and create value ... the concept of ‘creative
destruction’ is an apt description of the process ... the entrepreneur thus
disrupts the economic status quo, and as a result creates new market
opportunities (Smilor 1997: 341).

Smilor’s (1997) definition and explanation allows for an understanding of the dynamics
of the minority entrepreneur’s environment. All of the comparative group were
acceptable as entrepreneurs after the application of this definition as they all had created a
change process within their family sphere and introduced something new into their family
circles. Their entry into entrepreneurial activity in most cases was unplanned, in some
instances unpredictable. In business they were initiating change and creating value in
wealth from business controlled activity creating new market opportunities.

The comparative interviews followed a semi structured interview format, a copy
of the basic questionnaire is found in attachment two. The interviews were undertaken in
the individual workplaces of the comparative Hawaiian minority entrepreneurs. This was
done to ensure that they felt comfortable in their own surroundings. They were recorded
on audiotape and transcribed to hard copy at a later date for coding purposes; interviews
took on average thirty to forty-five minutes. The demographics of the comparative group
are outlined in the following sub-paragraph.

5.3.5.1 Non-Hawaiian Case Study Demographics

Of the sixteen entrepreneurs studied, ten were male and six were female businesspeople.
Just over half were second-generation entrepreneurs (similar to the Hawaiian study) and
the average years in business for this study group were nine years (slightly less than the
Hawaiian study). Business turnover was comparable to the Hawaiian study ranging from
approximately $20K per annum USD to under $1.5M USD. The average start up capital
was $10K USD, which was marginally higher than Native Hawaiian study. Almost 50%
of this group also obtained bank finance for the commencement of their business
compared to only 8% of the Native Hawaiian group. The balance obtained funding from
family with one obtaining vendor finance on the purchase of their business. Fewer than
40% of the comparative group also experienced positive assistance from the SBA in the
establishment and ongoing maintenance of their business.
None of this study group had contact or experience with the OHA, HCLF or HACBED. They did however have experience with other minority service providers with mixed results. These service providers organised small business guidance courses run by community based organizations that were funded by the SBA and related agencies. The names of service providers will remain confidential. Comments regarding the small business courses ranged from being irrelevant to being poorly structured. In general it was felt that the teachers spoke at them rather than with them. They felt there were language difficulties and the teachers went through the motions of teaching a set program rather than helping them develop their knowledge in small business. There were no positive comments about service providers.

5.3.5.2 Discussion Comparing Native Hawaiian Results to Control Study.

The findings of the comparative study resulted in five key discussion areas:

- **Motivators in business**, revealed three dominant intrinsic motivators which are lifestyle, family and money.
- **Discrimination**, the effect of racial and gender discrimination.
- **Success**, what is a marker of success, how do they define and value it?
- **Compromised culture**, have they had to compromise their culture or do they actively practise it? and
  1. **Values**, do they maintain their own cultural identity and cultural values?

These five key discussion areas are explained in the following subsections. This is followed by a discussion and summary of the comparison between Hawaiian based minority entrepreneurs and their Native Hawaiian counterparts.

5.3.5.3 Motivators

Perhaps the most apparent difference between the comparative study and the Native Hawaiian study can be found in the motivators. Fifty-six percent of the comparative group entrepreneurs stated that money was a prime determinant of why they were in business. None of the Native Hawaiian study acknowledged money or material goods was a motivator for being in business. Fifty percent of the comparative study also agreed that it was the lifestyle which entrepreneurial activity provided, that was an instigating factor to them pursuing entrepreneurial activity in small business.
On questioning, many of the comparative participants had difficulty in distinguishing a connection between increased incomes with improved lifestyles. For most they saw the two concepts as separate motivators, not identifying that increased income directly results in an improved lifestyle. A general view was that money was money; an improved lifestyle was something else. The business motivator to the comparative entrepreneur that is a superior lifestyle and its cost is mentioned in the following quotations by CS8 and CS9:

... this is all about lifestyle, I can do what I want to do and be in a job that is pleasant... It’s all about lifestyle, about me enjoying life (CS8 Interview August 20, 2001) ... it’s a lifestyle that is expensive (CS9 October 5, 2001).

These quotations are from Chinese-American entrepreneurs who value the attainment of lifestyle as a reward, which in their cases is an important motivator for success in business. Previous research has indicated however that Chinese tend to display a simpler ‘work to live attitude’ (Changanti and Greene 2002: 130) in that their strong work ethic looks at the provision of basic needs. The Chinese-Hawaiian comparative participants seek to obtain a lifestyle distant from a frugal hard work ethic displayed in other literature (Changanti and Greene 2002). The difference in findings is possibly attributable to the combination of a consumer driven capitalist American society and the relaxed ‘laid-back’ Pacific lifestyle of Hawaii which results in Chinese-American entrepreneurs working to achieve a lifestyle which is more luxurious and less spartan.

Half of the comparatives indicated that providing for their immediate families was a business motivator whereas the Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs had a broader concept of family. The Native Hawaiian concept included the wife’s family, brothers, sisters and their children and other extended family members. In several cases they also included employees or business partners. The minority comparative group however did not indicate that family responsibilities included anyone beyond the nuclear family. The provision for family appears to be a strong motivator. The cultural value of providing for family is consistent with previous research which indicated that the social and economic environment is a determining function of entrepreneurs’ thinking (Bird 1989). Motivation is not limited to the business goals; it is also driven by economic motivation (Baum 1995; Herron and Robinson 1993). In both the Native Hawaiian and the comparative group
study there is a positive need to be successful in entrepreneurial activity to directly provide for family, albeit that the Hawaiian scenario is both wider and more culturally focused. The motivation remains a cognitive process (Busenitz and Lau 1996) that drives the economic outcome of providing support. There is however another possible determining factor which is the kudos entrepreneurs receive for providing for their family (McClelland 1961).

The provision for family extends the entrepreneurial economic perspective. When the economic perspective is discussed it usually entails the economic impact of entrepreneurial activity on the economy (Beaver 2002). In both the Native Hawaiian and the comparative study the impact of a successful business has a micro economic impact on the respective minority economies. The family unit experiences the monetary benefit of this success which then has a flow on impact on the wider economy. Discounting the arguments within the economic school of entrepreneurship over business ownership and control, the effect of the business or the entrepreneurial characteristics of the operator (Beaver 2002), these results appear to contradict the concept that entrepreneurship is an instrument of macro-economic change (Hornaday 1982, 1990). The economic argument of ownership verses control is insignificant to the outcomes in which the motivation to provide for the family, impacts on the micro-economy at the level of the nuclear family and related economic cells. These findings in the comparative and the Native Hawaiian studies indicate that micro-economic development combined with self-management or a search for lifestyle in the comparatives group example are two of the major motivators of the minority entrepreneur. Self-determination (through self-management) is displayed in the economic independence that success in small business enterprises and entrepreneurial activity provides.

The third dominant motivator for the comparative study was money. Fifty-six percent agreed that they were in business for the money. On reflection, it appeared that each example was related to economic situations in that they came from abject poverty, they were divorced single mothers or they saw money as providing a means to an end. ‘I wanted to make it on my own and have money to enjoy life’ (CS4 July 5, 2001). ‘As a Philippino-American I come from an impoverished background, I no want my kids to experience this ... Money is my main motivator’ (CS5 November 11, 2001). ‘Ultimately
I am here for the money' (CS6 August 10, 2001). 'I am here for the money. We are here so we can pay our bills and live a bit' (CSII February 11, 2002). 'I am here to earn money' (CS12 August 29, 2001). 'Money is the main motivator' (CS16 October 18, 2001). A pursuit of wealth, to earn money was their dream, their goal. This differs to the Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs, who clearly stated that they were not in business for the money. Although the Native Hawaiian results identify that money alone is not an intrinsic motivator, literature does support the view that entrepreneurial achievement can contribute to the alleviation of poverty (Annan 2002; Lyons 2002; Hymowitz 1995). The findings of the comparative study support the findings of Annan (2002) and Hymowitz (1995) that confirms that entrepreneurial activity can alleviate poverty. Poverty is a driving for minority business people within the comparative study to be in business. The Hawaiian study in comparison reveals that although the Hawaiian operators in general were impoverished, their entrepreneurial pursuits cannot be simply attributed to seeking wealth in a dollar sense. What constitutes wealth in the Hawaiian study involves a wider understanding and determination that includes the well being of children, elders and supportive networks such as extended family and staff. This is a more holistic approach to wealth accumulation that is not defined in purely dollar terms used by the comparative group.

To summarize, comparative participants in business are motivated primarily by profit, whereas Native Hawaiians approaches business with much wider concerns.

5.3.5.4 Discrimination

Half of the comparative study felt they had been discriminated against by financial institutions in general and by banks in particular. On further investigation this discrimination was seen by some as racial and by others as gender based. Most agreed that they also thought they were treated with contempt by the banks because they were small business proprietors. 'At first no one would deal with me. I am European Spanish, not South American or Mexican. The banks think that as I have a [Spanish] accent I am stupid' (CS1 February 5, 2002). 'Banks don't want to help small business; we have to resort to other areas of finance' (CS3 February 8, 2002). These are some of the many responses denoting adverse treatment by the Hawaiian banking industry.
A gay male entrepreneur from the comparative group had also experienced homophobic treatment from banks, other businesses and some customers. ‘Due to my open sexual preference [following previous experiences of discrimination] I am very careful about which bank I deal with, “x” bank has a gay manager that the gay network trusts and deals with’ (business partner of CS9 October 5, 2001). CS9’s client base includes several quality west and east coast American buyers who he has no problem dealing with. His sexual preference only seems a problem when dealing with Asian clients, which is one of the reasons why his business partner is an attractive Chinese-American businesswoman who deals almost exclusively with the male Asian customers. He has never experienced racial discrimination.

Eighty-three percent of the women felt that banks and other organizations had discriminated against them based on their gender more than their ethnicity. This is supported by a number of statements: ‘I have received more difficulties in business as a woman rather than anything else. Bank managers always ask for your husband’ (CS4 July 5, 2001); ‘They always ask for your partner, women can’t be in business?’ (CS12 August 29, 2001); and think discrimination is more about being a woman: ‘the fact that you are coloured most likely adds to it’ (CS15 November 13, 2001). Both the Native Hawaiian and comparative groups experienced discrimination and/or negative experiences with banks or financial lenders. Research indicates that female entrepreneurs suffer discrimination from important stakeholder groups such as financial institutions (Beaver 2002). Other research indicates that women in general are discriminated against in terms of access to capital. For example they pay higher rates of interest and are likely to require higher secured collateral than male counterparts (Watson 2003; Coleman 2000). Unfortunately the results of this study (comprising the Native Hawaiian and the comparative studies) support the Beaver (2002), Coleman (2000) and Watson (2003) findings in that women in business are discriminated against.

5.3.5.5 Success

In general success was measured by the comparative group in primarily materialistic terms as shown in the following statements by CS1, CS2, CS3, CS4 and CS6:

... when I was younger it was a car, then to travel, then a bike then a house, then a bigger house, then a farm to retreat to. I have all that, now its
lifestyle. Success is not having to work (CS1 February 5, 2002); success is
to retire a rich old lady (CS2 February 5, 2002); would like to have no
debt, a nice home and car. Live a rich life (CS3 February 8, 2002); being
independent and paying my own way, that’s success, see this jewellery
and I wear good clothes. I go to Europe, France or whatever on vacation.
That’s success (CS4 July 5, 2001); and send your kids to college. It’s
having a nice home; I guess its material things (CS6 August 10, 2001).

Entrepreneurial literature has defined success as the extrinsic outcomes. These include
financial performance, increased personal income and wealth (Paige and Littrell 2002). It
can also be measured in intrinsic factors that include freedom, independence, controlling
ones own future or being one’s own boss (Paige and Littrell 2002). The comparative
group’s lifestyle motivation of being in control of their life agrees with the Paige and
Littrell findings (2002). This is often explained by the definition of success as a locus of
control (Fan and Karnilowicz 1997). Yet some of the comparative group saw success in
more modest terms: ‘[success] is paying my bills, a little holiday occasionally and
looking after my children’ (CS5 November 11, 2001); ‘success would be when I could
employ a full time office person’ (CS7 November 14, 2001) and: ‘having good health and
being able to retire’ (CS11 February 11, 2002). Although some had more modest
aspirations success was measured in purely materialistic terms in 81% of cases.

The next area to be investigated (the findings of which were independent as the
Native Hawaiian interviews had not as yet been collated or coded) sought to discover if
the entrepreneurs compromised their culture by being in business. The response was as
follows.

5.3.5.6 Compromised Culture

Eighty-one percent of the comparative group felt that by being in business they did not
compromise their culture. Their responses included: ‘never, have always been a money
grabbing capitalist entrepreneur’ (CS1 February 5, 2002) and ‘be it Chinese-American or
Japanese-American, business is culture, therefore the question is not applicable’ (CS2
February 5, 2002). CS2 has in effect substituted the contemporary values of being in
business in Hawaii with that of his upbringing without considering any cultural heritage
issues or synergies.

Other responses included: ‘never thought of it, No!’ (CS3 February 8, 2002) and
'never, we have no cultural type things ... we American' (CS$5$ November 11, 2001). CS$5$ is of Philippino descent, he became agitated at the thought that I would suggest he was different to mainstream America, or perhaps even inferior as a minority member. On further discussion it appears he interpreted the concept of maintaining Philippino cultural values as being below American culture. This is possibly an example of CS$5$'s internalisation of a negative racial stereotype which has people of Philippino descent below Euro-American's in American society.

In direct contrast CS$6$ is a Samoan who has experienced a compromise in culture. This is vastly different to the perceived negative racial stratification experienced by CS$5$. For example he states he compromised his culture: 'every day of [his] life ... This is not a world where we can respect the matai and follow the old ways' (CS$6$ August 10, 2001). This comparative respondent is Western Samoan; the Samoans have maintained a traditional family system based on the extended family under the authority, *pule* of the 'matai' (head of the family) (Croulet 1988). The inter-island and intra-island entrepreneurial activity pre and post-invasion has flourished under the 'matai' system, yet in Hawaii he is unable to follow his beliefs due to his cultural isolation. He concluded by stating: 'we are in a western culture and we live in western life now' (CS$6$ August 10, 2001). His cultural beliefs have been abandoned, substituted with contemporary American values. Another strong comment was: 'you sell your soul every day, the customer is always right ... Cultural beliefs, no I think we have no time to respect our special times. Our culture is contemporary America now' (CS$11$ February 11, 2002).

Overall the comparative businesspeople did not associate strongly with cultural values at all. Most of those surveyed still have close contact with migrant parents or grandparents and still speak their native tongues to some degree. The lack of association with any cultural values outside of normal family contact cannot be explained. As an example: 'We have strong Japanese values in business, sadly in my area I cannot use this network' (CS$7$ November 14, 2001). In summary, two of the comparative group stated that they compromised their culture every day that they went to work; several others stated that their culture was no longer applicable as the contemporary American culture dominated it.

Within the cultural values concepts, just over two thirds of the comparative group
thought that their entrepreneurial activity had resulted in a positive impact on themselves and their family. On further questioning this could in several instances be associated with thrift and hard work which is often associated with Asian entrepreneurs. For example the 'Confucian Dynamism' (Tiessen 1997: 374) is associated with persistence, status based relations, thrift and shame. As mentioned previously however the apparent loss of cultural values or cultural connection in business cannot be explained within this sample study.

5.3.5.7 Values

When asked about the values that they respected or upheld in business the comparative group talked openly about honesty, product quality, the provision of good service, and the treatment of others as they like to be treated. For example: ‘I think it has been ingrained in me by my father and my grandfather to treat your client how you would like to be treated’ (CS1 February 5, 2002); ‘Never sell yourself short, believe in yourself and never give up’ (CS2 February 2, 2002); ‘I think good service to your client is paramount, look after them and be reliable and they will not go elsewhere’ (CS3 February 8, 2002); ‘Hard work, networking, keep in touch with other people in your industry, you scratch their back they will look after you’ (CS4 July 5, 2001); and ‘I think good service and honesty’ (CS5 November 11, 2001).

Similar quotations were obtained from other comparative participants, which reinforces a strong work ethic of hard work and honesty. CS8 gave a different opinion: ‘I am an artist, I have no scruples or values, it’s all about expression and when I need money I prostitute my art to make saleable items’ (CS8 August 20, 2001). On further questioning however, he agreed that he still worked hard and gave the client value for money, which is why he was able to sell his product and maintain a profile within a flooded market with too many suppliers and only a limited and dwindling tourist client base. CS10 stated: ‘at times you sell your soul to the devil that is the greenback, but only when it’s justified’ (CS10 August 1, 2001). CS10 is a professional writer, who acknowledged that the difference between eating and going hungry was sometimes a matter of swallowing your pride and ignoring personal standards to ensure a second grade work was produced and sold within a market that they would normally not deal with.
This was a consequence of being in business. At times personal values had to be compromised in order to maintain customer relations and earn an income. It seems utilitarian ethical behaviour driven by contemporary economic forces governs this entrepreneur’s actions (Dawson, Breen and Satyen 2002). This scenario is similar to the experience of the artist CS8 which is in contrast to commonly held understandings of ethnic values (Bonacich and Modell 1980). Overall the comparative businesspeople do not display cultural values that are relevant to their cultural bases (Changanti and Greene 2002).

5.3.5.8 Summary of the Comparative Hawaiian Minority Case Studies

Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs have been able to maintain strong cultural networks that are exceedingly important in their business pursuits, not only within the Hawaiian community, but also within other minority community networks as well. Hawaii is a multicultural society where Anglo-Americans are often not the dominant race. Outside of the major tourist areas or military bases, Hawaiians and numerous other Islander and Asian groups make up the bulk of the population. There is a general acceptance of social difference and multiculturalism in the wider Hawaiian community. The Hawaiian language is used freely on radio, television, the newspapers and the concepts of ‘aloha’ in addition with a myriad of words and phrases are commonly used by other groups. Hawaiian Indigenous culture is interwoven into the everyday fabric of contemporary Hawaiian society, both in the daily rituals of Anglo-Americans and Native Hawaiians. This is in stark contrast to the lack of racial integration of Indigenous Australian culture into Anglo-European culture.

Whilst two thirds of the Hawaiian entrepreneurs recounted incidents of racial discriminatory practises in their business pursuits these were on investigation viewed as isolated and not the norm. In contrast the control study participants experienced widespread discrimination with the majority of women experiencing gender bias when dealing with financial institutions.

The comparative group did not reveal any equivalent levels of cultural connection or networking to that found in the Hawaiian study. Overall it would appear that the Hawaiian entrepreneurs were pluralistic in their networking, sharing of knowledge and
community interaction, whereas the comparative participants acted as individual
economic cells, not devoid of contact with other similar minorities but acting
autonomously. Cultural networking and evidence of the application of Ethnic theory was
apparent in some minor instances, both in the Hawaiian and control study. The
comparative group appears to be concerned about their families and measure their
success in openly materialistic terms discussing money as a major motivator. The Native
Hawaiians also value supporting their families, the wider family being a much broader
concept than their counterparts. They did not state money as being a motivator. There is a
strong ethic of Hawaiian people looking out for other people. It was generally observed
they feel that the well being of other people is more important to them than money. In the
Hawaiian situation they help their Hawaiian counterparts. They also help the Hawaiian
benefactor when that person needs support. This economic interaction requires Hawaiians
to be honest in all their dealings. They stated these values are still alive and generally
applied in business transactions

This was apparent in the Native Hawaiian interviews after introductions were
made and the process was discussed. They were open and honest, the openness appearing
to be an integral part of the Hawaiian philosophy. The comparative group’s responses
were in general guarded, requiring several interviews to obtain a clear understanding.
Having stated this, it is not inferred that the comparative studies were dishonest, rather
they did not share a common cultural base and thus, their responses remained guarded to
some extent.

Education standards were similar between both groups with approximately 50%
having tertiary qualifications. Those without tertiary education either had industry
experience or qualifications were not an essential vocational requirement.

The comparative businesspeople enjoyed a start up capital base of almost two
times greater than the average Hawaiian. Half of them also enjoyed bank finance on the
commencement of their business in comparison to only eight percent of the Native
Hawaiian group. There were therefore some significant differences in borrowing
capability and capital backing. Fifty-one percent of the comparative group and fifty-two
percent of Native Hawaiians are second-generation entrepreneurs which indicate some
statistical homogeneity amongst the group.
Whilst statistically there are some similarities, the comparative study group do not in general network on a broad scale. They appear to be in business for themselves only (in comparison to the Hawaiian) and are in general motivated by material goals. The Native Hawaiian however is in business for broader reasons which appear to be a cultural application or philosophy to business whilst the comparative group showed little cultural attachment and/or values. The Hawaiian participants in general displayed strong attachment to their cultural values, and the old Hawaiian style of love for Kupuna and keikies, [the elders/family and children]. This was seen as either a function of or an explanation for being in business. The comparative group studied revealed no similarity.

The openness of the Hawaiian interviews, linked to Hawaiian values is shown in kukulu kumuhana or the pooling of emotional, psychological and spiritual strengths for a shared purpose (Pukui, Haertig and Lee 2001a). Perhaps this characteristic, which is evident by self-acknowledgement in twenty-four of the twenty five participants, is the most outstanding individual characteristic that sets the Hawaiian entrepreneur apart from the comparative group of Hawaiian ethnic minority entrepreneurs.

The cultural values evident in the Hawaiian study are not applicable or duplicated in the comparative study. This indicates that the cultural strengths of the Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs are not duplicated in other minority groups and supports the validity of the Native Hawaiian research findings.

5.4 The Australian Study

Twenty-five Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs were examined in a qualitative case study analysis which mirrored the parameters and methodology of the Indigenous Hawaiian qualitative case study analysis. Both the Australian and the Hawaiian studies included an Indigenous Standpoint theoretical approach (Budby 2001; Foley 2002a, 2003b; Moreton-Robinson 2000; Nakata 1998; Rigney 2000; Smith 1999). The Indigenous entrepreneurs were snowball selected (Weiss 1994) after following the Indigenous protocol of community introduction and conducting an open interview. All interviews followed a semi-structured question format to assist in correlation of data and an open question line was used to probe issues that pertained to individual participants. A copy of the interview format is found in attachment one. Of these twenty-five studies,
twenty-two were interviewed based on the semi-structured format, the other three used participatory based action research. The latter method involves the researcher working within the organization for periods ranging from a few days to several months to observe interaction and discuss relevant issues in depth.

Entrepreneurs were only selected for inclusion in this study if they were personally responsible for providing fifty percent or more of the operational management and ownership of the enterprise. They also had to meet the requirements outlined in the definition of an Indigenous Australian as set out in Chapter 2.1. Other stringent guidelines included conformity to the definition of an Indigenous Australian entrepreneur as set out in Chapter 2.5 and the proviso that they were stand alone commercial concerns with no concurrent government financial assistance. Community based organizations that were not stand-alone commercial enterprises were not included.

In the course of this study almost two hundred prima facie Indigenous enterprises were reviewed. A sizeable number of business enterprises were discounted as the management and shareholding were controlled by non-indigenous people. It appears many non-indigenous entrepreneurs simply employed Indigenous people in public contact positions so their businesses would appear to be Indigenous owned enterprises, and therefore enable them to market Indigenous products. Others were deleted, as they were community-based organizations that did not comply with the definition of the Indigenous entrepreneur. Others were non-for profit organizations that required institutional funding to ensure their survival as ongoing commercial concerns, they were otherwise unprofitable as business ventures. In two cases participants withdrew their approval after the interview and these interviews were not used. Another withdrew following the death of an Indigenous partner. Out of respect for the deceased and his family this study was also not included. The remaining twenty-five enterprises are Aboriginal owned and managed commercially viable enterprises or businesses in which participants derive the majority of their income. As mentioned, all individuals comply with the definition of an Indigenous Australian entrepreneur.

Interviews were analysed using substantive coding (open coding and constant comparative coding) (Glaser 1992). The triangulation process used to code the Hawaiian
study was also adopted. The seven constructs used in the study of Hawaiian entrepreneurs were adapted for this analysis. They are:

- **Positivity**: the vision, the driving force in the pursuit of business.
- **Image**: the projected image, the business structure and the use of a non-indigenous accountant.
- **Adversity**: the catalyst that instigated entry into entrepreneurial activity.
- **Education and Industry Experience**: the relationship between education and industry knowledge, and business entry.
- **Networking**: the development of networking channels for the enterprise and business contacts.
- **Family**: the relationship between family and business.
- **Discrimination**: the level of public and institutional discrimination that affects the entrepreneur.

The application of these seven parameters to the Australian study enables it to be compared to the Hawaiian study. A grounded theoretical approach to the data (Glaser 1992; Glaser and Strauss 1967; Strauss and Corbin 1990; Strauss and Corbin 1998) enables emerging results to be gauged and collectively associated. This adheres to the concepts of constant comparative coding (Glaser 1992). The utilisation of the Hawaiian constructs, which were adopted in previous Australian studies, has not compromised the ideals of a Grounded theory approach. It is argued these findings have been strengthened by the measurement of outcomes against an adapted semi-formal benchmark.

The Australian study comprises twenty-five participants across a wide range of entrepreneurial pursuits and enterprises. They are:

- Solicitor
- Mixed farmer
- Furniture and artefact manufacturer and retailer
- Art gallery
- Book retailer and wholesaler
- Commercial writer
- Fruit and vegetable retailer
- Professional writer (author)
Employment consultant  
Auto spares retailer  
Retailer (corner store)  
Auto-garage operator  
Bed and breakfast  
Internet and information technology consultant  
Steel fabricator  
Timber mill owner  
Education consultant  
Hospitality consultant and agent  
Motelier  
Restaurateur  
Education publisher  
Apiarist  
Dance troupe/cultural consultant  
Film and television director.

To maintain confidentiality the details of these participants will be coded. The letter $A$ will function as a prefix to denote Australia and a randomly numbered suffix know only by the writer, will be used. For example, $A12$ does not equate to the twelfth entrepreneur. It may be any one of the 25 case studies. Quotations may duplicate the reference numbers and shuffle them to minimize the likelihood of a reader identifying the participant through any sequence of quotations.

Several Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs were interviewed prior to the Hawaiian study, the balance were interviewed on return to Australia. This was done purely to maintain a standard of interview technique to ensure the Australian and Hawaiian interviews followed a similar if not a identical interview process (Weiss 1994).

5.4.1 Demographics

The demographics of the Australian case studies are discussed in a similar order to their Hawaiian counterparts. At the time of writing, all twenty-five of the case studies were still trading.
The Australian study group comprised eighty-four percent male and sixteen percent female participants. This is allowing for Indigenous spouse/partners who were active in the day-to-day operations of the business. Seventy-two percent of the participants were married. Turnovers per annum varied between $20K AUD per annum to just under $600K AUD. Average start up capital was approximately $13K AUD. If five entrepreneurs with start up capital of $25K AUD or more were omitted, the median start up capital was approximately $6,350 AUD.

Approximately one third of the participants commenced business with capital borrowed from their families. They periodically continued to borrow from their families as their businesses grew and they experienced periods of tight cash flow. Several commenced business with their savings and used credit cards to supplement their capital requirements, or mortgaged/sold their family home and used the equity to provide the business capital. This action of having to sell the family home should be noted as less than one third of adult Indigenous people own a home whereas over seventy percent of the non-Indigenous people enjoy home ownership (Ruddock 2003). The use of credit cards for short-term cash flow is a common occurrence practised by forty percent of the study group. Others were fortunate in having spouses earning enough money from independent means to support them during the initial start up period of negative cash flow. The external wage of the spouse covered personal living expenses, nullifying any need for drawings on the limited cash flow of the nascent business. At the time of interviewing they were no longer dependent on their spouse.

Sixty percent sought government agency advice on commencing business, and assistance in business plan preparation. Only eighty percent of those seeking assistance received business plan support. Of those who sought business advice (eighty-four percent of the respondents) seventy-one percent have experienced a negative experience with ATSIC (the then peak body for Indigenous people). Sixteen of the twenty-one participants who sought assistance from ATSIC reported poor to bad experiences. Only twenty-four percent of the participants had a positive experience with ATSIC. Several participants voiced concerns about the trustworthiness of ATSIC due to an alleged lack of confidentiality in relation to their handling of entrepreneur’s business information. They also expressed fears of possible legal ramifications due to the sensitive personal nature of
these remarks. No further details will be discussed. Sixteen percent of the participants did not seek any support from ATSIC in any form; they either did not need business advice or obtained it from independent professional providers.

Only sixteen percent of the participants were second-generation entrepreneurs. Eighty-four percent of participants did not have a history in which family members had engaged in business activities. They were the first in their respective families to undertake entrepreneurial activity that resulted in a business enterprise which provided all or most of their income. The time in business for the Australian case studies was ten years and the average period of business experience was 16.5 years. The average age of the participants was forty-three years, forty-four percent had Indigenous spouses, thirty-two percent had non-indigenous spouses and the remaining twenty-four percent were unmarried.

5.4.2 Outstanding Traits
The results of the interviews will be discussed in the same format as the Hawaiian study; this is done purely for symmetrical analysis. Additional findings and the interpretation of values will then be discussed in the following paragraphs. In discussing the traits of the successful Indigenous entrepreneurs, it is acknowledged that mainstream literature suggests there is a remarkably diverse range of elements that identify the successful entrepreneurs (Smilor 1997). However, one should also accept that thirty years of research into mainstream entrepreneurship has revealed there are no clear sets of characteristics that specifically define the successful entrepreneur (Hatten 1997). In fact their similarities are often outweighed by their differences (Baron 1998). One common characteristic amongst Indigenous entrepreneurs is a positive mindset, which will now be discussed.

5.4.2.1 Positivity
The Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs in general exhibited positivity and a vision that could only be described as a driving force in their business. The positive nature of the Indigenous entrepreneurs is a social abnormality given the history of dispossession and oppressive colonisation which has had negative consequences for Indigenous Australian society. This includes high levels of unemployment, poverty, poor education and alarming health statistics such as crippling life expectancy whereby Indigenous people
can expect to live for a considerably shorter period than their non-indigenous counterparts (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare 2003). The positivity displayed by the Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs focuses on future-orientated ideas and concepts which have been explained in literature (Willutzki and Koban 2004) as a ‘pull’ orientation whereby concepts and goals becomes essentially self-fulfilling. They pull the entrepreneur towards their set achievement target. The positivity and associated skill development associated with future-oriented ideas and concepts helps counteract negativity within the wider Indigenous communities (Grawe 1998; MacLeod and Moore 2000). The positive application to ideas and concepts often (if not in all cases) involved considerable personal sacrifice in the pursuit of business success as shown in the following:

... there are a lot of issues here ... I have foregone a wage for several years to ensure I put money back in the business ... I have been to two ATSIC business funding schemes an they told me I would never be a successful business ... that motivates me ... 120 successful clients/jobs later no one else in this market comes close ... My nearest competitor has only done twenty jobs ... Another motivator, make sure my boys don't grow up with what I had, nothing. I am terrified at being poor (A24, interview August 20, 2003).

A24 is motivated firstly by the negativity shown to him by an institutional financier and secondly by the fear of poverty. A23 had a similar characteristic of positive motivation:

... what motivates me, [being] dirt poor having nothing ... one mother feeding four, having nothing. Just want to succeed ... seen enough domestic violence to last two lifetimes ... My children, that motivates me, to work hard to give them everything that I did not get (A14, interview August 20, 2003).

These two examples of positivity have emerged out of a condition of poverty and desire to provide a positive existence for children. A16 also held a firm belief in the possibilities of business success for his children:

... I cannot afford to fail, as an Indigenous businessperson the eyes of non-indigenous people are on you, (and the eyes of your own community) always watching, always waiting for failure so they can say I told you so, he would not succeed. This is my chance; if I fail I may not get another chance. I will not let the tall poppy negativity of other people win, I will succeed (A16, interview June 21, 2002).
A16 cannot afford to fail. He feels the social pressure on him from both Indigenous and non-indigenous people who are waiting for him to fail. A less dramatic situation is A13: ‘in business you just do your best, you can’t give up. This market has changed dramatically in the last ten years with major supermarkets destroying the small retailer, which makes you work harder, you have to’ (A13, interview August 6, 2003). This participant remains positive in a weakening retail market and cannot give up. A1 reviews his positivity in a slightly different light: ‘we [Aboriginal people] keep blaming governments and we get blamed for failure ... we got to take responsibility, if we fail, we to blame ... but we got to believe and have a go’ (A1, interview September 24, 2002). A1’s positivity drives him to accept responsibility for his actions, to break a stereotype by being successful in business. When he first began business many people within his community scoffed at him saying he could never do it, never succeed and never take control of his life. This participant went on to explain that if he failed it would be his own fault and he could not blame anyone else. Perhaps one outcome of colonization is the tendency for some sectors of the Indigenous community to blame governments or other instrumentalities for their poor living conditions. A1 believes Indigenous people have to stop blaming others and take responsibility and have a go, and then they can take control of their own lives. This positive attitude to business goes beyond standard entrepreneurial literature. There are wider connotations of a cultural nature; perhaps one outcome of business success is cultural survival for the Indigenous entrepreneur.

A4 supports this view and asserts their guiding belief that greater financial independence and cultural autonomy can be gained through Indigenous business activities. Their positive attitude is revealed in the following statement: ‘we have control ... even though working extremely long hours ... the quality in life has improved’ (A4, interview September 19, 2002). They are working longer hours however the reward is the improvement in the quality in life and the increased control they have over their lives. This is the positive outcome of business participation. A6 sees the positivity of their role in business as: ‘about human rights more than anything else’ (A6, interview July 9, 2003). They see their role in the provision of a business product as their human right as Indigenous people. This comprises two elements: initially the right to work and secondly their right to market an Indigenous product, which is Indigenous material for educational
purposes in learning institutions. They see themselves as playing a positive role in correcting the lack of educational material on the history of Indigenous Australia. It is their human right to work. They are working to correct the discrimination experienced by Indigenous youth within educational institutions who do not present materials on Indigenous Australia: ‘outside of a painted boomerang and trivial detail around NAIDOC week’ (*A6*, interview July 9, 2003).

*A9* believes that: ‘getting in business is like dancing with a gorilla, you don’t stop when you are tired. You’ve got to keep on going’ (*A9*, interview September 26, 2002). Their positive application to business is that they have taken a conscious decision to step into an all consuming business role. Reflecting on the comments made by *A4*, they communicate explicitly that which many of the other participants demonstrate in their actions. This positivity is driven by a belief that through business they: ‘have control of [their] life … [they’ve] got self-determination’ (*A4*, interview September 19, 2002). *A4* controls their life, they can pay for their child’s schooling and they are independent. Even though they were once public servants, they felt owned, contained, within a groove of being Indigenous public servants. They are now their own boss in control of their life and destinies. They do not have to answer to political pressures or be governed by cultural constraints, they can now choose what they wish to be involved in.

There is a common positivity amongst the Indigenous entrepreneurs. In several cases this is connected to childhood poverty and the need to succeed for the betterment of their family. This reinforces the positive goal setting that focuses on future-orientated ideas and concepts (Grawe 1998; MacLeod and Moore 2000; Willutzki and Koban 2004). In some situations the goal setting sounds almost like desperation, they must succeed so as to improve their life and their family’s life: ‘You have to keep going … you say to yourself you can see down the track, and the mongrel in you keeps going and you don’t take no for an answer … you succeed’ (*A16*, interview December 13, 2002). This determination typifies the positive drive displayed by the Australian Indigenous entrepreneurs. This positivity is also determined by an entrepreneur’s desire for a positive self-image within the wider community which is the subject of the following section.
5.4.2.2 Image

The concept of self image or ‘face’ is commonly used in ‘Koori English’ (Fesl 1993: 151) by Indigenous Australians. The definition of face, as discussed in the Hawaiian section, is the ‘outward show, the image that is projected’ (Concise Oxford Dictionary 1977: 370). This outward show or self-image is of importance to the Indigenous Australian entrepreneur. It would appear from questioning that the Indigenous entrepreneur places importance on how they are seen by others. This may be another outcome of the racial subjugation and racial stereotyping that is prevalent in mainstream Australia (Bennet 1999). Indigenous business people appear to believe that they are seen as lacking in respectability or accountability. The following quotations illustrate how they perceive they are seen by others and how they try to counteract these perceptions. 

Al provides insight into negative stereotyping of Indigenous Australia:

... all our life we have lived on handouts ... we blame the government ... [they] blamed us ... we have to take responsibility for everyone’s sake, we can’t stay living like this, stop winging, stop moaning. Get off your black arses and just make it ... change their views [of us] (Al, interview September 26, 2002).

This participant seeks to change society’s perceptions of his extended family by creating a new and more positive image of his Indigenous community by working in his business and thereby changing the views held by non-indigenous Australians. Al and his peers believe they can change negative understandings of Aboriginality through proactive intervention. A3 shows a more radical approach in his workplace:

... I am in business, everyone around me is non-indigenous. I am in a white world. I have to prove myself 140% continuously. The pressure is on me all the time to prove myself. I’ve got to wear a tie, I’ve got to look good, and I can’t afford to make mistakes, [If I did] the white world will jump on me and discard me as quick as look at me because it’s a savage white [business] world (A3, interview July 12, 2002).

This participant is under pressure to perform continuously without error. In business he is isolated, under pressure to show a respectable business image and maintain high performance. A2 likewise endorses the need for Indigenous people to project an image of respectability in business. When asked would they use an Indigenous accountant they replied ‘when we sell the business, if we used an Aboriginal accountant, they may not have the credibility of a white one. We want the books ridge-digg for taxation and to
show the trading profit’ (*A2*, interview September 19, 2002). In this case study the concept of image applies also to the area of accountability. Indigenous accountants perhaps due to negative mainstream Australian stereotyping, (Bennet 1999) are perceived as unacceptable due to a preconception that they could render the books of the business inaccurate. Similar comments were also expressed by *A10*, *A13*, and *A16*. This appears short sighted as a Certified Practising Accountant (CPA) is defined by professional qualifications, their cultural identity is not normally evident unless it forms part of their marketing image. For example some Asian accountants specialise in providing accounting support for Asian businesses.

This understanding (or misunderstanding) is explained by *A18* who uses an accountant as a normal function of the business. He went on to say:

... you must use a CPA to ensure your books are perfect for the Australian Taxation Office and other reporting, also to understand your financial position. If they are CPA qualified, it does not matter what colour they are. What is important is my image as a businessperson, looking and acting professional, having the restaurant neat and clean, serving only the best quality cuisine, the freshest of coffees and concentrating on the fine detail. This is what it's all about (*A18*, interview March 3, 2002).

Obviously the issue of the lack of credibility of Indigenous accountants is a fallacy; however it is based on preconceptions of the non-accountability of Indigenous Australians by mainstream Australia. Recent debate in the federal parliament over the demise of ATSIC (Parliament of Australia 2003) has only fuelled the negativity towards Indigenous Australians and their perceived lack of accountability. *A18*, correctly states it is the attention to detail and quality of his restaurant that is far more important in the portrayal of his image as a businessperson, than the cultural background of his CPA.

*A20* finds himself having to wear suits all the time in his business, in order to promote an image of professionalism: ‘I’m trying to show them [whites] that we are professional, that Aboriginal people can be professional and we are professional in our business dealings’ (*A18*, interview September 27, 2002). He added however that image is more complex than just clothes: ‘if you are in business today, you must accomplish your task straightaway. You must achieve it in a most professional and in the shortest time possible … that’s the only way you get repeat business’ (*A18*, interview September 27, 2002). *A20* likewise understands that whilst their visual image creates opportunities, it is
their efficiency and professionalism which enables them to cement repeat business. *A16* expands on this:

[In business] I have to play the game, I have to get dressed up, presentation is the name of the game, I know that I am subject to double checks and close scrutiny, and I made sure I have catered for that ... you have to have a pig's skin, you have to keep going (*A16*, interview December 13, 2002).

This participant acknowledges that pre-existing beliefs in Indigenous inferiority in business circles requires him to have a thick skin, play the game and ensure his presentation is always immaculate. He knows he must portray a faultless image. Another speaks of having to work harder than his non-indigenous counterparts to counteract these beliefs: 'I used to work harder ... I used to try and prove myself and work much harder [than my white peers]' (*A25*, interview August 21, 2003). *A25* provides another example of the lengths he must go to in order to establish himself: ‘The buck stops with me, I am responsible’ (*A25*, interview August 21, 2003). Ultimately responsibility rests with the entrepreneur, yet participants demonstrate that their skills and abilities go unnoticed unless they can portray a positive image, a ‘face’ to obtain the opportunity in the first instance.

The motivating force behind the Indigenous participants’ passage into business is the next issue to be discussed. This has been identified to as the condition of adverse fortune.

5.4.2.3 Adversity

A number of entrepreneurs advised they held adverse positions prior to their entry into independent business like working in a mundane role or being caught in the social welfare rut. In this study the term adversity is used to reflect a negative situation which acts as a catalyst for entry into entrepreneurship. Whilst sixty-four percent of participants had planned entry into their business, as much as thirty-six percent had suffered an adverse experience that resulted in them taking the step into entrepreneurial activity. For example *A19* saw themselves getting nowhere, her husband was an unqualified roof plumber and she was a clerk in the public service that offered no chances of advancement. They wanted control over their lives: ‘If we had stayed working for someone else 9 to 5 we would have been better off in the early parts, but now we are
getting the benefits of the lifestyle and the control over our lives that we now enjoy' (A19, interview March 25, 2003). Working for themselves was a way of taking control of their lives and enjoying a lifestyle they could only dreamed about when working for others.

A24 had dabbled in his industry for several years whilst at university and in employment after his university studies. The motivator for him to enter into business was a person he admired in his vocation area telling him in a derogatory manner that he should stay out of the industry. This spurred him on; it became the catalyst that changed his interest in an industry from a hobby to an entrepreneurial concern. Now his business is larger and possibly more successful than that of his previous role model.

A16 found himself being berated in a meeting by a senior staff member who was allegedly less experienced and less qualified than himself. He realized he wanted more in life and he wanted more control over what he was doing. The initial workplace meeting became the catalyst that changed his life from a salary and wage earner to a self employed entrepreneur (A16, interview December 13, 2002). Likewise A12, were teachers at a tertiary institution who were tired of endless meetings which yielded no outcomes in Indigenous education. They both resigned and commenced their businesses. Now they feel they are providing a positive contribution to cross cultural relations between Indigenous and non-indigenous Australians that their previous employment could not satisfy (A12, interview August 21, 2003).

A10 was unjustly dismissed by his employer and this sparked his involvement into self-employment. He was 'sick of making money for other people' (A10, interview January 19, 2003). A13 was tired of being long-term unemployed. When his unemployment status was negatively reviewed by a junior staff member of the then Commonwealth Employment Service (CES) he pursued a business opportunity. The negative attitude shown to him by the CES staff member became the motivation he needed to get into business: 'No pimple faced little kid … was going to tell me how to control my life' (A13, interview August 6, 2003). A4 were disenchanted public servants in 'dead end' jobs. They both decided that they had had enough of the daily negative atmosphere within their workplace and left to enter business: 'We had no future there and we worked from week to week, always depressing. The business has allowed us to have
control over our lives, now we have something to look forward to’ (A44, interview September 19, 2002). Once again a negative situation with no long-term positive outcomes became a catalyst that helped them decide leave where they were and to enter into business.

The entrepreneurs however who planned for their entry into business have very different stories. A1 had lived in and around his industry all his life. He contemplated entering into business for a decade: ‘I didn’t rush into it’ (A1, interview September 26, 2002). He thought about it and then leased a property to test himself, to see if he could overcome negative stereotypes which projected Indigenous Australian’s as incapable of working hard farming land with intensive multi-cropping practices. After several good seasons he was able to buy the property. He now leases it out to Indigenous share croppers which have enabled him to pursue other interests.

A25 turned the continuous rejection he experienced when he first thought about going into this business into his catalyst for positive action: ‘the negative vibes of other people, they motivated me. I have knocked on so many doors and received so many rejections and getting knocked back. This makes me strive even further which gets me to the place where I am now’ (A25, interview August 21, 2003). This participant worked hard and planned to get into this business, thriving on the challenge and using rejection as stimuli. Following international success he now experiences the luxury of having those who formerly shut doors on him trying to coax him to work with their projects.

The cultural values, the social contexts and the personal experiences of entrepreneurs all affect their intentions to start up their businesses: ‘I [was told] by ATSIC … I would never be a successful business … that motivates me … I am terrified at [the possibility of] being poor’ (A24, interview August 20, 2003). A1, A24 and A25 display cultural values, be it the fear of poverty, or being told they would fail. These resulted in positive cognitive responses that adhere to cross-cultural cognitive model (Busenitz and Lau 1996). The actions of each of the participants were influenced by their respective social contexts and personal situations.

A22 does not adhere to this situation; he has a different story. He is a second-generation entrepreneur following on from his father who passed down a business to him on his retirement:
... yeah I followed on from my Dad, rebuilt the place, made it bigger, and grew with market demands. It was not enough; I am always looking to branch out for example the art and craft. [Did this] after the highway was upgraded and the tourist attraction up the road gained international recognition. You wouldn't believe how many Americans come here and buy up big. The removalist trucks, well that was a spin off from here. I needed a good truck to get produce from Brisbane [fruit markets]. Why have it sit idle for 5 days a week? Now I have three [trucks] all paid for and all busy. Am always looking for new ventures, to broaden, to interest me (A22, interview November 17, 2002).

This participant went into the business after leaving school. He worked in other jobs initially, then came back to it and has been there ever since. Yet he is not content, always looking for new opportunities. A7 has a similar story of diversifying into new areas of business. He started out by purchasing a dairy run that involved a large milk run in a poor socio-economic area. He lost a lot of money through bad debts bought a stock truck and then a log truck. This developed into a solid business. He then went to the mainland after twelve years on the log trucks, worked for wages, came back, was awarded a government contract, sold that, then purchased two small troop carriers and began conducting small tours in the mountains. Within five years he had five buses. He then branched out into a backpackers accommodation, sold the bus company and the backpackers' hostel and started another specialist four-wheel drive tour company. After building a mountain lodge and being pushed out of that business by an unscrupulous partner, he then started a bed and breakfast and a seal and penguin tourism venture amongst other things. This entrepreneur's interests are as diverse as his talents. He comes from a large family, was raised in poverty after the death of his father at a young age in a logging accident. As the eldest of seven children he was always looked up to and found himself in the role as provider for his siblings and his widowed mother:

... I've never been a numbers person, they would have difficulty understanding where I come from ... I'm a picture man. I can look at something. I can say, this is what I want to do ... I am a dreamer ... always looking for something new ... Once it's finished I get bored and I am looking for the next project (A7, interview March 23, 2002).

A7 initially entered private enterprise out of necessity to provide for his in a region renown for some of the highest unemployment levels in Australia (no reference as this would jeopardise the identity of the participant) for both Indigenous and non-indigenous
people. Poverty was his adverse situation and his lack of formal education and skills compounded the problem. The only solution was to follow his dreams, his vision. This emotional state rather than rational can produce bias and error in decision making (Baron 1998). This is evident in some of his decisions, which resulted in financial failures.

A15 is also a second-generation entrepreneur, one of only four in the Australian study. He likewise followed in his father's footsteps and purchased an existing family business like A22. In A15's case he then employed his father to run the business, which maintained a stable and effective line of management whilst he pursued other interests. His adverse situation was the realisation that his father was forced into selling the business due to short-term cash flow problems. Since purchasing the business, A15 has injected needed capital, upgraded machinery to make them more cost efficient, saved a family business, thus provided employment for his father and maintained a loyal trustworthy manager.

Whilst only thirty-six percent of participants found themselves pursuing entrepreneurial activity at very short notice after workplace disputes or similar adverse situations, it is interesting to note that even entrepreneurs who planned their entries into business experienced events that forced their hands. This includes A7 and A15. The concept of adversity remains an important issue for the Indigenous Australian entrepreneur as prior to entry into business activities they envisaged themselves as oppressed. In theoretical application this has been defined as the 'crisis' (Fay 1987: 27) as their adverse situation acts as a catalyst that may instigate their entry into business in the short-term with or without forward planning. The choice to enter business and entrepreneurial activity may follow high levels of emotion that impact on the rational thinking of the entrepreneur (Baron 1998). Entry into business that results in entrepreneurial activity, however, can also be a form of 'liberation' whereby 'a group not only come[s] to understand itself in a new way', it engages in 'revolutionary activity in which its oppressors are overthrown' (Fay 1987: 28). Business activity is a revolutionary act for Indigenous Australians as this is in contradiction to the commonly held perception that Indigenous Australians are not industrious. Overthrowing the oppressiveness of poverty and achieving success in business though entrepreneurial activity is interpreted as 'enlightenment' (Fay 1987: 28). Overall, success in business is a form of self-
determination, a casting off of the ‘welfare shackles’ (Herron 1998) and therefore a step towards ‘emancipation’. In this instance, ‘emancipation’ (Fay 1987: 29) is the destruction of negative racial stereotypes, which position Indigenous Australians on the lowest rung of a social system. Entrepreneurial activity enables emancipation for Indigenous Australians because it ‘radically alters [their] social arrangements’ and ‘alleviates [their] suffering’. As a result, the group is ‘empowered by its new-found self-understanding’ (Fay 1987: 30). Fay’s (1987) Critical theory can be applied to this study as it explains the social repositioning of Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs as they proceed towards business success. The oppressed experience a crisis that may encourage them to enter business, they find the positive socio-economic benefits of entrepreneurial activity enlightening and their ultimate entrepreneurial success is emancipatory as they become economically independent.

All of the participants in this study managed to survive with various levels of forward planning and positive thinking, hard work and some would say touches of good luck. In all cases they seized opportunities to entering business. Opportunity recognition (Busenitz and Lau 1996; Hills 1995) is arguably an important attribute of the entrepreneur. Opportunity recognition is also described as an essential part of the entrepreneurial process (Hisrich and Peters 2002). It is well illustrated by A16: ‘I plan, look at all factors then do it … there are lots and lots of factors to take into consideration but don’t let the chance pass by’ (A16, interview December 13, 2002). In this situation the ability to effectively plan his entry into business counteracted A16’s initial fears about adverse affects on his lifestyle. A16 found that making provision for adverse conditions during the planning process enabled him to counteract several negative situations which could have had considerable negative impact on the business cash flow. The successful running of A16’s business depends on sound planning and the identification of new clients on an ongoing basis, so as to ensure lost clients are absorbed to some degree by their replacements.

The one commonality all participants possess is either a tertiary education or sound industry experience. This highlights a major impediment to entrepreneurship as Indigenous Australians have the worst education participation rates in the country. Only 36% of the Indigenous population remain at school until year twelve. This compares with
73% of mainstream students (ABS 2002). The next section expands on the participant’s education and industry knowledge.

5.4.2.4 Education and Industry Experience
Given the low participation rates of Indigenous Australians within educational institutions and the high percentage of successful Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs in this study with year twelve or better qualifications, it would suggest sound education is linked to business success. Eighty-eight percent of participants have year twelve or better education. Fifty-two percent of the total sample have tertiary qualifications and twenty percent have trade qualifications. Only twelve percent of the participants have below year twelve education and all of these have extensive industry experience with hands on vocational knowledge. A9 and A16 illustrate the importance of education:

... I got a BA in the 70s and a law degree in the 80s. The private sector is a no go zone without qualifications [education] I made it, am happy with what I now do. You cannot achieve anything without qualifications; if you do it is so much harder (A9, interview September 26, 2002); You need an education ... there are no shortcuts. You can be a gun with your mouth but if you don’t have any substance to back it up, it doesn’t mean a thing. [Need] knowledge of the industry. I’ve been a teacher ... I knew the strategic directions ... having the background I was able to plot out a pathway (A16, interview December 13, 2002).

Seventy-two percent of participants have formal education that includes trade based qualifications. Another sixteen percent have achieved a year twelve high school education. Only three remaining participants have no high school graduation or formal qualifications. They have industry experience totalling ninety-seven years between them. The mean industry exposure was sixteen and one half years and the average years in business, was ten. The study group exhibit a long history of exposure to and involvement in industry. This could possibly indicate they have a conservative approach. Those participants without formal schooling have on average thirty-three years of industry knowledge.

Literature on entrepreneurs suggests they have a considerable knowledge of the market and of the product (Kuratko and Hodgetts 2001). This view is supported by the results of the Australian study. General knowledge, general product knowledge, and market knowledge appear synonymous with business success. This is supported by recent
research which argues 'the investment in education and training is also likely to have a significant positive effect on the growth and profitability of [Indigenous Australian] small enterprise' (Fuller et al. 2003b: 25). Education and vocational skill development appears to offer an important skill base to Indigenous Australians entering business (Fuller et al. 2003b). Education enables the Indigenous entrepreneur to understand 'key institutional arrangements, processes and cultural priorities associated with the mainstream, market based economic system' (Fuller et al. 2003b). Fuller's (2003b) studies, which are based in rural remote Australia, are supportive of this urban study and vice versa. Education and vocational skills are key elements/management tools for the successful Indigenous entrepreneur and their importance should not be underestimated. There is, however, some conflicting, contradictory literature from America on ethnic research and Native American research which contradicts these findings.

Changanti and Greene (2002) reviewed literature on Native Americans, African-Americans and Hispanics and found varying relationships between education and successful minority entrepreneurs. The significance of the variation on the findings depended on the nature of the sample and comparisons drawn. Overall however, on the analysis of Changanti and Greene's (2002) comparatives, education levels are definitely at a lower level. For example Native American women in business have lower college graduation achievements than their mainstream American counterparts. However, minority enterprise participants have higher levels of education than the general minority population levels.

Recent Australian research criticises the findings of empirical studies which emphasise the importance of education over the effects of racial discrimination (Hunter 2003). This is covered in 5.4.2.7 to some extent as well as in the final chapter. This argument is important but it should not detract from the achievements of Indigenous Australians with basic education, vocational education and/or industry experience, which research has shown is invaluable and almost necessary for business success (Fuller et al. 2003b; Foley 1999, 2000a, 2000b, 2002b, 2003).

Knutson provides a sound summary of the importance of education and knowledge to the Indigenous Australian entrepreneur:
Most scholars and professional managers agree that whether the economy falters or prospers, there is little doubt that the value of education will be much more important in the future than it is today. Knowledge and information will be important to virtually all managers and leaders in the future (Knutson 2000: 26).

The Indigenous Australian entrepreneur is a member of a small cultural group in Australia which generally is characterised by a low level of educational qualifications. The sampled entrepreneurs however enjoy high levels of education and or industry/vocational qualifications/experience. There appears to be a strong correlation between the attainment of education and vocational skills and success in a business environment which is dominated by non-indigenous values.

5.4.2.5 Networking
One of the most important factors influencing entrepreneurs during their years in business is their choice of role models and networks (Hisrich and Peters 2002). Only sixteen percent of participants are second-generation entrepreneurs. This leaves eighty-four percent of participants without a history of family members in business. The majority of the participants were the first in their respective families to display entrepreneurial talents that resulted in business undertakings. On entering business many felt isolated. Networking was a key component to their survival. This is their story.

Aj looked up to:

... this whitefella, I get a lot of criticism but he works farms at a profit, he works hard, he knows the land. He goes to the sales, always gets best price or buys well and gets the lowest price on new stock, his contacts are the best, he gets first contract, first pick of the lot, you get the best feed, he teaches me and he does this for nothing (Aj, interview September 26, 2002).

Aj drew on the experiences and the skills of a non-indigenous mentor who has helped him establish key industry contacts that arguably would not have been possible previously due to negative stereotypes and discrimination.

A2 uses their contacts with other successful Indigenous people in their industry, which has enabled them to build and develop a network of industry professionals that they can use as a resource. A4 likewise networks continually as he plans his next venture. He talks to his bank and people from small business agencies. Outside of his creditors, he
has limited networking capabilities, as he is the first in his family to enter business. It is significant however, that is he is planning for his next venture.

*A6* is a partnership of two talented, well educated Indigenous women. They have intellectual ability and strong industry contacts. Both have previously worked in the industry to which they market, and one partner maintains a position in the industry to increase their profile and market potential. It is interesting that they experience no difficulty in networking with other women, even when their clientele is predominantly professional non-indigenous woman. They do experience difficulty, however, when they attempt to network with men as either potential clients or potential suppliers of specialised goods. The greatest obstacle they face is dealing with males who do not seem to want to listen or communicate with them. This raises the issue of gender inequality and is of grave concern. This is discussed in greater detail in the discrimination section. It raises questions including: do men prefer not to deal with woman in business, or is it more sinister? Do Anglo-European men refuse to deal with Aboriginal women at a professional level? Whatever the answer, *A6* recognises the importance of networking and they are possibly precluded from reaching their full potential due to race and/or gender discrimination (*A6*, interview July 9, 2003).

The opposite scenario exists in the following example. *A3* networks with non-indigenous people and is somewhat hostile towards Indigenous business contacts:

… in business I can’t afford to mix with black people, in community I mix but in business I can’t. During business hours and during my business time I cannot afford to mix with black people because black people [Indigenous Australians] do not give me access to things I need. They do not give me access to business connections. Indigenous people have not developed enough to provide these things for me, so therefore it is in my best interests to mix with white people (*A3*, interview July 12, 2002).

*A3* is driven by what he perceives as a business necessity to deal with non-indigenous people. Networking opportunities with Indigenous peers are non-existent as he works within a business environment managed by non-indigenous people. His Indigenous staff work in reception or low level menial positions (*A3*, interview July 12, 2002). This participant feels that the expertise and knowledge that he needs can only be found within the non-indigenous sector. This is a similar situation experienced by *A1*. Both *A3* and *A1* can only find expertise outside of
the Indigenous community. They are forced by necessity to network with mainstream business contacts.

Similarly A7 commenced his first business in 1969 and has since enjoyed success in many diverse enterprises. He appears to be a skilled networker. For example whilst he was being interviewed, he was also negotiating the purchase of some rare timber that he noticed as logs, laying in a paddock. During the interview, A7 also negotiated the sale of the timber ‘milled’. The logs were first seen whilst he was conducting a guided bus trip for tourists in a rainforest area. The bus trips are another of his business ventures. He is continually looking for opportunities and new ventures: ‘once I finish a project I get bored very quickly and I am always looking ... dreaming of what can be done [elsewhere]’ (A7, interview March 23, 2002). A7 and A1 both take networking with mainstream businesspeople in their stride. They see it as an inevitable, natural part of business whereas A3 is somewhat confronted by it. A3 has only been in business for four years whereas A1 and A7 have sixty-five years of industry experience between them. Perhaps the ability to network across cultural and/or racial barriers comes with years of experience and exposure to mainstream business.

A8 uses a unique form of marketing strategy. They network with large, strategically selected not-for profit youth organizations and schools. By way of word of mouth recommendations they are able to make considerable savings by cutting advertising costs. Outside of brochure printing costs they have no advertising budget and do not need to allocate funds to that area, such is the effectiveness of their networking. A10 is also involved in the hospitality industry. The networking skills of A10 have been taken to a higher level by their appointed to industry representative bodies. This displays a maturity in networking ability as he is not only networking to raise the level of awareness of his specific business, he is also indirectly raising the awareness of Indigenous Australian business operators within peak industry bodies. A10 is the first Indigenous Australian to do so in their industry and he has also been pro active in being elected to local sporting clubs. A10 is possibly the first Indigenous President of a very large and
financially sound sporting club, which since its inception has had a non-indigenous executive and management team.

_A11_ are strong supporters of industry networking as they operate within a very competitive industry. Trade shows, industry magazines and alternative lifestyle periodicals are some of the marketing outlets that have facilitated contact with other businesses. These have resulted in the establishment of positive networking associations. They also vigorously pursue opportunities to promote their business through positive industry word of mouth. There is no networking within Indigenous circles.

_A12’s_ customer base is aligned to the predominantly non-indigenous tourist industry. However they also need to network extensively within the Indigenous community to obtain their stock in trade. They have two distinct marketing plans; one is aimed at the non-indigenous retail sector through travel agents, hotels tour operators and the general hospitality industry to encourage them to bring their clients into the store. This networking occurs within a very competitive industry; their major advantage is the quality of their retail goods, which they obtain from their second networking circle. This latter network is the source of Indigenous made goods including artefacts, clothing and artwork. They network extensively with Indigenous communities across Australia and do not pay on consignment, which is the market norm. They pay cash on delivery or according to agreed trading terms which is not the market norm as many retail operators either work on consignment and/or thirty day terms. Their networking abilities enable them to source original artworks produced by Aboriginal Australians:

[...you won’t get anything made in Hong Kong here, not like my competitors ... we are still developing a network ... and its hard, we just don’t get to do all the things that we should do [just not enough hours in a day] (A12, interview August 21, 2003).]

_A12’s_ situation is unique. Like many other participants studied, their retail sales are directed towards mainstream Australia, yet their creditors are mostly Indigenous people. This requires sound networking strategies such as treating a creditor more like a ‘kin’ relation and less like a producer of product. This
highlights the importance of general business networking skills. It is also an example of skilful in Indigenous business circles rather than within non-indigenous business networks.

Like the other participants, A14 provides a valuable insight on matters of networking. They are now established and have a high profile name. Networking is no longer as important: ‘earlier on, [it was] very important to learn that stuff, what your client wants and what kind of contracts and deals you can get’ (A14, interview August 25, 2003). This participant no longer needs to network. This is a similar situation to that faced by A25. Both have achieved international acknowledgements and no longer need to knock on countless doors. Both A14 and A25 enjoy sound reputations that allow industry recognition and they find that their product perpetuates the networking process. Both participants acknowledge the importance of building those contacts and walking those hard yards. Their success is now only partly attributable to their networking within a very difficult market. It is a non-indigenous market controlled and managed by non-indigenous operators who once seemingly sneered at them. Now they deal with them as peers.

A16 acknowledges that knowledge of the industry combined with networking is paramount for success. They had worked on the periphery of service delivery in the industry for several years. This enabled them to identify the key stakeholders and decision makers and ensure their networking was effective:

... I knew the strategic directions and changes in directions, and the changes in philosophy in the industry ... so knowing and having that background [together with industry contacts] I was able to plot out a pathway and be really proactive ... where to develop a product ... and bring it into this market ... that it would be successful (A16, December 13, 2002).

A16 works in a non-indigenous industry and the networking process is and was daunting for him. The successful identification of strategic connections enabled him to enhance his own position and there by achieve a competitive advantage (Paige and Littrell 2002). Networking has enabled A16 to achieve strategic goals.
In all cases, networking has enabled the participants to develop and make use of relationships with suppliers and other organizations and in the process provide increased opportunities to build credibility, a positive image and customer access (Zhao and Aram 1995). Building credibility and a positive image are important concepts when one has to confront racism within the business world. This is discussed in greater detail in section 5.4.2.7. For the Indigenous businessperson networking is essential as they are working within a non-indigenous business network. Networking provides role models, industry advice, the sharing of experiences, and access to suppliers and customers (Dollinger 2003; Kuratko and Hodgetts 2001). It is seen as a strategic and a purposeful activity by Indigenous entrepreneurs to gain entry into markets that are non-indigenous. Networking enhances the Indigenous entrepreneur’s ability to succeed and survive (Paige and Littrell 2002). Perhaps the most important aspect of networking, as outlined in this study, is that it allows the participants to obtain a positive image and industry credibility (Zhao and Aram 1995).

5.4.2.6 Family
The relationship between family and business took on two separate roles. The first produced a positive outcome whereby entrepreneurs were influenced to undertake entrepreneurial activity as a means to support and provide for their families. The second aspect was the negative effect that family had on some participants due to the concept of wealth sharing and the misconceptions that flowed on from this cultural principle. 

A25 provides an illustration of the positive role through their use of parental role models:

[m]y Mum was a cleaning lady in a car yard for fifty years and Dad was a mechanic and a bus driver ... all my siblings have got degrees ... the poverty and hard work that we came from motivates us. Our parents did it tough (A25 interview, August 21, 2003).

This participant is tertiary qualified well known in their industry and strongly influenced by parents who encouraged all their children to go to Brisbane at secondary school leaving age, to get a higher education and learn a profession. Family issues positively motivated A25.
A24 has a family story that illustrates another form of motivation which many Indigenous Australians remember or can relate to. He will not eat stew. As a child he went with his mother and his siblings to scour the tip and rubbish bins for the choice off-cuts of vegetables. They would cut the rotten parts off and later stew up the choice bits. This level of poverty impacted upon contemporary Indigenous Australia, including: [m]y mother comes from Cunnamulla ... in a place where the native Police were first introduced, we copped them first, they came to our lands. Every generation of my family are doing better and better [since then]. I am going to do better and my kids are going to do better still. And as long, as they are happy and don’t have to do what we did. My mother used to travel around looking for food ... going to garbage bins ... or the bread shop and get stale off cuts. That’s where I came from, so I am not going to be poor (A24, interview August 20, 2003).

This emotional statement illustrates the motivation within the Indigenous entrepreneurs to succeed in business and provide for family. A24 is not going to be poor as he has tasted poverty and wants a better life for his family and his children. This is his motivation to provide for his children and ensure they do not experience poverty. A23 has a similar story. They were ‘dirt poor having nothing ... just want to succeed ... have two children, they motivate me to work hard and give them everything I did not get’ (A23, interview August 14, 2003). Once again the motivation to succeed is driven by a desire to provide for the children. This motivation is in some ways similar to the positivity attribute (5.4.2.1). It could, however, be argued that positivity is driven by a participant’s desire for non-failure. The need to provide for family and the strong family orientated connection is the driving force, the internal motivation (Baum 1995), the action of resistance to poverty.

A20 is likewise motivated to provide for his children and he states this is his intrinsic motivator. He also uses his business to provide for his wider family. He employs many of the youth in his different projects. Similarly A16 works to provide his children with sporting and educational opportunities, which he did not have access to.

A14 views the role of the income-earning entrepreneur slightly differently:

... as a woman with family, as a mother you look after your own kids and I guess I have responsibilities towards by brothers. I value and have different concerns to the whitefella. My extended family kids and I have different responsibilities and you have a longer-term view because as soon
as our kids are born you start worrying are our sons going to be alive in 16 to 20 years time, that's just not on the radar for most white guys. That's why I am in business to provide, maybe a role model, not sure. I am there doing what I want but also to look after them (A14, interview August 25, 2003).

A14 is motivated by very personal reasons in business. She believes that unlike the non-indigenous businessperson, who she stereotypes as being in business for personal gain, her motivation is dominated by a desire to support her family as she believes Indigenous families suffer more than their non-indigenous counterparts. Her concerns over youth suicide, substance abuse, youth incarceration, police harassment grew out of experiences she had when she was growing up. Her fears were fuelled by contemporary events within her own group of family and friends. Her motivation to be a successful woman in business is driven by her strong family bonds and the desire to provide for her children, her siblings, their children and her extended family where possible. She is in business to provide. She also hopes she will act as a successful role model to help the youth around her aspire towards a positive future and overcome the problems outlined previously.

Similarly A13 first entered business to support his seven children through school. He continued in business so as to provide for their futures and the futures of fifteen grandchildren. A12 is in business to give their children more opportunities than they were given:

... [t]he boy and girl, real keen, get involved in the business, whole family involved. When our children started working for us they began to understand the support and need for us. They no longer thought, oh Mum and Dad are making lots of money, when they are here they can see that on some days we make almost nothing, they see our overheads (A12, interview August 21, 2003).

A12 also involves their children in the business so they may understand their parents' struggle and sacrifice and to ensure they gain a work ethic. A11's young family is his motivator. He wants to ensure his young children have a good start to life. When A10 entered business they had a young family. Their business has put two children through university and the third through trade college. That child has now started a business, is self-employed and is entrepreneurial in his own right. Now A10 is involved in youth training amongst other things. They have successfully sponsored several Indigenous
youth in apprenticeships in their business. Their family was their initial motivator. Now they support other children, helping them obtain skills and experience. They also look after aging parents and several family members. This wealth sharing is a direct result of their business success.

Family and wider community networks can act as a motivator. ‘The money that we create goes back in the place and helps give the community some valuable employment’ (A8, interview September 28, 2002). A8 have a pluralist approach to the business, as it is a community based business and the community is a priority. Both A7 and A6 are also motivated to provide for their families. A6 also has a strong conviction to provide a service to the community. A2 was motivated for his family; he cares for an ill mother and unemployed siblings. He provides a house and basics to enable them to survive comfortably. A1 is also motivated to provide for his family and the success of his business directly assists several of his wider family who are employed in the business.

Overall the majority of Indigenous entrepreneurs were motivated to provide for their family. It could be argued this is no different to mainstream entrepreneurs to whom the social and economic well being of the nuclear family is also a key motivator (Bird 1989). Having stated this, whilst the Indigenous Australian is motivated to provide for family, he/she is also driven by an intense social commitment to overcome general levels of poverty and welfare dependency within the wider Indigenous community. There is no evidence to suggest non-indigenous Australian entrepreneurs experience societal commitments at this level in either statistics or wider literature.

These Indigenous Australian kinship obligations can also have a detrimental effect on Indigenous entrepreneurial enterprises. A16 experienced this on the commencement of their business. They were shunned by close family members who interpreted their polished dress and presentation as well as their new car as the attainment of wealth. A4 has experienced the difficulty of family taking stock off the shelves without paying as they incorrectly interpreted that A4 was rich. The family members who would take the stock did understand that A4 had to replenish the stock. A dichotomy of values is evident in the capitalist free market and the perceived kinship obligations of acceptable sharing behaviour (Berndt and Berndt 1992). The wider family members expected to be able to take consumables from A4 as it appeared they had plenty. Kinship obligations
carry specific, rights and respects (Lawlor 1991). In A4's case the reciprocal respects were either not spelt out or were forgotten. This created a difficult situation for A4 to manage, which resulted in conflict between family and extended family.

Provision for the family structure and especially children is a strong motivator. Aspects of kinship law have created difficulties for some participants. On analysis this appears to be caused by a misunderstanding of kinship obligations as they operate in two ways. There is also the concept of reciprocity which possibly is not recognized or know by its exponents (Berndt and Berndt 1992; Lawlor 1991). The provision for family appears to be a driving force behind the Indigenous entrepreneur's entry into business. It is almost a cultural force. This claim is supported by wider literature (Baum 1995; Bird 1989).

5.4.2.7 Discrimination
The findings of this Australian study illustrate that all Indigenous entrepreneurs shared a common experience of negative discrimination from mainstream Australia following their entry into business. A4 described incidents with suppliers' representatives who were very negative towards them. They believed this behaviour was race or colour based. When they complained to the parent company they were relieved to learn it was neither company policy nor generated practice that spurred this attitude, rather it was the racist attitude of the individual representative. He was subsequently transferred. This problem was widespread; A1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 24 all had similar experiences to A4 with suppliers. This would suggest that when entrepreneurs need to purchase goods from trade suppliers on either a cash or credit payment basis, they are confronted with negative racial attitudes. Sixty percent of participants experienced similar negative situations with creditors that also appear to be race based. These are negative situations where the trade representative or supplier were rude to them or ignored them. In several cases these representative suppliers asked to speak to the manager in the belief that a black person could not own the business. This common problem existed with both suppliers and clients. The behaviour of the buying public provides an example of how racism has the potential to be an extreme inhibitor to entrepreneurial business success. A5, for example is established within the services industry. He has experienced numerous instances where clients either ask for the
manager, or question him on his abilities, or call him 'boy'. Within Indigenous Australia (and African-American society) 'boy' is commonly linked to slavery and often denotes a power imbalance of 'white' people subjugating 'black' people (Holingsworth 1998).

Half of the remaining forty percent of participants, who are not self-employed within service industries, have experienced race-based discrimination or intimidation in their daily business operations. Race-based discrimination appears to have also played a part in participants' dealings with Government institutions, financiers, and creditors. For example A5 had their credit changed without any notice from thirty days to COD with a major creditor shortly after a new sales representative called him 'boy' and asked to speak with the manager. A5 withdrew his business from that company.

Racial discrimination is a part of life to Indigenous Australians. Whilst racism should never be accepted or condoned, reference to Australian contact history and data collected from the twenty-five participants in this study, indicate many people in mainstream Australian society behave in a racist way and hold racist attitudes. Wider literature supports this view that Australian society generally, be it the business sector, the education sector or the local everyday community, is a racist society that practices inequality towards Indigenous Australians (Bennet 1999; Hollingsworth 1998; Huggins 1998; Stratton 1998, Tatz 1979). While there are exceptions to every rule, it is generally accepted that racism remains a historically grounded problem in contemporary Australia.

These statements are supported by the findings of the 1992 Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody, which is arguably the most significant government document produced on Indigenous issues. The Commission's findings acknowledged the existence of overt and covert racist attitudes, and the way these attitudes have been institutionalised in the practices of legal, educational, and welfare institutions as well as the authorities which were designed to assist Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples (Commonwealth of Australia 1992). The Human Rights Commission report of 1991 also acknowledges the extent of racism in Australian society. This has been confirmed to some extent by the findings of this study.

In the business context, A3 makes an observation that was given by several other participants: 'all the people who make decisions are white' (A3, interview July 12, 2002). A3 finds that often racism occurs in indirect ways. The decisions made by non-
indigenous people can have dramatic effects on business outcomes if the decision maker holds racist or negative attitudes towards coloured people. A reversal of this pattern is given by A1. When a trade representative made derogatory statements about his trade accounts (which were local Aboriginal businesses) to the non-indigenous owner of a large hardware store the trade representative was informed that: ‘Aboriginal businesses were the only ones in town who paid their bills on time (A1 interview September 26, 2002). The hardware operator added that he had to: ‘continually chase the white accounts’ (A1 interview September 26, 2002). The trade representative had automatically accepted the negative stereotypes of Aboriginality and belittled A1 without getting to know their abilities. This is a common occurrence in a society that generally holds racist views.

As mentioned A5 experienced negative behaviour from customers. Other participants were also often questioned about their qualifications and/or proficiency by Anglo-European Australian customers. Similar situations occurred with financial institutions. Eighty percent of participants suffered negative experiences with banks and or financiers. A5 often feels he is placed under the microscope. When he is probed with questions, he interprets them as really asking: ‘can an Indigenous Australian be successful in business’ (A5, interview August 21, 2002). A13 provided his summation of financial institutions in respect to both Indigenous Australian and small business people generally: ‘banks, can’t comment on any good experiences with them’ (A13, interview August 3, 2003). Several of the participants reflectively agreed racist taunts did hurt. Your skin never gets that thick was a general reply from A4, A9, A10 and A16. Other participants had similar comments.

The National Inquiry into Racist Violence in 1991 stated that:

…many Aboriginal people have grown so used to being verbally abused and called by insulting names over the whole period of contact with whites that they tended to focus their complaints upon physical harassment and discriminatory exclusion from social venues. (Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission 1991: 16)

The experience of negative discrimination (racism) is so common to Indigenous Australians that it is only acknowledged it when it is physical or exclusionary. Two instances were witnessed by the writer during the interview process. In separate incidents
customers treated both A5 and A6 with racial contempt. To the respondents’ credit, they did not react or acknowledge the racist comments. Rather, they smiled and said to me after the clients had departed that their money was the same or equally as good as other peoples. They concluded with the admission that after a while you just ignore them. The entrepreneurs have also had negative dealings with government agencies whose mandates should have required them to be supportive. Sixty-four percent experienced negative dealings with ATSIC. This would suggest that racism is evident even within the very agencies that are instituted to counteract it.

Sixty percent of participants experienced discrimination from Indigenous communities themselves. The data revealed that this has the potential to be more destructive and inhibiting than racism from mainstream society. In general the participants were more emotional when this subject was discussed. It appears that for many of the Indigenous entrepreneurs, as they became more successful their own communities and family networks became discriminatory towards them. This was particularly evident as social change in the form of a realignment of networks and community contact took place. This is a secondary form of racism, racism from within Indigenous society against itself.

A16 for example received rebuttal from several close members of his family when he first entered business because he dressed in business clothes and purchased a new car. This was the first new car ever purchased in his family. The car combined with smart clothes gave a false impression to A16’s wider family that he had new found wealth when in fact the car was bank financed and the clothes purchased on credit card. The wider family were unable or perhaps unwilling to accept this explanation. There was a perception that they were not getting a share of his income and they felt rejected. Even after several years, a number of his family still refer to him as ‘white shirt’ because he wears long sleeve white shirts, a tie and business trousers. The clothes match the image required for his business endeavour, which is not the norm in his impoverished family. Even though he actively supports several family members financially with medicine and food there is still apprehension against his ‘image’.

Participants also experienced another form of discrimination that is gender discrimination. The female entrepreneurs are not only exposed to racial discrimination,
most also experienced gender discrimination. A14 in her role as a mother, wife and a sister felt that she carried a heavier workload of responsibility in comparison to the non-indigenous woman, when racial discrimination was also included:

... I get the same old bread and butter questions, its getting very tedious. If I were darker I would be seen as much more unintelligent and uneducated
... Being light it helps white audiences to relate to me in a different way. Makes it easier for them. You get crap from your own people for the opposite, you are too white (A14 interview, August 25, 2003).

This participant has a high public profile and is continually confronted by negative stereotyping which is a tedious experience for her. A14 also refers to Indigenous negativity in a similar context to A16. Indigenous entrepreneurs experience a level of rebuttal from their peers that is also race-based. They are seen as too white. Too white to be black, yet too black to be white (Foley 2000c). A6 is an Indigenous female partnership that has also experienced gender bias. They also experience gender bias:

... being a woman yes [I have experienced both gender and racial discrimination]. You try, you try and get a quote to get a product done, and you need [quotes] in your business plan and things [to work out costing and budgets]. [The men] will not listen to you, you can not get a quote or anything, I am struggling, I am not talking the right language, which must be real businesslike, a white male [perhaps]. They will not go to the trouble of giving you a quote, as it will take them a bit of time (A6, interview July 9, 2003).

Both partners are extremely frustrated at the negative responses from men within the printing and packaging industry who will not give them business courtesy. This is having a detrimental effect on their business. At first they thought they were not speaking the right language, a Anglo-European male’s business language. They now realize that their inability to obtaining quotes to cost their projects is because they are female in business. Possibly being Aboriginal does not help. When asked how they cope with this treatment they replied, ‘[we] refuse to be weighed down by it ... you just get on and do things’ (A6, interview July 9, 2003).

The discrimination experienced by participants can be overt or covert. It can be evident in dealings with government agencies, financiers and banks. It is apparent in the habits of the buying public and in the entrenched stereotypes of those in positions of power such as creditors. With respect to female entrepreneurs, it is not only race based.
There is unconcealed gender discrimination as well. Australia is generally a racist society, being Indigenous and being in business requires survival skills. It would appear that the widespread existence of negative and potentially destructive discrimination in Australian daily life could be the most significant hurdle for the Indigenous entrepreneur to overcome. It may be more important than for example, the need for capital, market placement, industry knowledge and effective marketing. It must be remembered these are the findings of successful Indigenous entrepreneurs. It does not include the outcomes of those Indigenous business people who have possibly (and most certainty) failed under the oppressive yoke of racism. Discrimination, be it gender bias or race-based, is a negative aspect of life in Australia if you are Indigenous. The survival practices, the positivity of the entrepreneurs studied illustrates the uniqueness of the participants and the importance of their economic reform. Racism is about dominance and power (Hollingsworth 1998). To achieve self-determination and economic independence, the Indigenous Australian entrepreneur must break the shackles of a welfare state, as well as sever the disabling constraints of Australian racist culture.

5.4.2.8 Values
This research sought to determine if traditional Indigenous values still exist amongst the participants and identify what these traditional values are.

Although A1, A8, and A20 are engaged in different business fields, they exhibited a strong link to their country and traditional values concerning land. A common denominator of these three entrepreneurs is that they were born, grew and developed within the confines of their traditional homelands. They, or more importantly, their parents were not taken from their traditional homelands. Nineteen of the remaining participants from the eastern seaboard are predominantly the children of Indigenous Australian parents who were dispersed from their lands and institutionalised in missions. This covers the geographic space between Townsville to Hobart. Of the remaining, one was adopted, and the other two were stolen generation children. Twenty-two of the twenty-five participants had their connection to land and culture forcibly ruptured. This concept will be discussed in more detail in the results; however it is important to mention this fact at the beginning of this section.
A2's apply their values in their work. They do not see business as compromising their culture. In fact they are making a living off it and commercializing it. They see themselves as storytellers, the same as their old people: 'I am in a modern world doing what the old folk [pre European contact] would have been doing anyway, except I am putting it into the written instead of an oral culture' (A2, interview May 11, 2002).

A3 asserted: 'Aboriginal people have values which change continually. If we did not have white domination, we would still have the dramatic changes in our values as we progress and get more and more in touch with the modern world' (A3, interview July 12, 2002). This participant strongly believed that cultural values are always in a state of change and Anglo-European domination has slowed this down to some extent. The imposition of one set of values over another has not allowed for Indigenous values to evolve in an organically, internally driven way.

A4 thought that they continually compromised their cultural beliefs by being in business: 'which is the downside of being Aboriginal in a modern world ... we try and get involved in as many cultural events as we can that doesn't affect the business ... but modern life is that you are compromising your culture and you do less and less cultural things' (A4, interview September 19, 2002). A4 accepts that the business now comes before cultural obligations when there are clashes. The priority is now the business, not their Aboriginal interaction. A5 openly admits that he has no idea what traditional values are:

... Mum and Dad hid their Aboriginality for years to survive ... I'd love my mother to talk more but she is too scared. ... I don't know what is a traditional values or what traditional culture is ... I would like to ... I get involved in as many blackfella things as I can (A5, interview August 21, 2002).

When asked about contemporary values he replied: 'well that'd be nice to think that we got Aboriginal contemporary values ... the concept of looking after family ... looking after your parents ... trying to provide for your kids that they learn more culture' (A5, interview August 21, 2002). A5 went on to consider if these values are any different to non-indigenous values and commented that perhaps the only difference is the Indigenous need/desire to learn more about and practice their culture.
A6 was initially adamant that they do not have any traditional values, as they grew up and lived in a contemporary urban setting:

... I refuse to be weighed down by it, rather than focus on traditional values, what I have done in my life is focus on and made a decision on what has happened to my family and understand my family history ... learn what the community is all about. And simply operate accordingly to those values that the community sets for you. If you choose to live as an Indigenous person within a community you have to learn to abide by the rules and the values that the Indigenous community sets for you. Traditional values do exist ... depends on the definition ... we still see ourselves retaining cultural values. ... If you maintain relationships and if you uphold the responsibilities that your family and community set for you, you can still be a blackfella. It's about relationships, you don't have to be an activist to be a blackfella (A6, interview July 9, 2003).

It about relationships, A6 believes that cultural values can be maintained if relationships, Indigenous relationships are maintained. A6 also added that traditional values were not static; they changed with interaction with non-indigenous society. A6 considers the real traditional value is to know who you are because:

... we understand that the community sets the rules based on traditional values but we must also acknowledge that this is an urban culture ... it goes back to the three Rs, respect, responsibility on which you get your rights (A6, interview July 9, 2003).

In summary, traditional values can be maintained in contemporary urban culture if the Indigenous business practitioner maintains their identity, acknowledges and maintains respect for Indigenous values and for those around them, acknowledges and maintains responsibility to their family and peers and manages their Indigenous rights. It is important that they do not abuse their position of trust.

A7 dismissed the concept of traditional values. They thought that assimilation had taken its toll in their country, and cultural values were a dream. They maintained strong family values and respect for the environment but could not see how this was any different to other non-indigenous people (A7, interview March 23, 2002). Whereas A9 has a much stronger view, he believes that traditional values do exist:

[everything is changing across the country [with Indigenous people] engaged in trade and commerce ... it's nothing new to us ... before the white fellas came it thrived, now we have a currency system before it was open trade ... it seems that half of our community is engaged in trade and
commerce, the other remains on its own ... we still have this welfare mentality of government [in some sectors] ... The cultural aspects of finance, that's where I stand, I question selling our culture. Business is fine as long as you are not bastardizing your culture ... it is a philosophical position ... whenever you engage in commerce, you are engaging in compromising your culture ... when you talk about profit you are already presuming ... you are structuring and positioning yourself in a corporate scene ... the issue of ownership is critical ... appropriate conduct ... communal arrangements, how will they be worked out (A9, interview September 26, 2002).

A9 believes we are currently experiencing a westernization of an economy that existed prior to European intervention; the dangers however are the loss of Indigenous protocols, appropriate conduct and communal arrangements. Indigenous protocols, appropriate conduct and communal arrangements ensure traditional values are maintained in commerce. A9 has witnessed many Indigenous business people get into all sorts of difficulties because the step of going into business is so big. For many Indigenous people the issues are overwhelming or inadequately worked out. He used cattle stations, grocery stores and other examples to illustrate how these businesses did not allow for kin obligations, seasonal restrictions on human capital or wider obligations to community. They failed because the laws of commerce and traditional values can conflict if suitable planning does not take place before entry into business. The Indigenous business participant must delineate their function and interaction/obligation to family and the community, and then traditional values may co-exist with the laws of commerce in the search for profit.

The need for a self-identity which allowed for the existence of contemporary values was a key issue for A10, A11 and A13. Self-identity posed a problem for A11 and A13 because displaying their Aboriginal identity could cause a consumer backlash which would be detrimental to their business. They knew who they were and encouraged their children to participate in the community. In contrast, A10 is active in Indigenous employment issues within the wider community. Their combined success in business and their maintenance of community interaction would suggest they have retained certain values that also benefit the Indigenous community.

A12 strongly believes in Indigenous values in a contemporary application. The concepts of providing for direct and wider family networks are high on their priorities as
well as helping extended brothers and sisters in business. Many of them have limited education and are at the mercy of some unscrupulous non-indigenous operators within the Indigenous art industry.

*AI4* is a woman with a personal desire to care for land and be involved in conservation issues. She sees this spin off of her business work as maintenance of a traditional value. However she realizes they are now contemporary values due to the modern setting she finds herself in. The concept traditional values has been used against Indigenous people in business and contemporary life: ‘In an overtly political sense, the concept of traditional has been used to divide us if we let it with status, authenticity and that stuff by the [white] sociologist and anthropologist’ (*AI4*, interview August 25, 2003). Indigenous people who seek or deny traditional concepts or values in business can have their Aboriginality denied by non-indigenous academics that define and divide Aboriginal people into the categories of ‘the inauthentic’ and ‘the authentic’. *AI4*’s view is supported by wider literature (Neill 2002; Hollingsworth 1998). It seems that a traditional or cultural value is largely defined by non-indigenous people. *AI4* hopes that she can remain true to her values, without worrying about non-indigenous stereotyping or classification. *A16* provides a slightly different perspective which provides an insight into the complexity of Indigenous Australia. We are not one people, we are, many, hundreds of different Indigenous nations within a construct that is loosely called Aboriginal:

... I have never had to compromise my cultural beliefs, now as an Aboriginal person growing up in a particular town, the cultural morays of that particular town will be different from community to community. Now a person out in say the Northern Territory, they may see my culture as not being legitimate or valid as an Aboriginal culture but I would argue the point and that’s the dynamics of culture ... I would say that my Aboriginality and what I see as Aboriginality for my area and how I compromise that I say no! However if you were to get someone else to have a look at it [the result] may be different (*A16*, interview December 13, 2002).

Local dynamics can influence the definition of Indigenous culture. Other interviews clarify this. ‘Ethics and protocol rank very high as a traditional value ... respect is a key traditional value’ (*AI4*, interview August 25, 2003). *AI4* believes the way in which an Indigenous businessperson uses ethics, protocol and respect determines their place in contemporary Indigenous Australian society. ‘It goes back to the three Rs, respect,
responsibility on which you get your rights’ (A6, interview July 9, 2003). It would appear that in Indigenous ethical protocol respect is linked to responsibility and rights. Each Indigenous entrepreneur appears to understand and apply these values in personal and different ways. A25 summarizes traditional values in business as being concerned with ethics and protocols. A16 includes locality in this mix and endorses the idea that values are not necessarily universal across all Indigenous groups.

A15 provides an additional concept to the discussion: ‘contemporary values are an evolution of traditional values [we live in a contemporary world]. We are Aboriginal! We will always hold some things close to us that the white will never understand … being black and being in business does not go against cultural beliefs’ (A15, interview July 28, 2003). A15 supports the concept that Aboriginality is not reduced by being in business. A16 endorses this:

… as a Koori, I hold my head up high, and I live a good honest life. I work hard and value relationships. I think these are very important; perhaps traditional values are being redefined; now they are traditional contemporary urban (A16, interview March 24, 2002).

In this instance A16 asserts the belief that traditional values are now traditional urban values. A20 added firmly:

… you don’t have to become a white man … in business if you can maintain your culture … if you don’t have the heart already there of being a black man, if you go into business … you’re going to become a white … Culture can be maintained and you can still be in business (A20, interview September, 27, 2002).

A20 believes that if traditional/cultural values do not already exist in the individual, then the outcome will be a transition into the dominant culture of the non-indigenous business world. A8’s summation is that ‘if they don’t hang on to those traditional values, then they’ll end up in the cut throat game of white society, where there’s no respect for each other’ (A8, interview September 28, 2002).

The concept of values, traditional and modern appears to be interpreted by Indigenous entrepreneurs in a similar manner. Contemporary values are viewed as the evolutionary outcome from traditional values. Yet traditional values exist in the value base that comprises ethics, protocol, respect and responsibility from which the Indigenous entrepreneur earns their right of place within the Indigenous community. To
the management theorist the concept of Indigenous values may seem an arbitrary topic. To the Indigenous Australian entrepreneur however (as well as those studying them, policy makers, bureaucrats and other business people interacting with Indigenous entrepreneurs) values are often both external and internal control mechanisms that warrant explanation and understanding.

Fuller and Cummings (2003a) strongly support the need for adequate business research and planning for Indigenous business ventures. Understanding Indigenous Australian values would appear to be an obvious component of Fuller and Cummings' (2003a) recommendations. The lack of understanding of Indigenous Australians is an important issue. Within basic financial lending, a financier always looks at the character of a potential borrower in addition to the standard loan criteria of credit-worthiness, capital, and capacity to repay. The character of the Indigenous Australian is determined by their adherence to values. As stated above, adequate research into the Indigenous Australian entrepreneur’s business undertakings is required and within that research, the character of the entrepreneur needs to be better understood.

This study looked at the way in which individual entrepreneurs understood and applied their Aboriginal cultural values to their business dealings. The findings provide important insights into the character of the Indigenous Australian entrepreneur. Without this understanding, potential and actual Indigenous Australian business people continue to suffer at the hands of financiers, bureaucrats and policy makers who are often ill-informed, uneducated and unappreciative of Indigenous culture. The statistics speak for themselves. This is a case study analysis of twenty-five successful Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs. Yet it was difficult for any of them to remember constructive relationships with financiers or government departments, including those which were established to support them. The basis for these unsatisfactory relationships may be due to a misunderstanding of minority values, which makes this area of research of extreme importance to stakeholders in Indigenous business development.

5.4.3 Conclusion

The Indigenous Australian entrepreneur is driven to achieve success by several motivators. A dominating force is the experience of poverty or: ‘[being] dirt poor, having nothing [as a child]’ (A14, interview August 20, 2003). There is also a strong desire to
provide a better life for their children. This is the direct result of the entrepreneur’s economically deprived childhood. This resulted in a determination to produce an outcome, or a positivity to succeed: ‘I cannot afford to fail … I will succeed’ (A16, interview June 21, 2002). The positivity enables the entrepreneurs to ‘have control’ of their lives (A4, interview September 19, 2002). The trauma of 200 years of European subjugation is partially erased to some extent by the Indigenous entrepreneur gaining financial independence as a result of his/her own success in business. In comparison to the historical background of their youth, or their parents’ upbringing they obtain a degree of self-determination and control over their lives, at least _prima facie_ to a similar degree to that experienced by their non-indigenous counterparts. In so doing they take responsibility for their actions and stop blaming others: ‘we got to take responsibility, if we fail, we to blame’ (A1, interview September 24, 2002). The Indigenous Australian entrepreneur is learning to survive in a non-indigenous business world. This is a world where decisions are primarily made by European Australians, not by Indigenous operators. They need to network and interact with non-indigenous Australians for their business success.

In numerous cases the opportunity recognition process (Hisrich and Peters 2002) resulted in enlightenment and emancipation outcomes for Indigenous participants (Fay 1987). They were able to move beyond their previous positions of welfare dependency and/or negative lifestyles. The majority (sixty-four percent) of the participants planned their transition into business and seized entry opportunities (Busenitz and Lau 1996; Hills 1995). Relatively high levels of educational qualifications and/or business expertise together with the capacity for opportunity recognition appear to be associated with business success: ‘I plan, look at all the factors … but don’t let the chance go by’ (A16, interview December 13, 2002).

Education does not necessarily provide the direct skills to ensure business success. Education may however provide exposure to life skills, networking and the sourcing of business contacts. Eighty-eight percent of the participants have year twelve or better education, over half have tertiary qualifications. Almost three quarters have tertiary and/or formal trade qualifications. As mentioned only thirty-six percent of Indigenous students complete year twelve in comparison to seventy-six percent of non-indigenous
Australians (ABS 2002). With such appalling high school graduation rates, this concentration of educated entrepreneurs supports previous research that links formal education with Indigenous business success (Foley 1999, 2000a).

Family was another strong stimulant in a pluralist approach to business success. The entrepreneurs are providers: ‘the money we create goes back in the place and helps give the community some valuable employment’ (48, interview September 28, 2002). Other entrepreneurs were motivated to provide a better life for their nuclear family and children in comparison to what they experienced during their youth. As a contrast, female entrepreneurs had a wider approach to family. They indicated women had both wider and longer term responsibilities due to the high incarceration rates and early death rates of Indigenous men. Overall family bonds included not only children, but siblings and extended family as well. The provision for family appears to be a driving force behind the entrepreneurs’ entry into business. It is possibly a cultural force as well, one which is linked to their own cultural beliefs (Baum 1995; Bird 1989; Foley 1999, 2000a).

Networking is an almost essential attribute. It enables the participants to develop and make use of relationships and in so doing provide increased opportunities to build credibility, a positive image and customer access (Zhao and Aram 1995). Networking provides role models, industry advice, the sharing of experiences and access to suppliers and customers (Dollinger 2003; Kuratko and Hodgetts 2001). Networking enhances the Indigenous entrepreneurs’ ability to succeed and survive (Paige and Littrel 2002). When discrimination or racism is evident, however, networking is severely impaired.

Most if not all of the participants suffered discrimination and racism within the marketplace. Those operating within the retail sector and service industries appear to have regularly experienced a detrimental aspect of Australian life. Australia is generally a racist society that practises inequality (Bennet 1999; Hollingsworth 1998; Huggins 1998; Stratton 1998; and Tatz 1979). The 1992 Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody and the 1991 National Inquiry into Racist Violence illustrated the level of racism in Australia towards Indigenous people. From the case studies, inhibitors to business growth include limited working capital, inadequate provision and planning, limited networks, access to equity funding, and joint venture partners. Within wider Australia the dominating inhibitor to business growth and success however appears to be racism.
Participants experienced regular incidents of discrimination and racism. It was a daily occurrence to many. In fact to some it is a way of life.

Indigenous Australians are often referred to as being restricted by the shackles of welfare (Herron 1998). To survive in business and be a successful Indigenous Australian entrepreneur, participants must break both the shackles of a welfare based minority economy, and the disempowering constraints of a racist culture in Australia.

The Australian study also covered the concept of cultural values. It sought to identify the existence of traditional or other values in the business dealings of Indigenous entrepreneurs. Without going into an anthropological explanation (which is outside of the scope of this study), it was generally agreed that traditional values such as ethics and protocols still exist. Several agreed that ‘contemporary values are an evolution of traditional values’ (A15, interview July 28, 2003). It was also believed that ‘being black [Aboriginal] and being in business does not go against cultural beliefs’ (A15, interview July 28, 2003): ‘You don’t have to become a white man ... if you maintain your culture ... you can still be in business [and stay black]’ (A20, interview September, 27, 2002).

The concept of Indigenous cultural values is an important topic for non-indigenous people to come to terms with, be sensitive to, show empathy for. That will enable them to work more constructively within Indigenous business networks. Aboriginal culture can be maintained. Even possibly more important however, is the finding that Indigenous entrepreneurs can both be successful in mainstream business and uphold their Aboriginality. Or in other words, they do not necessarily have to become culturally Anglo-European (non-indigenous). To do so however, the Indigenous entrepreneur must maintain their cultural beliefs and respect. It was generally agreed that cultural beliefs and respect was a community and/or personal undertaking, which is not measurable by external definitions.

Based on the diversity of responses from the participants, generalisations cannot be applied. Each Indigenous community sets the rules of governance on values. Indigenous community members must display and practise respect and responsibility, and in so doing, earn their rights (A46, interview July 9, 2003). Following further participant discussion and wider community consultation, it was accepted that non-indigenous people external to Indigenous communities or families have no right to determine or pre-
empt Indigenous values, be they traditional or contemporary or a mix of both. The findings revealed that the Indigenous concept of Indigenous values differ by group and by area. Aboriginal people are not all the same (Foley 2001). The values of one language group may (and can) vary considerably to the next. The difference in values can be based on group law structure. For example matriarchal rather than patriachal or salt rather than fresh water law (Foley 2001). Or they can differ for other complex reasons which are the product of colonial policies and social change. Two hundred years of social practices and policies including annihilation, protectionism and assimilation (Elder 1992) have resulted in the removal and mergence of major traditional groups. Many of which have been relocated and concentrated in major capital cities away from their traditional homelands. This has created confusion and increased the degree of difficulty for non-indigenous people to understand, classify or clarify Indigenous Australian values as different Indigenous communities self correct and self monitor their own situations. This internal determination of Indigenous values by Indigenous Australians provides further support for the selection and application of Indigenous Standpoint theory as the methodological approach to this study (Foley 2002a). In summary, the Indigenous community sets the rules of governance on values.

5.5 Summary of Research Results

Chapter 5 provides the results of field studies of the Hawaiian and Australian entrepreneurs as well as the findings of Hawaiian control studies which ensure the validity of the Hawaiian research.

The Hawaiian results revealed Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs have been able to maintain strong cultural networks that are exceedingly important in their business pursuits. Racial acceptance within the multiculturalism of the wider Hawaiian community appears to be less inhibiting to the Hawaiian Indigenous culture than is the situation in Australian society which is dominated by western culture. Experiences of direct discrimination by the Hawaiian entrepreneurs in their business pursuits were isolated and not the norm. In contrast, participants in the Hawaiian control study experienced widespread discrimination, with the majority of women also experiencing gender bias when dealing with financial institutions. In Australia, discrimination was often the norm.
It would appear that the Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs were pluralistic in their networking, sharing of knowledge and community interaction, whereas their comparative Hawaiian study participants acted autonomously. Whilst the comparative group was concerned about their families, they measured their success in materialistic goods and openly discussed money as a major motivator. Money was not stated as a motivator by the Native Hawaiians, rather the well being and care of their family was seen as a primary motivator.

Education standards were similar in both Hawaiian study groups with approximately 50% having tertiary qualifications. Those without tertiary education either had industry experience or it was not an essential vocational requirement. The comparative Hawaiian group enjoyed a start up capital of approximately double that of the average Native Hawaiian. Half of them received bank finance on the commencement of their business in comparison to only eight percent of the Native Hawaiian group. This indicated differences in borrowing capability and capital backing. Fifty-one percent of the comparative group and fifty-two percent of the Native Hawaiians are second-generation entrepreneurs which indicate some statistical homogeneity amongst the groups.

Whilst statistically there are some similarities, the comparative Hawaiian study group do not network on a broad scale whereas the Native Hawaiian values networking as a key attribute of their cultural and business interaction. The comparative study showed little cultural attachment and/or values whereas the Hawaiian participants in general displayed strong attachment to their values and the old Hawaiian style.

The openness of the Hawaiian interviews is linked to the Hawaiian value of *kukulu kumuhana*; the pooling of emotional, psychological and spiritual strengths for a shared purpose (Pukui, Haertig and Lee 2001a). Perhaps this characteristic, which is evident by self-acknowledgement in twenty-four of the twenty-five participants, is the most outstanding individual characteristic that sets the Hawaiian entrepreneur apart from the comparative Hawaiian ethnic minority entrepreneur. The cultural values evident in the Native Hawaiian study are not applicable or duplicated in the comparative study. This indicates that the cultural strengths of the Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs are not duplicated in other minority groups. This validates the Native Hawaiian research findings.
The Australian research findings showed the Indigenous Australian entrepreneur is driven to achieve success by several motivators. A driving force for the Indigenous Australian to succeed in business was poverty. There is also a strong desire to provide a better life for their children, which is the result of the entrepreneur’s own economically deprived childhood. They have a determination to succeed and have control of their life. They achieve self-determination by economic independence, which differs from the historical background of their youth, or their parents’ upbringing. The Indigenous Australian entrepreneur must learn to survive in a non-indigenous business world, a world where decisions are made by European Australians, not by other Indigenous operators. The need to network and interact with non-indigenous Australians is therefore essential for their business success.

High levels of educational qualifications and/or business expertise appear to be associated with business success. Whilst education possibly does not provide the direct skills to ensure business success, it may provide exposure to life skills, networking and the sourcing of business contacts. Eighty-eight percent of the participants have year twelve or better education and over half have tertiary qualifications. Almost three quarters have tertiary and/or formal trade qualifications. As mentioned only thirty-six percent of Indigenous students complete year twelve in comparison to seventy-six percent of non-indigenous Australians (ABS 2002). With such appalling secondary school graduation rates, the high concentration of educated entrepreneurs supports previous research findings that link formal education to Indigenous business success (Foley 1999, 2000a).

The provision for family appears to be a driving force behind the entrepreneur’s entry into business. This is possibly a cultural force which is linked to their own cultural beliefs (Baum 1995; Bird 1989; Foley 1999, 2000a).

Networking is an almost essential attribute. It enables the Australian participants to develop and make use of relationships which provide increased opportunities to build credibility, a positive image and customer access (Zhao and Aram 1995). Yet when discrimination or racism is evident, networking is severely impaired.

The participants suffered discrimination and racism within the marketplace. Those in the retail sector and services industries appear to regularly experience this detrimental
aspect of Australian life. Australia is generally a racist society that practices inequality (Bennet 1999; Hollingsworth 1998; Huggins 1998; Stratton 1998; and Tatz 1979). The case studies have identified inhibitors to business growth that include limited working capital, inadequate provision and planning, limited networks, access to equity funding, joint venture partners and the like. The dominating inhibitor to business growth and success, however, would appear to be racism within wider Australia. Experiences of discrimination and racism were not isolated incidents. It was a daily occurrence for many of the participants. To some it is a way of life. Indigenous Australians have been generally referred to several times as being subject to welfare shackles (Herron 1998). In order for participants to survive in business, to be a successful Indigenous Australian entrepreneur, they must break the shackles of a welfare based minority economy, as well as escaping the constraints of a generally racist culture that is entrenched within Australian.

The Australian study also covered the concept of values. It sought to identify the existence of traditional or other values amongst Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs. In general it was agreed that traditional values such as ethics and protocols still exist. Several agreed that contemporary values are an evolution of traditional values. It was also believed that ‘being black and being in business does not go against cultural beliefs’ (A15, interview July 28, 2003): ‘you don’t have to become a white man … if you maintain your culture … you can still be in business [and stay black]’ (A20, interview September, 27, 2002). Aboriginal culture can be maintained and perhaps more importantly, being successful in business need not necessarily make you seem Anglo-European. The Indigenous practitioner however must still maintain their cultural beliefs and respects. It was generally agreed that cultural beliefs and respects were a community and/or personal undertaking.

The final area of discussion in Chapter 5 reviews the thematic model as it applies to these findings.

5.6 The effect of the research findings on the Thematic Model.

The thematic argument developed in Figure 7 within Chapter 3 has been reproduced for
the purposes of discussion and the research results in Chapter 5 are incorporated into it.

**DUPLICATE OF FIGURE 7** **THE INDIGENOUS ENTREPRENEUR: APPLICATION OF INDIGENOUS VALUES.**

The thematic argument and its relevance for the Hawaiian and Australian results are discussed separately.

### 5.6.1 The Hawaiian Thematic relevance

The Hawaiian results confirmed that traditional values still existed. This could be interpreted as Hawaiian entrepreneurs having the capacity to follow the straight line from their Indigenous standpoint in pursuit of their personal needs, and survive the negativity of socio economic barriers and social constraints. It was found in this study that some experienced social marginalisation and in some cases this is still occurring. Their lack of start up capital is an indication of the problems they experienced in their venture development as they broke through the socio economic barriers to business. The
development of networks by the Hawaiian entrepreneurs with other successful Hawaiian entrepreneurs or non-Hawaiian business people is the key to their business expansion and success. Networking skills gave them access to capital and increased markets, as well as to industry skills to ensure they could adjust to increased market demand for their products, to juggle several small businesses. Although their centre of operation was firmly placed in the Indigenous value position, it moved with networking and became attached to the dominant culture. This is illustrated in the model. The cultural strength of their basic value system allowed them to move between the two Indigenous positions as shown by the large curved arrows. Contact with and integration in their business environment enabled them to access free market needs and resources. Their product lines have also enabled them, in some instances, to access ethnic markets that are linked to the dominant culture. They retained access to their own ethnic markets as shown on the lower right hand side of the model. This has however, been shown to be minor in comparison to the dominant markets. It carried the risks of small market size, concentration in debtors and only a few wholesale buyers or limited retail markets. The domestic market has parallels to Ethnic Enclave theory (Stanger 1992) in that it also experiences limited access to capital and short term cash flow turnover which is almost subsistence in its market structure. The domestic ethnic market obviously involves the Native Hawaiian consumers. The second tier ethnic markets existed for those entrepreneurs who were not exclusively supplying the Hawaiian domestic market. These were associated with the dominant Anglo-American market that includes other Pacific Islander groups, several Asian groups under American influence and a growing west coast economy centred on Los Angeles and San Francisco.

To illustrate how the thematic argument is applicable: Figure 1 illustrates the position of the Indigenous entrepreneur prior to commencing business. Figure 2 introduces the concept of social stratification to the thematic argument. This has relevance due to the social constraints which are based on racial discrimination. The Hawaiian results revealed that racism and other forms of discrimination were experienced. The socio economic barriers of poverty, unemployment, limited access to education, ill-health and other poor living standards also act as inhibiting factors to the nascent Indigenous Hawaiian entrepreneur. Figure 3 includes the Bulhan (1980) model,
which introduces the two cultural concepts. Figure 4 introduces the radicalization of the Bulhan model, which illustrates the Hawaiian entrepreneurs' access to markets and resources through their industry and community contacts. These contacts enable them to cross over to the dominant culture; however it disregards the effect of racism, bigotry in business, lack of capital and the cost of funds required in business expansion. The Shook model (1992) is illustrated in Figure 5. This perhaps best describes the Hawaiian ability to link up with the dominant culture, yet remain firmly entrenched in its cultural standpoint by the two-way arrow, or as the model states, dissonance. Synergetic articulation and awareness occurs when the entrepreneur moves away from the dominant culture. This is not ideal for whilst they reject any form of oppression they become subjected to societal and socio-economic barriers. The Shook model (1992) allows for social change and the changing attitudes of the Hawaiian entrepreneur, which were both, supported in the research findings. Figure 6 develops the application of Ethnic theory, which also illustrates the Hawaiians' position of finding new markets. Overall Figure 7 illustrates the model has applicability to the Hawaiian findings and can be used to illustrate the research findings.

The application of the thematic argument is now presented in respect to the Australian findings.

5.6.2 The Australian Thematic relevance

The applicability of Figure 7 to the Australian situation is slightly different in comparison to the Hawaiian research findings. The Australian entrepreneurs did not show evidence of the applicability of Ethnic theory. This discounts the model development illustrated in Figure 6. Figure 1 illustrates the pre-business position of the Indigenous Australian entrepreneur. The existence and these socio economic barriers are illustrated in the case studies and literature (Bennet 1999; Coombs, Brandt and Snowdon 1983; Neill 2002). Figure 2 is also relevant in terms of the inclusion of social constraints that involve racial stratification and stereotyping. Racial discrimination was experienced by eighty percent of the Australian entrepreneurs. Literature tells us that racial discrimination is a part of life for Indigenous Australians (Bennet 1999; Hollingsworth 1998; Huggins 1998; Stratton 1998; Tatz 1979). The application of the Bulhan (1980) model in Figure 3 and its radicalization in Figure 4 has relevance when the entrepreneur seeks strength in the
dominant culture to access the market and resources of the dominant culture as a means to provide for his or her family through business success. The provision for family appears to be a significant driving force for the Australian Indigenous entrepreneur in business. It is almost a cultural force that is supported in literature (Baum 1995; Bird 1989). Even after considering the oversimplifications in the Bulhan (1980) model in Figure 4, this model illustrates a two-culture concept. The Indigenous Australian entrepreneur capitulates to the dominant culture to gain access to needs. With success and economic independence there is a revitalization of the Indigenous culture which the participants identified as contemporary Indigenous values. With the Bulhan (1980) model, there is a synthesis of both cultures that enables the entrepreneur to act in either of the cultural spheres.

Figure 5 introduces the application of the Shook (1992) model. This progress allows for Indigenous Australian entrepreneur conformity when the entrepreneur shifts to the dominant culture to access personal needs and market resources. The Native Hawaiians in general maintained strong cultural values and were able to enter the dominant culture and still maintain a firm grip on their Indigenous cultural values. They are assisted by a commonality in their culture, a homologous language that, when combined with their well developed networking systems, allows them to enter (and leave) the dominant market easier than their Australian counterparts. In general the Australian Indigenous entrepreneurs did not have a strong cultural base to begin with due to their history of assimilation and genocide (Attwood 2001; Bennet 1999; Neill 2002; Reynolds 1989; Tatz 2001). Only twelve percent showed strong cultural land values, yet in the discussion it was argued that all participants still maintained traditional values to some degree in areas such as ethics and protocols.

Contemporary values are an evolution of traditional values. This allows the entrepreneurs to move back and forth to access the market benefits of the dominant culture. Dissonance is not an issue as the evolution of contemporary values, (highlighted in Figure 7) allows the Indigenous Australian entrepreneur to move between cultures. Most are still in the initial position due to the forces of race based discrimination or social stratification (Waldinger 1996). Entrepreneurial activity and acceptance into the dominant culture is the stimuli that allow the Indigenous entrepreneur to move between
the two standpoints. Resistance and immersion in the Figure 5 model are always possible scenarios. The dominant market may either reject the entrepreneur or absorb them. Whilst racism and discrimination are an everyday issue to the Australian Indigenous entrepreneur, none of the participants were faced with total exclusion in the Australian marketplace. Absorption was a possibility. Several of the participants hid their Aboriginality from their clientele in the fear that there could be a retail backlash if the public ascertained they were Indigenous. Introspection in the Shook (1992) model is also a possibility if the Indigenous entrepreneur is uncomfortable with their minority position. If this occurs however, they are no longer Indigenous according to the definition of Aboriginality adopted by this study (ATSIC 1998c) and the model is no longer applicable to them. Synergetic articulation and awareness (Shook 1992) is also a possibility. However for simplification and in view of the consensus of opinion regarding contemporary Indigenous values, it is thought that the entrepreneurs in this study would revert to their initial Indigenous standpoint and have access to the dominant culture and markets along the top of the model. They would not break away from the dominant culture and remain separate from their initial position. The Indigenous Australian entrepreneur in the majority of case studies aligns with the dominant culture to ensure access to the market. The application of Ethnic theory has little applicability in the Indigenous situation due to the size of the Indigenous population and other demographics discussed in earlier chapters.

The schematic understanding of the Australian research findings presents a more streamlined model that builds onto Figure 7. The new model shown as Figure 10 is represented on the following page. The significant differences are the removal of synergetic articulation and awareness, per the Shook (1992) model. By definition the entrepreneur would be no longer be Indigenous so this does not apply. Also removed is the access to ethnic markets and application of Ethnic theory. The Indigenous entrepreneur does however continue to suffer the socio economic barriers and social constraints. That is a characteristic of Australia in 2004 and it is unlikely that these attitudes and socio-economic positions will undergo noticeable change in the foreseeable future. To achieve business success in order to provide for their family, the Indigenous entrepreneurs move from their own cultural standpoint to the dominant culture, whereby
they then have access to free enterprise, market needs and resources. From this position they can fulfil their personal needs which are driven by the need to provide for their family. The development of contemporary Indigenous values, whilst maintaining belief in traditional ethics and protocols, allows the entrepreneur to change their standpoint from the original position in the centre, to the dominant non-indigenous culture which is shown on the left of the figure. The two-way interaction is maintained by contemporary Indigenous values that have their cultural moorings in the traditional kinship system.

The model is shown as follows:

**FIGURE 10  THE INDIGENOUS AUSTRALIAN ENTREPRENEURIAL MODEL.**

The research findings are discussed in the following chapter. Chapter 6 is therefore a discussion and evaluation of issues with respect to the literature review and methodology, as well as issues that did not fall within the parameters of Chapter 5.
6 DISCUSSION

The discussion chapter will finalize comparisons of the Indigenous Australian and the Native Hawaiian case studies and discuss issues that are not covered in the findings chapter. These include the application of Indigenous Standpoint theory, how the values of culture, religion and family were revealed in the research results and the overall positive application of micro-economic reform in Indigenous society. Other findings discussed include how the researcher gained acceptance into the Hawaiian networks, the effect of Matriarchal and Patriarchal social systems on the research findings, and the incidence of non-indigenous spouses. The effect of the policy of child removal, which is commonly known as stolen generation, on the Australia studies will also be considered. Finally a brief summary of the issues raised in the discussion is given.

The first discussion point is the application of Indigenous Standpoint theory.

6.1 Application of Indigenous Standpoint Theory

Numerous scholars have ruminated about an Indigenous Standpoint theory. Despite an extensive literature research in both Australia and the United States there was little found to substantiate its actual use or the structure outline it took. It was necessary therefore to test how this theory could be used, how it could be interpreted and applied. During the development of this project the writer was privileged to work with some of the leaders in the field of Indigenous Epistemology. This includes Dr. Manulani Meyer of the University of Hawaii, the late Professor Japanangka errol West, formerly of Southern Cross University, Lester-Irabinna Rigney of Flinders University in South Australia and lastly a respected elder in Indigenous Education, Uncle John Budby, who is one of Australia’s first tertiary qualified Indigenous school teachers. This work would not have been possible without the shared wisdom of these outstanding Indigenous scholars. This is basically what Indigenous Standpoint theory is all about. The Academy is not the owner or keeper of the knowledge, the researcher is not the expert. Indigenous knowledge is owned by the community who share and discuss it with the researcher. The Indigenous community is the keeper of knowledge. The privilege and power structures of the dominant groups in society (Butler 1991; Fuller, Dansie, Jones and Holmes 1999; Ogbor 2000; Schaper 1999) do not feature in Indigenous Standpoint theory (Foley...
The elaboration and application of Indigenous Standpoint theory has already added to literature (Foley 2002a, 2003a, 2003b).

Four criteria were developed in Chapter 4 that simplified Indigenous Standpoint theory in its application. Once again, these are:

1. The practitioner must be Indigenous. Academic supervision in the first instance should be from suitably qualified Indigenous Academics.
2. The practitioner must be well versed in Social theory, critical sociology, post-structuralism and post-modernism. This is not so that the Indigenous researcher may reproduce them, but rather to be acutely aware of the limitations of these discourses and to ensure that Indigenous research is not tormented by or classified according to the physical and metaphysical distortions of these western approaches.
3. The Indigenous research must be for the benefit of the researchers’ community or the wider Indigenous community and/or Indigenous research community. The Indigenous epistemological approaches in an Indigenous standpoint enable knowledge to be recorded for the community, not the Academy. The participants are the owners of the knowledge, not the researcher.
4. Wherever possible the traditional language should be the first form of recording. English translation should be the second method of recording (Foley 2002a).

Firstly, the low number of Indigenous scholars with PhD qualifications within the University system presents a logistical problem with no short term solution. Indigenous research students have little option but to accept the less than satisfactory supervision of non-indigenous academics. The impact of non-indigenous supervision may reduce the effectiveness of the theory.

The second point highlights that the Indigenous researcher must be fully conversant with high level research skills in two knowledge systems. This is an additional responsibility to the Indigenous student who already bears other forms of social disadvantage that ensures that they are not on a level playing field with non-indigenous students (Neill 2002). The decision made by Indigenous research practitioners to learn a double set of skills is a matter of social, cultural and academic choice.
The third point is self explanatory and is an empowering process similar to the outcome of the application of Critical theory (Fay 1987, 1996) because it allows Indigenous researchers to maintain their cultural standpoint (Smith 1999). This process is fraught with difficulties within academia as it displaces the centre of control from the researcher to the researched. The prioritisation of traditional language in point four also ensures the locus of control is maintained by the researched and not by the researcher.

In practice, using Indigenous standpoint has been difficult. The feedback and approval of data between researcher and participant has proved to be laborious and has added considerable time to the project and particularly the Hawaiian study. However this process has also strengthened the validity of data. From the researcher’s personal perspective, the application of the methodological and epistemological approach to Indigenous Standpoint theory has been testing but fulfilling. This was especially so in the linking of Hawaiian language to the Hawaiian findings.

If the writer were asked to repeat this project, Indigenous Standpoint theory would be applied again without hesitation. This is due to the importance it places on personal ‘cultural’ rigour that is centred on respect for an Indigenous worldview. The close contact with participants during the multiple feedback stages was different to any other research previously undertaken. This led to discussions with Hawaiian elders about trust, working three jobs, their personal love for their parents and children. They spoke of hunting game in cloud topped mountains, practicing ceremony, exposure to the elements, the intertwining spiritual, religious and community beliefs. Discussions covered the values and standards they exercised during their everyday struggles for existence. This included entrepreneurial activity. Australian examples were equally rewarding for the closeness that result when you are a visiting participant rather than a taker. The western researcher using western methodology is often viewed by Indigenous eyes as a thief of knowledge, an extractor of information. The researcher who uses Indigenous standpoint methodology is a visitor who respects the knowledge of the participant, ensures that knowledge remains with and is a benefit to the participant and also creates qualitative knowledge for academia. The increased interaction with the participants should also ensure the knowledge gained is more accurate in relation to the people it purports to speak about.
The intimacy within the application of Indigenous Standpoint methodology is highlighted in the researcher being exposed to the participants personal values, this is the next area to be discussed.

6.2 Values

Literature on values was discussed in Chapter 3 under three main areas. They were culture, religion and family. Recent research has concluded that Indigenous values and Indigenous ‘...views on Indigenous business enterprises is basically, unknown’ (Mapunda 2002: 56). The Hawaiian and Australian case studies revealed a considerable amount of information in relation to Indigenous entrepreneurial values. This included intrinsic motivators and other strongly held values retained during the Indigenous persons business involvement. Discussion on the three identified areas is given in the followed sections.

6.2.1 Culture

Whilst cultural values are often elusive, complex and contestable (Said 1994) the Hawaiian study revealed the existence of a value system known as Kukulu Kumuhana. This is the pooling of strengths, be they emotional, psychological or spiritual. The case studies revealed that this cultural value enabled the Native Hawaiian entrepreneur to gain access to resources of human capital, family credit, and networking systems that encouraged profit sharing with family in culturally accepted ways such as employment, christenings, first birthdays, weddings and funerals. There is an established value system in contemporary Hawaii, be it consciously or subconsciously recognized by the Hawaiian participant that has no apparent parallel in Indigenous Australia. This value system allows for cultural networking. There was also evidence of the application of Ethnic theory in some minor instances in the Hawaiian study whereas this domestic ethnic market includes Native Hawaiian consumers; the second tier ethnic markets comprise entrepreneurs who are not exclusively supplying the Hawaiian domestic market. These second tier markets form part of the dominant Anglo-American market, which includes other Pacific Islander groups, several Asian groups under American influence and a growing west coast economy centred on Los Angeles and San Francisco. The Australian entrepreneurs did not show evidence of the applicability or application of Ethnic theory.
In comparison to the Hawaiian study, Indigenous Australians do not have the numbers in population, the geographic proximity and the cultural acceptance that Native Hawaiians enjoy. Having said this it should also be remembered that the Native Hawaiian population as a whole experiences relatively poor educational attainment, higher than average levels of unemployment, incarceration and poverty (Alu Like 1998). This is a very similar social stratification position to that experienced by Indigenous Australians. What sets Native Hawaiians apart from Indigenous Australia is they have one main language and high levels of cultural synergy. Australia however has many Indigenous peoples and hundreds of different languages (Fesl 1993; Flood 1995). In Australia hundreds of Indigenous cultural groups were placed under the one social construct of the ‘Aboriginal’. That construct was developed for colonial administrative convenience. It identified all Australian Indigenous people as ‘Aboriginal’. This incorporated many culturally diverse groups into a common classification. Indigenous Hawaii however is basically one people; Indigenous Australia is a plethora of different cultures. This is possibly why there is no synergy or common cultural values in the Australian results.

Native Hawaiians also enjoy a cohesive representation in government. Hawaii is the 50th state of the United States of America that comprises an ethnically diverse population. Numerous people of Hawaiian descent have been historically and contemporaneously elected to government. Native Hawaiians have a long voice in all levels of government: in local government, in state government and in the senate. This strong coherent representation in government is strengthened by a single Hawaiian language and strong common cultural traditions.

Indigenous Australian representation in government however, presents a very different view. Australia has only had two Indigenous senators, the late Senator Bonner and the recently disposed ex Senator, Mr. Aden Ridgeway. It also has a poor representation record at the state level. NSW recently elected their first Indigenous Member of Parliament and the other States have or have had only token representation. This is also the case in Local government. Indigenous representation throughout Australia can only be described as minimal.

This lack of representation raises important questions. For example, how can Indigenous cultural values survive if there are few legislators who maintain an
Indigenous agenda that is socially acceptable to Indigenous people? In New Zealand this issue has been partially addressed by the establishment in 1868 of four permanent Maori parliamentary representatives in the New Zealand legislature (Martin 2004). This representation was enabled by a formal treaty which Australia lacks. Formal parliamentary representation maintains cultural recognition. Cultural values are recognized and to an extent maintained by formal cultural recognition. This is ensured by parliament in New Zealand and by elected representation in all levels of government in Hawaii. Given the absence of a treaty, permanent Indigenous membership to the legislature in Australia can only be achieved through Constitutional amendment.

Both the lack of a single language base and a history of poor government representation have disadvantaged Indigenous Australia in relation to their Hawaiian counterparts. However the Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs exhibit what they often refer to as contemporary values. These are based on kinship (Mapunda 2002). The identification of contemporary kinship values is a significant outcome of this research and the work by Mapunda (2002). It is commonly accepted that other cultural groups around the world, including Chinese, Cuban, Greek, Indian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Philippino, Spanish and Vietnamese-American have successfully operated business enterprises as minorities. The literature review looked at several American studies on minorities (Light and Rosenstein 1995; Min 1996; Park 1997; Portes and Bach 1980; Portes and Manning 1986; Spencer and Bean 1999; Stanger 1992; Waldinger 1985, 1996, 1997; Wilson and Portes 1980; Yoon 1997). Indigenous Australians are a minority group (Commonwealth of Australia 1992), they are oppressed dependent people without a long standing in western orientated business culture, attempting to establish themselves in the mainstream capitalist business sector (ATSIC 1998c; Fisk 1985; Hunter 1999; Mapunda 2002; Pearson 2000; Pollard 1988).

Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs stated generally that ‘traditional values’ no longer existed, yet they continued to base themselves in a kinship or quasi-kinship arrangement and identified the provision for family as their dominant intrinsic motivator in business. They made adjustments to their social and cultural life to achieve this as their primary concern was the improvement of their respective Indigenous family’s condition in a modern society. This claim that the provision for family is a cultural force is
supported by wider literature (Baum 1995; Bird 1989; Foley 1999, 2000a). When the initial negative social positioning of the nascent Indigenous Australian entrepreneur is considered, this identification of one common motivator becomes a significant finding. The Indigenous intrinsic motivator is also supported by the same family that it will benefit (Dana 1996; Mapunda 2002). In a predominantly racist, multicultural society such as Australia, (Bennet 1999; Hollingsworth 1998; Huggins 1998; Stratton 1998; Tatz 1979) the intensity of motivation to provide for family (kin) and the reciprocal support from family may be unique and warrants further research.

Literature on ethnic entrepreneurs (Chaganti and Greene 2002) reveals that ethnic entrepreneurs turn inward and focus upon issues relevant to their own culture which is reflected in social activities (Bonacich and Modell 1980). Social activities in the Indigenous Australian study are centred on their families. Studies by Enz, Dollinger and Daily (1990) supports the difference between non-minority and minority groups when six dimensions of values were compared. The minority groups studied included African-American, Hispanic, American Indian and Asian groups. Statistical differences were found on every dimension of the comparative between minority and non-minority (Enz, Dollinger and Daily 1990). Minorities (which includes Indigenous Australia) have different value dimensions. The degree of motivation towards providing for the Indigenous family needs further comparative studies with Anglo-Australia to determine the measurability of how important the provision for family is between Indigenous and non-indigenous entrepreneurs.

Traditional Hawaiian cultural values are still strong today and contemporary Indigenous cultural values are possibly just as strong in Australia. This is an interesting concept and will be discussed in more detail in a following section on family. Religion is the second of these three areas to be discussed.

6.2.2 Religion

Religion does not appear to be a value that influenced the Indigenous Australian entrepreneur. The existence of strong religious convictions was not apparent in some eighty percent of the Indigenous Australian participants. They reduced their mention of religion to comment only. Two Australian participants were practising Christians; the balance held religion in contempt or stated it was a personal issue that was usually
restricted to births, deaths and marriages. Only five Australian participants exhibited strong conviction in contemporary urban Aboriginal religious beliefs. The balance treated traditional spiritual knowledge as if it was largely irrelevant or dead and only thought about on Survival or NAIDOC days. Most of this group reservedly explained they did not know their traditional culture, it was something that had been lost or that their parents or Elders had not taught them it. It was subsequently revealed these participants belonged to one of three groups. They were either members of the stolen generation, the children of the stolen generation, or were parents/grandparents who were institutionalized in Missions. In short, most of the study group lost control or contact with their traditional land, culture and kin.

Literature reveals (Reynolds 1981, 1989; Tatz 2001) that successive generations of Indigenous people who forcibly relocated from their ancestral lands or subjected to other government removal policies lost their concepts of traditional life. Many of them were institutionalized with little or no continuing family contact, which resulted in devastating consequences including the systematic destruction of Indigenous Australian values by the dominant power (Reynolds 1981, 1989; Tatz 2001). The common loss of cultural knowledge in traditional religion by the participants of this Australian study and their obvious despair is indicative of the cultural genocidal practices that have been experienced by many Indigenous Australians (Neill 2002). The findings of this study reveal Indigenous Australian survival practices within the development of contemporary kinship values.

In summary the findings reveal that religion, either traditional, that is ‘Aboriginal’ or Christian beliefs had little to no effect on the Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs in the environment of small business. Religion has however a strong influence amongst the Hawaiian participants. Twenty-three out of twenty-five displayed a solid belief in God. This is a Christian God, yet there was still a strong connection to their traditional beliefs, which many referred to as superstitions. Further questioning revealed that any reference to superstitions related to traditional beliefs. In questioning and observation, the morals of Christianity were an influencing value in the daily business life of the Hawaiian entrepreneur. The strong Hawaiian value system of Kanaka makua, which is a code of honesty and maturity towards each other, is intertwined with Christian standards similar
to the Ten Commandments. On interaction with the Hawaiian entrepreneurs it became apparent that there are deep-rooted cultural concepts involving honesty, fair play in business and treating others as you would have them treat you. Maturity is both a behavioural and an emotional standard. Whilst it is noted that Christian beliefs are practised, twenty-three out of the twenty-five Hawaiian participants made numerous remarks which indicate that to various degrees, Hawaiians still believe in the spirits, the Gods, the religious faith that existed prior to Christianity and colonization.

The next cultural area to be discussed is family.

6.2.3 Family

The sociological approach to entrepreneurship (Dollinger 2003) argues that the intrinsic motivator for both Hawaiian and Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs is to provide for their family. If the writer had to isolate and identify a single intrinsic motivator from the results data, the need to provide for the nuclear family and the wider family is the dominant finding of this study. Provision for family is closely linked to the concept of kinship. As mentioned within the findings, kinship has been interpreted as a contemporary Indigenous value, even for the two participants who had unbroken links with their traditional lands. They still suffered similar social and economic upheavals. The application of kinship concepts within the Indigenous family cell is much stronger than is shown in any literature found on mainstream entrepreneurship that identifies the provision of family as a motivator. This exceeds personal motivation dimensions (Baum 1995; Herron and Robinson 1993) as the social and economic environment of the Indigenous Australian entrepreneur is a determining factor in the entrepreneur's cognition and motivation (Bird 1989). The need to provide for family is an important concept to understand.

The Australian study is essentially dealing with holocaust victims (Neill 2002) or the children of genocide victims as generation after generation of Indigenous Australians were subjected to successive government policies and practices of genocide (Bennet 1999; Neill 2002; Reynolds 1989; Tatz 2001). The cultural values or motivators for Indigenous and non-indigenous entrepreneurs differ because Indigenous Australians are more concerned with basic human needs such as food, shelter, education and medical assistance for their family (Neill 2002). The majority of Indigenous Australians are still
seeking to satisfy the basic physiological and safety needs that Maslow (1970) once identified as essential to human life, and which most non-indigenous Australians now take for granted.

An Elder illustrates the differences in Indigenous and non-indigenous societal needs:

… all I have left is my family, that’s the only thing the government had not stolen from me. Yet where are my Uncles, my Mother’s sisters, my Aunts, countless cousins? They stole them! (A8, interview September 28, 2001).

The Stolen Generation will be discussed in more detail in a subsequent section.

Participant A8 has only his family left. He works in order to provide for them. This is his dominant cultural value and business motivator. Family is the dominant business motivator for Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs.

The Hawaiian value system also includes a strong code of support and provision for their family. In Hawaiian business, the welfare of the family goes beyond profit. Perhaps a strong healthy family including staff and colleagues is the Hawaiian equivalent of material profit in non-indigenous terms. It was recorded that staff happiness combined with a good work ethic results in higher performance and increased efficiency and sales.

The Native Hawaiians entrepreneurs value family in similar terms to their Australian counterparts.

The comparative values of Australian and Hawaiian entrepreneurs will now be summarised.

6.2.4 Summary of Comparative Values Australia and Hawaii

The Native Hawaiian entrepreneur demonstrates a core set of principles and values. These Hawaiian values were not found in the comparative study on Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs.

The Australian case studies revealed that entrepreneurs who worked within their traditional lands, and had an unbroken connection to that land over successive generations, exhibited a strong cultural link to that land. They also practised cultural procedures concerning that country. These included ceremony, formal kinship obligations as well as contemporary kinship practices.
The majority of those studied (twenty-three out of twenty-five) resided along the eastern seaboard and did not enjoy an unbroken link to their traditional homelands. Many had no knowledge of the whereabouts of their spiritual connections due to previous government policies of removal and assimilation (cultural genocide). These entrepreneurs did however possess strong values, which by and large were referred to as contemporary Indigenous Australian values or contemporary kinship values.

Many of the participants acknowledged that Indigenous culture is not static; it changes with time, it adjusts to external factors like technological advancement as it evolves through internal innovation. Several pointed out that entrepreneurial activity was not a purely European custom. Literature confirms entrepreneurship was firmly entrenched in Indigenous society through trade and other commercial undertakings long before the arrival of Europeans (Trudgen 2000). Contemporary Indigenous entrepreneurs’ values initially revolve around the provision for immediate family. From this platform the Indigenous entrepreneur adheres to and practices ethical protocols in their daily undertakings. In return they earn respect and take responsibility for their lives and actions. Those accepted within Indigenous communities are empowered with an Indigenous right. This enables them to act within an ethical framework and to live according to Indigenous protocols. When Indigenous entrepreneurs are rejected by a community it raises barriers to restrict their activities. This includes the loss of reciprocity. These ethical and protocol systems are both intricate, and simple, and in most cases determined by the Indigenous community/family in which the entrepreneur lives.

The value systems of the two groups are very different. Whilst the Hawaiian value system has a strong traditional base and is applied within a contemporary setting, the Australian system is grounded in a modified, contemporary set of protocols and ethics, and practised within an urban environment. The Indigenous Australian contemporary values emerged as a survival response to decades of government interventions designed to inhibit traditional Indigenous cultural values and assimilate Indigenous Australians into mainstream Australian society (Neill 2002).

The Hawaiian results will not be discussed any further apart from brief comparative references as it is the Australian research findings that form the focus of the remaining analysis and discussion. This study seeks to help policy makers, educators and
potential Indigenous Australian business practitioners better understand, assist or engage in the economic revitalization of Indigenous Australia. Entrepreneurship is one of a number of processes that could facilitate Indigenous Australian employment and financial independence. The following discussion concerns the micro-economic reform that is evident in this study of successful Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs.

6.3 Micro-economic Reform – Indigenous Entrepreneurs

The introduction of this thesis referred to the general poverty level and welfare dependency of Aboriginal Australians to provide an overview of the depressed state of the Indigenous Australian economy. Microeconomics is the study of how individuals make themselves as well off as possible in a world of scarcity (Perloff 2001). In general terms the Indigenous Australian has a very low average wealth level and is a member of a pluralist society with an extended family that can continually drain the personal resources of a wage earner. Whilst the individual may be classified as impoverished, their wider family may be on an even lower level of the poverty scale. Envisage an example of high unemployment within the Indigenous Australian community. The Indigenous Australian wage earner may be directly or indirectly supporting several of their family members. This ensures that their economic status and income remain at subsistence level or below. Incorporate into this scenario a successful businessperson, the urban Australian Aboriginal entrepreneur. It results in reform within an economic cell that was once predominantly welfare dependent, or subjected to family commitments that prolonged (and even cemented) welfare dependency.

The successful Indigenous urban entrepreneur has the potential to break free of the conditions which subjugate them. With economic independence they are no longer restricted by minimal or fixed incomes within a welfare environment of dependency on government agencies.

This study looks at microeconomic reform in what is basically a subculture within Australia that is impoverished and shackled by welfare dependency (Herron 1998) as a result of post-colonial policies (Neill 2002). The positive flow-on from business success and entrepreneurial pursuits are illustrated in the following examples. AI has been able to lease then buy a freehold property and farm it intensively. He now leases the property out
for cash crops and has expanded into other areas. This is a remarkable change from his previous status as an unemployed welfare recipient or a casual farm hand. A2 is a professional writer living in a capital city. He not only supports himself; he now supports his mother and several siblings: ‘They now can afford medicine and don’t have to worry about the rent money’ (A2, interview May 11, 2002). In both examples there has been a change in the participants’ spheres of operations. A1 is now a landowner, leasing his property out. Whereas he was once dependant on welfare and part-time work, he now has people working for him and he earns profit on crops that he does not farm. The future prospects for A1, his spouse and his children changed dramatically when they shifted from uncertainty in rented premises to security in an income producing property. A2 has likewise changed his socio-economic situation by the entrepreneurial use of his writing talent. His business achievements have provided him with economic stability. Enabling A2 to provide a home and essential medicine to his nuclear family and support a wider family network. This has had a domino effect. Now a brother has access to medicine, he is no longer sick. A2’s brother has managed to maintain employment and thereby bring additional income into the family economic cell. This has increased the cell’s overall wealth, and distanced it from welfare dependence. His elderly mother is no longer forced to work in mundane jobs and can fulfil community obligations by looking after Indigenous children. This allows young mothers in her community to seek part-time work. This repeated strengthening of cultural ties within wider family circles results in the strengthening of cash flows within the family. A1’s success in business has allowed similar financial independence. The people working for him were once welfare dependent between farm cropping seasons. They now have a permanent income which allows them to provide for their families on a regular basis. This includes school uniforms, medicine, and food that is purchased for its nutritional quality rather than affordability. These basic items increase the standard of living of Indigenous Australian family cells.

A4 were once employed public servants. Their business success has enabled them to improve their economic positions considerably and they are now looking to branch out into different ventures. They never would have achieved their level of economic independence if they had remained on wages. They are now independent. A similar scenario exists with A3. He has managed to provide for his family and ensure better
prospects for his children. He has provided them with a home, regular holidays, sporting opportunities and a sense of security. \textit{A3} did not have access to these benefits previously. \textit{A7} enjoys a lifestyle and income that they would never have achieved if they had remained in their previous positions. They now have economic independence. \textit{A10} has gone from a modest $60,000 capital investment in a beachfront property over ten years ago, to a million-dollar plus property that earns a sizable return. The effect on his family has been considerable. He has financed his children through university or college, set one child up in their own business, employed numerous Indigenous staff, and become involved both physically and financially in several Indigenous projects. All of this expands the positive economic influence of his business success. The microeconomic reforms are felt by his immediate family as well as by his Indigenous and non-indigenous staff who now have permanent incomes. Similar situations exist for \textit{A12} and \textit{A13}. Both shifted from positions of economic uncertainty to the security of managing stable businesses which have in turn greatly improved the living conditions of their families. \textit{A12} has also improved the good fortunes of their creditors. Many Indigenous artists in Australia are exploited, short changed or paid in alcohol and tobacco. \textit{A12} pay their creditors in cash and pride themselves on their payment of fair market prices for artworks. The microeconomic reform generated by these exchanges has filtered through to central and northern Australia as their creditors now enjoy a level of wealth and economic independence that has never been experienced by them before.

\textit{A15}'s business is financing him through university. In terms of microeconomic reform, the permanent income \textit{A15} has achieved has allowed him to pursue wider interests including higher studies. He believes that this will in time considerably improve his income earning capacity. This is a dramatic turnaround from the casual labouring positions he had held prior to entry into business. \textit{A18} has been able to build a sound business after several years in his industry.

He has achieved financial security after developing his human capital and accruing considerable equity in a well-known and profitable business. The microeconomic reform is evident in his transition from a tradesperson to a successful owner/manager of a business that trades in order to accumulate wealth and secure a brighter future for staff and family.
Similar stories are told by most of the other participants who likewise have experienced reform in their lives. All have worked to provide a positive home life for their children, education at an early age, and many things they did not enjoy during their youth. This includes choice in clothing, nutritious food and a comfortable home. Most of the businesses examined employ Indigenous Australian staff and/or other minority people. This further extends the positive effects of Indigenous involvement in entrepreneurial activity as their employees experience the benefits of a stable income, rather than the previous insecurity of welfare dependency.

The microeconomic reform witnessed within the Australian studies has improved the quality of life of the participants. \textit{A2} has improved his life dramatically: ‘It’s not only improved my family life dramatically, I am able to provide for my mother and grandmother’ (\textit{A2}, interview May 11, 2002). \textit{A4} likewise replied their quality of life has improved as have most of the participants highlighted earlier in the section on microeconomic reform. Success equates to an improvement in the quality of life and it is measured in many different ways by the Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs.

\textit{A5} equated success to his capacity to look after his family comfortably. They believed: ‘if you can work and work hard and enjoy your work, that’s success’ (\textit{A5}, interview August 21, 2002). \textit{A6} believes there are many different dimensions to success. Whilst he acknowledged that the economic dimension to success, or the ability to provide for children, was what all humans seek, he added: ‘for me, I would not like a capitalist approach at all; I would tend to give back to the community because that is where the knowledge comes from’ (\textit{A6}, interview July 9, 2003). Once again \textit{A6} supports the concept of supporting family. They do however include the return of benefits from their business success with the community that gave them their Indigenous knowledge: ‘success is changing attitudes and I have seen some evidence of that’ (\textit{A14}, interview August 25, 2003). \textit{A14} gauges his success on the level of social benefit that their work can provide. \textit{A16} also has a community focused concept of success. They get ‘one big buzz ... when [they] come away speaking from grassroots people and ... really see these programs have worked’ (\textit{A16}, interview December 13, 2002).

The following section expands on other findings that have arisen during the course of the study.
6.4 Other findings

The research revealed many interesting side issues that include:

- The researcher’s acceptance into the Hawaiian network,
- Matriarchy and Patriarchy: does this impact on Indigenous entrepreneurs?
- The correlation between non-indigenous spouses and success,
- The effect of the Stolen Generation, and
- Another theory on Indigenous entrepreneurship, Emerging theory.

6.4.1 Acceptance into the Hawaiian Network

The writer’s acceptance into the Native Hawaiian networks was achieved after considerable networking and the basic hard work of knocking on doors, following up leads and patiently waiting. Acceptances finally resulted from snowball networking (Weiss 1994). This worked as follows: an existing contact would provide a formal introduction to another contact and this association would repeat itself until the researcher acquired a significant number of industry and service industry contacts. The researcher had previously delivered a paper at the World Indigenous Peoples Conference-Education in Hilo in 1999. This provided a valuable spring board as several Indigenous and non-indigenous academics at the University of Hawaii remembered the researcher delivering what was then considered a cutting edge paper on racism in High Schools. This fuelled their interest in this research. The contacts at the University of Hawaii allowed the researcher to meet other staff in numerous faculties and schools. This had spin-offs into community organizations and government departments that included Alu Like, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, the Office of Small Business, the Hawaiian Community Loan Fund and several others. In turn this provided invitations to several seminars, some of which the writer took an active part in. This subsequently increased the research profile.

In hindsight the greatest problem faced was the initial lack of cross-cultural understanding. The Australian accent was difficult to decipher by most Hawaiian listeners. The speed of vocal delivery had to be reduced considerably and the researcher had to make conscious efforts to speak clearly, over-emphasize vowels and simplify sentence structure. In addition to the modification of speech patterns the researcher also had to increase his voice volume and learn the Hawaiian Creole. This is a mix of Portuguese, Pidgin English and Hawaiian slang. As an example if the researcher wanted
to interview a Hawaiian participant, in lieu of asking the proposed participant direct
‘could I please interview you?’ He would arrange a Hawaiian third party to ask them on
the writer’s behalf, ‘he talk story to you?’ This would validate the researcher’s intentions,
introduce him to participants and let them know that the researcher wished to speak with
them about issues. The expression ‘talking story’ is a very apt choice of words that
summed up the intentions of the research.

This concerted networking effort enabled the writer to gain the trust of senior
Hawaiian community people and academics as well as introductions to a broad research
sample of Hawaiian entrepreneurs from across the five major islands of the Hawaiian
archipelago. It was difficult to earn the participants trust as there was initially a mood of
distrust towards university research. Credible community introductions to participants
were mandatory as these endorsed the researcher’s indigeneity and highlighted the
importance of the proposed research study findings. Once a relationship was established,
the writer had to communicate in Hawaiian-American language. Whilst the gaining of
Hawaiian-American language audibility was an essential factor in the success of this
study, it was never envisaged in the research planning phase nor factored into the
research methodology. The researcher experienced a steep and unexpected learning
curve.

6.4.2 Matriarchal, Patriarchal

The writer initially believed matriarchy/patriarchy had no effect whatsoever on the study.
In hindsight, however, it is realised that the writer’s salt-water law Matrilineal society
background was in many cases a topic of conversation that broke the ice and freed up
conversations with Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs who were initially met through
intermediaries at first meetings. This was also the situation in Hawaii. In South Australia
discussions about salt-water/fresh-water and matriarchy/patriarchy occupied a large
section of initial discussions with participants.

Within contemporary Indigenous Australian circles, discussions about patrilineal
or matrilineal descent may not necessarily restrict interaction; instead it was an effective
means to establish identity and comfortable interaction with the interviewer. In a
subsequent unrelated research project in a remote community in the Northern Territory
the author’s matrilineal descent proved to be a restrictive issue that required extensive
introductions. This would suggest that matrilineal/patrilineal descent does not have the same level of restrictions in modernised and/or urbanised Indigenous society. By contrast, it may necessitate extensive introductions and increased protocols in remote communities.

The non-indigenous spouse is the next area to be discussed.

6.4.3 Non-indigenous spouses

Initially this topic was not going to be included in the research outcomes and discussions as race theorists could and may still use it negatively. The decision to include comment on non-indigenous spouses was based on the needs to ensure transparency in the grounded theoretical application to the research and discussion of contentious issues such as race based interpretations.

The data suggests that when one of the spouses in the business is non-indigenous, the couple generally experiences easier access to capital or cash flow finance in the early stages of their entrepreneurial activity than do couples who are both Indigenous. The results indicate that the time taken by the mixed couple between financial independence was considerably less than those couples who were both Indigenous.

The non-indigenous spouse would either have increased access to capital through family or other means. This highlights the disparity of wealth between Indigenous and non-indigenous Australians or the disparate access to external institutional funding from banks. On questioning it was evident that the non-indigenous spouse inevitably brought to the business a considerable depth in education, family business expertise in some cases and networking skills or contacts in almost all cases. Once again this highlights the disparity of social and business skills between Indigenous and non-indigenous Australians. This line of questioning proved to be very difficult for the writer as participants became sensitive to the personal nature of the enquiry.

An interesting finding was the connection between business exit strategies and non-indigenous spouses. In the Australian study, only one Indigenous owned and the entire non-indigenous spouse operated enterprises had exit strategies or proposed exit strategies. Some were straight sale plans to outsiders or insiders. Others had fire-sale provisions which followed standard management literature (Scarborough and Zimmerer 2003).
The connection between exit strategies and mixed couples could not be explained as the participants could not comment upon further questioning. Perhaps this is an indicator of the increased level of education and broader life skills of the non-indigenous spouse as Indigenous Australians are generally less familiar with or exposed to standard western business practice. The over-riding question remains however: why does a non-indigenous spouse enable easier access to external funding, finance and capital?

This question could yield many answers. This disparity could be caused by institutional racism, or the lending criteria within mainstream lending institutions could be too inflexible in its requirements. Perhaps criterions other than existing capital, creditworthiness, capacity to repay, character and credit history are needed to foster the development of minority group businesses. Is the disparity the product of a racist society or ultra conservative approaches to lending? Both the Indigenous entrepreneur and the banker would appear to have different views on this which adds further support to the argument for specialist lending facilities for Indigenous business people such as the Hawaiian Community Loan Fund. This study has shown that access to financial assistance through commercial loans by Indigenous Australians ranges from very difficult to almost impossible.

The next area to be discussed is the effect of the Stolen Generation on the research findings.

6.4.4 The Effect of the Stolen Generation

When this project began, it was not contemplated that the Stolen Generation would prove to be an issue. Twenty-three of the twenty-five participants are the children of stolen generation victims who have suffered (to some degree) the emotional traumas of their parents (Beresford and Omaji 1996). Twelve of the twenty-five Australian participants were also taken from their families and placed in institutions as children. The majority of these twelve Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs not only were institutionalised themselves, so where their parents. Participants for this study were chosen following a snowball selection process (Weiss 1994). The fact that forty-eight percent of these people are still suffering from the effects of former child removal policies indicates the high level of occurrence these policies have on contemporary Indigenous Australians.
Statistical evidence is not available from the Australian Bureau of Statistics or any other government agency at the time of writing to quantify the number of Indigenous families torn apart by child removal practices. They can only provide conservative estimates (Attwood 2001; Bennet 1999; Moses 2001; Neill 2002). This study never contemplated such a high prevalence of forced removal children in entrepreneurial activity. Critics of Aboriginality and conservative political groups could use this research outcome to support the historical belief that inhumane practices like child removal would ultimately benefit Aboriginal people in successive generations. Any such interpretation would be incorrect, and a misrepresentation of the findings. Some Jewish people who were forcibly removed as children from Poland and incarcerated at Auschwitz have survived and became successful businesspeople. This is not to say the Nazi genocide of European Jewish people during the 1930’s and 1940’s was economically beneficial to the survivors. This answer would be unthinkable; the same applies for Indigenous Australia.

To counteract any such argument, Indigenous Australian business representation is small in comparison to non-indigenous Australian activity, and this is decreasing. As stated earlier: ‘Indigenous Australians remained three times less likely to be self-employed than other Australians’ (Hunter cited in ABS 2004a: 1). The incidence of stolen generation people in this study may indicate the high prevalence of children who have been violated within the Indigenous population. It does not prove a link exists between entrepreneurial skills and colonial genocidal practices. It does however highlight the Aboriginal tenacity to survive.

It is not the intent of this study to recount stories given by participants who have been adversely affected by child removal practices. Their pain is too grisly and personal. The writer accepts these issues are outside the parameters of this study. There are many renowned historians that include Bain Attwood (2001), Rosanne Kennedy (2001), Dirk Moses (2001), Professor Peter Read (2002), and Colin Tatz (2001) who have published works on the genocidal aspects of child removal practices within Australia.

What the research findings do reveal is that participants who have been exposed directly or indirectly to forced removal have suffered severely disadvantaged lives. This includes poor access to early education, diminished or no family networks prior to entry into business and almost no opportunity for access to credit. Not only are twelve of the
Australian entrepreneurs members of the stolen generation, twenty-three of the group (ninety-two percent) have a parent who was institutionalized. Yet despite these disadvantages, this group has sought economic independence and self determination through entrepreneurial undertakings in self-employment. This is significant given that: ‘... conflict theorists argue that society consists of competing social groups who do not have access to the same life chances and social rewards’ (Beresford and Omaji 1996: 17). Indigenous Australia is a minority group that does not have the same life chances and social rewards that Anglo-European Australians enjoy (Bennet 1999; Beresford and Omaji 1996; Neill 2002). Relationships between minority groups such as Indigenous Australia and dominant groups are often oppressive and antagonistic in nature. This frequently results in vengeful anger being directed at the dominant group. This is partially the reason for the extraordinarily high levels of Indigenous incarceration and was a significant finding of the 1991 Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody (Commonwealth of Australia 1992). The forward of Beresford and Omaji (1996) asks:

[w]hy are young Aborigines who offend against the law four times more likely to end up in detention centres ... How is it that two thirds of the inmates of those detention centres are Aboriginal when only two percent of the Australian population is Aboriginal? (1996: 1)

Despite all of this, Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs have operated within an oppressive social environment, rejected the negative social stratification within Australia’s social order and become successful in their business pursuits.

To illustrate the lack of financial assistance from government agencies, only three of these participants received any financial support from ATSIC. The rest began business with nominal credit after often using a credit card for working capital. The majority of this group obtained tertiary qualifications as mature aged students after their non completion of high school. Their driving force in striving for business success has been identified as the contemporary kinship value. This is the intrinsic motivator to provide for their families, to give their children a better life than they had.

Only one identifying characteristic can be interpreted as a success indicator. This is a deep rooted hatred of poverty and a ‘fire in the belly’ to succeed (Smilor 1997). Failure is not an option. Many participants spoke without hatred. They wish to progress and work towards their children’s future. They have put their hatred and anger behind
them. They do not hold the former colonial/assimilation policies of non-indigenous Australia and assimilatory policies of conservative political parties in esteem; however they realize they must work within contemporary Australia in order to survive. After all, 'white' Australians within multicultural Australia are their customers.

The final area to be discussed is Emerging theory.

6.4.5 Emerging Theory

Indigenous entrepreneurship theory has been developed during the compilation of this project. This includes the work of Hindle and Lansdowne (2002). Hindle and Lansdowne's (2002) have established that there are three essential elements that distinguish Indigenous entrepreneurship from mainstream entrepreneurship; the heritage positioning index, the autonomy-accountability network and the twin skills inventory.

The first claim places emphasis on the 'twin skills' of the Indigenous entrepreneur. This is confirmed by the Australian and Hawaiian research. The entrepreneur not only must be well versed in standard business skills they must also have a combination of cultural skills (Hindle and Lansdowne 2002).

Proposition two focuses on the importance of networking and accountability within the sphere of the entrepreneurs' stakeholders. The fundamental attribute of the entrepreneur is how they consolidate the business within the commercial network and account for its performance (Hindle and Lansdowne 2002). This is prevalent within the Hawaiian and Australian studies.

The third proposition merges the essential elements of both propositions one and two and highlights the importance of double accountability. Indigenous entrepreneurs they argue must be able to handle extra cultural, political and commercial accounting pressures (Hindle and Lansdowne 2002). Their model has simplified the understanding of what it is like to be an Indigenous person operating within a mainstream commercial market. Their work is based on studies undertaken within the First Nations people of Canada.

Developing theory on Indigenous entrepreneurship is restricted by its dearth of understanding of what constitutes an Indigenous entrepreneur, what values motivate their entrepreneurial activities, and what is the social positioning of Indigenous business people. Developing theory is meshed with the understanding of societal values to enable
clearer insights into Indigenous entrepreneurship. The combination of the concepts raised by Hindle and Lansdowne (2002) and the findings of this comparative Australian/Hawaiian work allow a greater understanding of Indigenous entrepreneurship.

A brief summary of the issues raised in this discussion will conclude this chapter.

6.5 Conclusion

This chapter covered four main areas of discussion. Firstly, the principles of Indigenous Standpoint theory were discussed and reviewed in the light of the research findings. Secondly, human values were discussed. These included cultural values, religious values and family values. The study related these values to both the Hawaiian and Australian participant groups and identified their existence and modification. Thirdly, micro-economic reform theory was discussed and entrepreneurial activity was shown to be an important part of the economic reform of Indigenous society. Finally, diverse findings were discussed. These included issues such as how the writer gained access to the Hawaiian study group, the concepts of Indigenous kinship law and the interaction of matrilineal and patrilineal societies, possible outcomes when an Indigenous entrepreneur has a non-indigenous spouse, exit strategies, the effects of the stolen generation on the Australian sample group and Emerging theory.

These broad ranging topics were seen to be of related interest and in the spirit of the study, deemed to require further discussion. Owing to the scope of material covered in the interviews, the data has not been exhausted. The discussion however, has been limited to the relevant issues raised in literature.

The following chapter concludes the research. Chapter 7 will look at the key findings, outline the contribution to literature, and discuss the implications for theoretical development, for practitioners and for policy makers. It will also discuss research limitations and future research possibilities.
7 CONCLUSION

Chapter 7 commences with an appraisal of the initial research questions and a summary of their relevant outcomes. Key findings will be once again reviewed and summarized. This project's contribution to literature will then be discussed as will its implications for firstly theoretical development and secondly, for practitioners and policy makers. This will be followed by an overview of the research limitations. The role and direction of future research will then be outlined before a discussion of the recommendations which conclude the chapter and this study.

7.1 Summation of the Project and Key Research Questions

The backbone of this research revolved around five research questions which were raised in Chapter 1. In summary they are: do the Indigenous entrepreneurs identify less with Indigenous culture and more with Anglo-European values, do they need to adopt values of the dominant Anglo-European culture to remain successful in business, are there existing impediments/inhibitors that restrict business growth and subsequent success for the Indigenous entrepreneur, is the Indigenous entrepreneur different to the non-indigenous entrepreneur, and does entrepreneurship free the Indigenous business person from the welfare system?

These questions are answered below.

1) Does the Indigenous Australian entrepreneur identify less with Indigenous culture and more with the Anglo-European values of the dominant culture?

The answer is inconclusive as no precise form of measurement can be placed on the outcomes. The value systems of the two groups are very different. The Hawaiian system has a strong traditional base in a modern urban setting. The Indigenous Australian value system is also practised within a modern urban environment. It is however, based in a modified set of Indigenous protocols and ethics. This follows decades of formal government policies which were designed to breakdown Aboriginal culture and society, and assimilate Indigenous people into the dominant Anglo-Australian social system. The difference in the value systems was not fully understood by the writer in the planning stage of this study.
In reality, each Indigenous entrepreneur responds differently to the business environment within which they operate according to their personal background and individual situation. The Indigenous entrepreneur however does in general maintain and practice modern urban Indigenous Australian values. A18 summarises the question of identity in a way that typifies the responses of participants. Indigenous business people live a good honest life. They hold their head high, work hard and value relationships. A18 does not hold a grudge against Anglo-European Australia; they work with them and prosper. They believe they have adapted traditional values to suit their particular modern urban environment and call them traditional contemporary urban values. They see this adaptation as cultural and economic survival. Survival is perhaps the key word in this conclusion, if that means adopting and/or adapting to mainstream business methods, then this is what the Indigenous entrepreneur must do to survive and operate a successful business. They do not however, consider themselves any less Indigenous.

2) Do successful Indigenous entrepreneurs in effect need to adopt or conform to the value system of the dominant Anglo-European culture to remain successful in business?

Many participants stated they are often regarded and treated as the ‘exotic other’ by Anglo-European Australians. They also highlighted that they are obliged to live and work in the dominant society, but non-indigenous people will never live according to Indigenous culture values. The Indigenous Australian is basically forced to live according to the rules of the dominant non-indigenous socio-economic system in order to survive. The overall findings of the Australian research indicate that the Indigenous entrepreneur can remain true to their Indigenous beliefs in a modern urban environment and be successful in business.

3) Are there existing impediments/inhibitors that restrict business growth and subsequent success to the Indigenous entrepreneur?

The results of the study reveal the existence of a number of impediments and inhibitors. There is a lack of access to ‘start up’ capital and working capital to a sector of Australian society that has been formally acknowledged as the most marginalized and impoverished group within Australian society (Commonwealth of Australia 1992). Whilst education and industry experience have been acknowledged as strong determinants of business
success, the current low level of Indigenous participation in school (when compared to non-indigenous Australians is of concern. The current trend towards reduced Indigenous participation in education is of even greater concern (ABS 2002). This poor level or even total lack of education becomes a significant impediment for Indigenous people to gain basic employment, industry experience, and/or trades, professional or business acumen. Indigenous youth have little opportunity to break out of their entrenched poverty and welfare dependence within Australian society if they lack adequate levels of education.

Racism is the strongest and most destructive impediment for Indigenous people. Its existence is widespread across Australian society and is even evident within the peak institutions that are enacted to assist Indigenous people and promote Indigenous issues. Generational racism has ensured low participation levels of Indigenous Australians in the ‘paid’ workforce within the Australian economy over the past two centuries. This has resulted in low to non-existent levels of family capital accumulation. The stolen wages case in Queensland and the recent admission that generations of Indigenous workers went unpaid in NSW, by the States current Premier, are examples of this economic injustice. There is almost no accumulated wealth and/or inherited wealth within the Indigenous economy. Without a capital base the economic future and development of Indigenous Australia is bleak. Outdated and derogatory racial stereotypes continue to perpetuate negative attitudes within large sections of the Australian population. This all makes the economic revival of Indigenous Australia a more difficult task.

Racism is seen as the fundamental stumbling block that restricts Indigenous Australian development and positive engagement within the business sector.

4) Is the Indigenous entrepreneur different to the non-indigenous entrepreneur?

Whilst the Indigenous entrepreneurs exhibit many similar traits to their non-indigenous counterparts this study reveals they also have distinctive Indigenous cultural attributes. Recent unpublished academic discussion has suggested that Indigenous leadership and management techniques are no different to those used by non-indigenous people in the business environment. They claim Indigenous operator’s must adopt and exhibit identical traits to those of the dominant group in order to survive and succeed. The Indigenous entrepreneur however is vastly different to that conceptualised by Appo (2002) when the
environment within which the Indigenous entrepreneur operates is considered. The
Indigenous entrepreneur is not the same as the non-indigenous. The Indigenous
businessperson's intrinsic motivator is the provision of basic needs for their extended
family network and overcoming oppressive racism within the workplace. This
distinguishes the Indigenous entrepreneur from their non-indigenous counterpart.

Developing theory (Hindle and Lansdowne 2002) supports the finding that
Indigenous entrepreneurs are indeed distinctive to their non-indigenous counterparts. The
twin skills inventory of functioning within the Indigenous cultural realm and the
mainstream business world together with the autonomy-accountability network
propositions are fundamental attributes of Indigenous entrepreneurs. They are the key
points of distinction between Indigenous and mainstream non-indigenous entrepreneurs
(Hindle and Lansdowne 2002). Indigenous entrepreneurs are indeed distinctive from non-
indigenous entrepreneurs.

5) Does entrepreneurship free the Indigenous business person from the
welfare system?

Both the Hawaiian and the Australian research results supported the view that
entrepreneurship is a positive step towards economic independence. Success in small
business has many positive, stimulating outcomes for the Indigenous practitioner. This
was also evident in the Hawaiian comparative minority study. Entrepreneurship is a
family activity amongst many minority groups, or an individual activity that allows the
participants to avoid welfare and seek economic independence. Prior to entrepreneurial
activity they were tied to either fixed basic wages or welfare, or in some cases both of
them.

With careful planning and market research, Indigenous entrepreneurs can develop
into positive participants within the business world across a plethora of commercial
pursuits. This study has shown that Indigenous entrepreneurs are capable people and do
succeed in business. Despite or because of their upbringing in impoverished homes, many
have constructed sound economic bases for their families. The literature reviewed also
covered a vast area of the Pacific ranging from New Guinea to Hawaii. This revealed the
regional extent of Indigenous group participation in various business interests.
Examples of Indigenous people’s involvement in business undertakings in open market economies show that their skill and hard work is rewarded by their freedom from the shackles of welfare dependence. These answers to the research questions conclude in recommendations for the study. These are covered in the final section; a summary of the key findings of the project however are summarized and discussed beforehand.

### 7.2 Key Findings

The key findings for the Hawaiian and the Australian studies are as follows. The Hawaiian results revealed that money was not a motivator for the Native Hawaiian. The well being and care of their family was seen as a primary motivator. Approximately fifty percent of the Hawaiian participants had tertiary qualifications. Those without tertiary education had extensive industry knowledge and experience. Only eight percent of the Native Hawaiian group enjoyed bank finance which indicates a low level of borrowing capability and capital backing. Fifty-two percent of the Native Hawaiians are second-generation entrepreneurs. Direct discrimination in their business pursuits was isolated and not the norm. The Native Hawaiian entrepreneur values networking as a key attribute of their cultural and business interaction. This enables them to maintain strong cultural networks that are exceedingly important in their business pursuits.

The most outstanding individual characteristic that sets the Hawaiian entrepreneur apart from the Australian counterpart is the Hawaiian value of *kukulu kumuhana*; or the pooling of emotional, psychological and spiritual strengths for a shared purpose (Pukui, Haertig and Lee 2001a). This characteristic was identified and acknowledged by Hawaiian entrepreneurs themselves in twenty-four of the twenty-five case studies.

The Australian research findings showed the Indigenous Australian entrepreneur is driven to achieve success by several motivators. The first is a desire to succeed in business in order to escape their childhood poverty. The second is a strong desire to provide a better life for their children. This is a by-product of the entrepreneur’s own economically deprived childhood. This results in a strong determination to succeed. This positivity is also driven by a will to gain control of their lives. They strive for self-determination through economic independence, which is a sharp contrast to the conditions experienced during their youth and that of their parents.
High levels of educational qualifications and/or business expertise appear to be associated with business success. Eighty-eight percent of the participants have grade twelve or better education, while over half have tertiary qualifications. Almost three quarters have tertiary and/or formal trade qualifications. Networking is an almost essential attribute of the successful Indigenous Australian entrepreneur, as it enables the participants to develop and make use of relationships. When discrimination or racism is evident however, their networking is severely impaired. The dominating inhibitor to business growth and success within Australia is racism. Participants experience incidents of a discriminative and racist character on a daily, rather than isolated basis. Access to capital was poor; a third borrowed start up capital from family and forty percent used credit cards for working capital.

In general it was agreed that traditional values such as ethics and protocols still exist. The Native Hawaiian entrepreneurs demonstrated a shared core set of principles and values that conformed to strong traditional beliefs and actions. The Australian study revealed that entrepreneurs who worked and had unbroken connections to their traditional lands over successive generations exhibited a strong cultural link to that land. They practised cultural procedures related to that country including ceremony, formal kinship obligations as well as contemporary kinship practices.

The majority of the Australian study did not have an unbroken link to traditional lands. Many had no knowledge of where their spiritual connections lay due to past policies and practices of assimilation and child removal. These entrepreneurs did however possess strong Indigenous cultural values. They were referred to as contemporary Indigenous Australian values that were further defined as contemporary kinship values.

Indigenous culture is not static. The participants agreed that culture evolves with technological advancement, other external factors as well as internal dynamism. Several participants pointed out that entrepreneurial activity was not a custom practised solely by people of European descent. Entrepreneurial activity was a firmly established component of Indigenous society through trade and commercial undertakings long before the arrival of Europeans in Australia. These comments are supported by wider literature (Foley 2001; Trudgen 2000). The Indigenous entrepreneur adheres to and practices ethical
protocols within the operation of their daily routines. From this they take responsibility for their Indigenous lives and earn respect.

The value systems of the two groups are very different. The Hawaiian entrepreneur has a strong traditional base in a modern urban setting, whilst the Indigenous Australian value system is more contemporary within an urban environment. The Australian contemporary kinship values are the result of an ongoing modification of traditional protocols and ethics that occurred during the decades of the formal assimilation of Indigenous Australians into Anglo-European Australian society (Neill 2002).

The findings indicate that the key organizations of OHA and ATSIC have not been helpful to the successful entrepreneurs given the high level of criticism levelled against them. Only one quarter of participants had a positive experience with their peak body. These comments were qualified by participants. They believed both ATSIC and OHA were ineffective because they were the products of post-colonial politics. It was recognised that whilst both organisations were visionary in their policy development, they lacked government support in their application of holistic Indigenous policies that supported sustainable and self-sufficient economic management.

Australian entrepreneurs were predominantly male, whereas their Hawaiian counterparts were almost equally male and females. On average they were married and had start up capital of around $5,500. A third or more commenced business with borrowed capital from their families, a large percentage used credit cards to supplement their working capital (75% in Hawaii). More than half sought business plan advice before commencing their ventures. In the majority of cases business plans were developed for the benefit of potential financiers. The occurrence of second generational entrepreneurs in Hawaii was far greater than in Australia (52% vs 16%), which may suggest Native Hawaiian people and their culture have been an accepted part of the dominant Anglo-European American culture for longer than Indigenous people have been accepted in Australia. On average the successful entrepreneurs have an average age of forty-three years. They have been in business for approximately ten years and have around fourteen years of business experience. Approximately half have tertiary qualifications and eighty-eight percent of the successful Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs have year twelve
The Australian findings highlight there is a need for better access to business and working capital finance. A sound education and industry experience are obviously characteristics of successful Indigenous entrepreneurs. Neither the peak Indigenous governing body (ATSIC), which had a mandate to help Indigenous business peoples, or mainstream state funded business developmental organizations have been successful or effective in assisting Indigenous entrepreneurs in this regard. Research results also indicate economic independence, as a result of entrepreneurial activity, does allow Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs to achieve self-determination. Finally, it would appear racism and discrimination within Australia does pose as the greatest threat to business success for Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs.

These research findings make the following contribution to literature.

### 7.3 Contribution to Literature

This thesis makes an extensive contribution to literature in terms of a better understanding of two particular Indigenous groups, namely Native Hawaiians and Indigenous Australian urban entrepreneurs. It also includes an extensive review of entrepreneurial literature in the Pacific that links Australia to Hawaii: from New Guinea to Micronesia, including the Marshall Islands, Western Samoa, Cook Islands, Fiji, and Tonga. To the writer’s knowledge, a similar comparative study of Indigenous entrepreneurs within first world Pacifica Nations has never been attempted before. This comparison is an important addition to the sparse literature on contemporary activity in this area of study.

The case study analysis of other minority groups in Hawaii also appears to be innovative and will add to Hawaiian literature when the dissertation is finally lodged with the University of Hawaii.

This thesis forms the basis for both future research and policy development. Its strengths lie in its adoption of an Indigenous epistemological standpoint, and its qualitative, empirical orientation. In short it has approached research on Indigenous entrepreneurs from a life experience perspective. Qualitative research into matters concerning First Nations peoples by an Indigenous researcher is very rare. Most
Australian researchers to date have relied on statistical reviews of ABS data. The qualitative Indigenous approach will make this work a valuable addition to literature. It has also demonstrated there are successful independent Indigenous entrepreneurs who have found a way to operate within the dominant society and still maintain their Indigenous cultural values. This study has provided an overview of the major characteristics and attitudes needs and influences of and on contemporary Indigenous entrepreneurs.

### 7.4 Implications for Theoretical Development

The findings and outcomes of this research have the possibility of being significant additions to two important areas of theoretical development. They are firstly the introduction of a new dimension of academic rigour to the ongoing development of what is Indigenous Standpoint theory and secondly additional insights into Indigenous Australian entrepreneurship that are possibly parallel to the Indigenous entrepreneurship Emerging theory (Hindle and Lansdowne (2002)).

The exclusion of Indigenous Australian pedagogical approaches to research and the inability of academia to acknowledge important cultural differences between Indigenous and non-indigenous Australians (NTEU 2000) are of concern to the writer. The majority of research to date on Indigenous cultures and values had been done from Eurocentric pedagogical and epistemological perspectives, without any mechanisms with which to differentiate Indigenous values. The Eurocentric epistemological application to research does not allow for Indigenous pedagogy or Indigenous epistemology to be considered (Rigney 1999; Nakata 1998). The result is an enforced application of western approaches on postgraduate students that has resulted in numerous Indigenous Australian students abandoning their dreams of a higher degree (Budby 2001). The oppression of Indigenous Australian pedagogy and research methodologies within higher education institutions needs to be acknowledged and corrected (Budby 2001).

The second contribution made by this work to theoretical development in entrepreneurial research is the increased understanding of what is an Indigenous entrepreneur: their values, their societal positioning, their motivators and their industry/societal inhibitors. The concepts raised in this work when read in conjunction
with the Hindle and Lansdowne (2002) finding, provide a greater understanding of Indigenous entrepreneurship. The two sets of research compliment each other. This enables academics such as Hindle to ‘[augment] conceptual and empirical research’ and thereby make it ‘research useful to practitioners’ (2004: 98). This work provides a foundation from which business theory can be further developed and importantly, it can be used by Indigenous practitioners or policy makers for positive outcomes. It is not theory for theory sake (Hindle, Anderson and Gibson 2004) or theoretical development written for knowledge alone. It is theoretical development intended for practical implementation. Both the development of Indigenous Standpoint Theory and the research findings have positive implications for future theoretical development.

7.5 Implications for Practitioners and Policy Makers

It is the writer’s hope that this study’s findings will have many positive implications for practitioners and policy makers.

Racism and discrimination needs to be addressed by policy makers. This can only be achieved through the improvement of management practices within the education system over several generations. Mainstream education ontological, pedagogical and epistemological approaches need to be readdressed. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander consultative groups have been discussing the need for this reform with state and federal governments for three decades. There have not been any effective outcomes (Brown and Bull 1994; Commonwealth of Australia 1989; Department of Employment, Education, and Training 1996; Foley and Flowers 1989; Hughes 1988; Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs 1995; National Board of Employment, Education and Training 1995; Office of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner 1999; Yunupingu 1995). The initial success of Pauline Hanson’s political aspirations and popularity based as they were on a racist platform highlights the enduring racial tensions that exist in Australia (Neill 2002). The Redfern riots in February 2004 are an indicator of the smouldering frustration felt by Indigenous people at the lack of a commitment from mainstream Australia to stamp out inequality in this country.
Education and business expertise are determining factors in business success. Policy makers need to address these two areas. Growth of Indigenous business activity and the reduction of welfare dependence is contingent on improved levels of education and industry experience. It is otherwise doomed. One answer is the better education of Indigenous youth. We must enquire as to why they do not finish school? It is vitally important to consider the grass roots problems, be they poverty or the inability to manage daily living requirements; and appreciate their causes, be they enforced institutionalism, the socio-cultural genocidal intent of child removal, or any of the other social problems that have followed the deliberate breakdown of Indigenous social systems. Policy makers need to take a look at holistic correctional practices. The declining number of Indigenous students who began higher education between 1997 and 2000 (ABS 2002) is of serious concern. The results also highlight the need for ‘real’ vocational education in the trade area. This is an area where Indigenous participation has increased by sixty percent between 1996 and 2000, and produced a thirty-four percent increase in vocational education and training (VET) enrolments (ABS 2002). Whilst apprenticeships and traineeships have increased significantly from 1996 to 2000, the majority of students enrolled in VET programs are only studying certificate IV (ABS 2002). It is likely that this is a catch up for those students whom failed to complete year twelve? Only thirty-six percent of the Indigenous population stay at school until year 12 compared to seventy-three percent of mainstream students (ABS 2002). This indicates the high failure rate and/or dropout rate of Indigenous students in high school. If VET rates increase then this is obviously a catch up that should not be reason for excitement. It is distressing to learn that a sound education is the most common characteristic amongst successful Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs. This would suggest the decreasing numbers of Indigenous Australian enrolments at higher education institutions (ABS 2002) will lead to a decline in Indigenous entrepreneurs in future years.

Simply stated, as the attainment of tertiary qualifications decreases then the pool of potential successful Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs will also decline. This will no doubt stifle the likelihood of economic growth within Indigenous families (and wider Indigenous society). This will also inhibit any future prospects of micro-economic reform in a section of Australian society that has already endured the shackles of welfare (Herron
1998). Improved access to industry and vocationally orientated tertiary education training are obvious recommendations to policymakers. This will increase the pool of potential nascent Indigenous entrepreneurs. The creation of industry focused business incubators together with Indigenous supervision and Indigenous business advisors are also policy recommendations that would generate positive outcomes if they were correctly implemented.

Finally, one of the most important issues that emerged from this study is the need for micro-finance in Australia. There is a demonstrated need for access to initial start up capital and working capital. This will enable and foster Indigenous Australian enterprises. With success in business, Indigenous Australians become economically independent. It is logical to extend support to the sector of the Indigenous community that wants to enter into business be it through improved access to education, training, business support access to capital and business lending on a micro-financial basis. The Grameen Bank provides a potential model for Australian consideration. The Hawaiian Community Loan Fund is another. This has an excellent program with a holistic application to lending, business health and personal well-being that could be adopted within Australia.

The findings of this study could also be applied to the current economic redevelopment work being undertaken in northern Queensland by Noel Pearson’s Cape York Peninsula partnership, between federal, state government and industry partners such as Westpac. There is a need for practitioners and policy makers to remain flexible and to utilize alternative methods that produce successful outcomes as they become available, and thereby enable increased numbers of Indigenous Australians to attain economic independence. Although business activity is not the solution for all people and all concerns, entrepreneurial success does produce a positive ripple effect within the Indigenous community.

The next topic to form part of the concluding discussion is research limitations.

7.6 Research Limitations

Within the closing stage of this study, it is appropriate to reflect broadly on the research approach and limitations to the study. The main research limitations revolved around access to participants. The second limiting factor was the application of Indigenous
Standpoint theory. The next two limitations are the development of the thematic model and the preceding review of Pacifica literature. Both were limited by resources. Their deletion from the final study would have resulted in a reduced document in terms of its richness of content. Another limitation was the questionnaire format. It raises the question: could this have been developed in a different way? Another concern to the researcher is the future application of the project outcomes: will they contribute to social change? Lastly, the seventh limitation is the lack of Indigenous supervision. This should in no way be interpreted as a criticism of the author’s non-Indigenous supervision. Rather these comments are an indictment as to the lack of suitably qualified Indigenous scholars within academia who can supervise and support Indigenous students with their higher research degree aspirations. These seven broad limitations to the study are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Over two hundred potential Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs were contacted in the course of the Australian focused research. Of these, only thirty five met the definition of an Indigenous Australian entrepreneur, as many of these ventures were Indigenous in business name only. In many cases the principal investor/owner and ultimate manager was non-Indigenous. Others were omitted for several reasons such as deaths in the family or a business partner’s passing which excluded any mention of them in the interview transcripts. These interviews were excluded out of respect for the deceased. In several cases participants withdrew their support as they were frightened that their critical comments levelled at ATSIC or state government departments would be traced back to them. In two other unrelated instances, participants withdrew their support because they did not trust the confidentiality of university researchers after previous negative experiences. This resulted in only twenty five studies being included in the Australian study. The identification of and the gaining of acceptance from Australian Indigenous entrepreneurs was a limiting factor.

Another limiting factor was the application of the Indigenous standpoint theory protocols, or the constant referral of transcripts back to the participants for review. This proved to be exhaustive as it locked up limited resources that could have been better used elsewhere. This is raised for the information of potential Indigenous researchers so they
may learn from this document and ensure they allow for this time consuming (but necessary) process.

The development of the thematic model required much thought. The inclusion of the Bulhan and Shook models was undertaken with trepidation. Although they are used in American minority group research they had not, to the writer’s knowledge, been applied to business/management enquiries. The academic development of the Shook model is an area that should possibly be undertaken in other related research.

The study promoted theoretical development by linking the two fields of methodological considerations and empirical enquiry with constant reference to emancipatory theories. This was strengthened by meetings with Indigenous academics including John Budby and Lester-Irabinna Rigney. The Hawaiian study enabled development to further refinement after consultation with Dr. Meyer who had completed a doctorate in education at Harvard looking at Hawaiian Indigenous epistemology. This intellectual stimulation allowed for accelerated confidence in the academic rigour of Indigenous Standpoint theory.

The inclusion of Pacifica literature was an important time consuming exercise because it strategically differentiated between a Hawaiian ‘warrior-Chiefdom based culture’ and an Indigenous Australian pluralist society. At the onset of the research the writer was not aware of the major cultural differences between Indigenous Hawaiian and Aboriginal Australian societies. The wide ranging literature covering New Guinea and the Pacific Islands revealed the differences and similarities of Indigenous entrepreneurs in diverse cultures across a wide area. The Pacifica literature enabled the reader to understand the different characteristics of Indigenous entrepreneurship and prepared him for the interpretation of the negative findings as set out in Chapter 5.

With the wisdom of hindsight, the questionnaire format could have been improved before commencement with more detailed discussion regarding values. This may however, have complicated the thesis literature base and discussion. The real limitation to this work is facing the crippling effects of Indigenous poverty and social dysfunction and maintaining faith in the belief that this can be overcome. Every time an Indigenous researcher enters a community or the home of an Indigenous person they are exposed to pain. Be it pain from the loss of land, or trauma through telling of the stories
about the way in which colonial governments treated their Indigenous cousins. The writer likewise experienced pain during qualitative interviews about psychological pain, stories of hardship, of racism, of lack of educational opportunity, or the reliving of experiences of rejection by Anglo-European Australia. This is perhaps the low-side of the application of Indigenous Standpoint theory and one of the shortcomings of this project. Indigenous researchers are not trained or prepared at university for this emotional distress. There are no support mechanisms within a Graduate School of Management or School of Business to even counteract the agony that Indigenous researchers experience as they unavoidably prise open the ghosts of colonial policies and the pain they produced for Indigenous Australians. Indigenous researchers often relive their own childhood traumas in the process.

The issue of minority student support needs addressing. Some of the many concerns are raised in this document. This problem has adversely impacted upon this Indigenous higher research student and is not limited to this study. Overall, Indigenous students in higher research degrees have little student support as many universities continue to employ Indigenous staff with inadequate tertiary qualifications as Directors of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander student support centres. This often means senior Indigenous staff are ill-equipped to deal with the problems experienced by Indigenous researchers and to support/mentor them through the higher research degree process. The writer looks forward to the gradual acceptance of Indigenous Standpoint theory within Australian universities. This should generate increasing demand for Indigenous academics with higher level research skills and ensure future research by Indigenous students is enabled, rather than limited by, culturally grounded intellectual support. The lack of suitably qualified peers was another limitation of this research. Without further expansion this leads us to discussion of future research.

7.7 Future Research

There is a need for future research in both the pursuit of knowledge and a greater understanding of Indigenous entrepreneurs, as well as the development of Indigenous Standpoint theory and Indigenous epistemologies.
There is also a need for further research to monitor and improve the level of understanding Indigenous entrepreneurs by educators, policy makers and bureaucrats (to name a few), and to enlarge the latter group’s capacity to support the development of rural/remote and urban based Indigenous enterprises. This study adds to the available literature on Indigenous entrepreneurship. It takes a different approach to standard entrepreneurial literature however, due to its methodological approach being based within Indigenous Standpoint theory.

Further research is also needed within higher education that will allow the development of Indigenous epistemological approaches into the classroom setting. The eventual acceptance and inclusion of Indigenous epistemologies will ensure a more enlightened approach to postcolonial research and a more sophisticated level of academic rigor. It is evident that academic philosophy is based on European concepts. This Eurocentrism however, is increasingly being contested. Indigenous standpoint has a valid position within the search for knowledge.

It is also hoped that Developing theory on Indigenous entrepreneurship (Hindle and Lansdowne 2002) will eventually include the developments contained within this work, so that the basic understanding of Indigenous entrepreneurs, their values and their societal positioning, may be included in the three developing propositions of the Developing theory of entrepreneurship (Hindle and Lansdowne 2002).

Having now answered the research questions, the discussion will advance to the recommendations of this study in the following section.

### 7.8 Recommendations

The findings of this research reveal that before Indigenous entrepreneurship in Australia can flourish several actions must be taken. Initiatives need to be introduced, or existing programs need to be redeveloped. These are not new concepts; in fact the Honourable Member for Warringah, Tony Abbott has raised some of the issues in previous press releases (Abbott 2002). It is one thing to recommend, or to highlight past comments. For Indigenous Australia to progress within Australian society to be anything other than a Fourth World people the following recommendations need to be put into practice. Actual practice, not two, three or five year plans. Politicians and bureaucrats need to count...
beyond their fingers. Indigenous Australia needs holistic economic recovery plans that are ten, twenty and fifty year plans that focus on real outcomes. Indigenous Australia has for far too long been a political football.

A summary of concluding recommendations to this study is as follows:

- Nascent and established Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs need access to a time responsive and efficient micro-credit loan system for start up capital and working capital similar to that extended by the Grameen Bank of Bangladesh. Hawaii already has the Hawaiian Community Loan Fund which is based on the Grameen principle; it does however need to be streamlined in its bureaucratic process to make it more efficient. A micro-credit system cannot be run on traditional bank lending equity base principles or be restricted by an endless panel of loan application filters which check for credit worthiness, for capacity to repay, the character of the applicant, existing capital and so on. The former ATSIC commercial loans were based on traditional bank lending principles. There is a need for an efficient lending system that is based on the character of the applicant and the potential of the enterprise. This is a new way of appraising a human capital and venture profitability. These loans need to be centralized and trialled initially within urban areas. This scheme could be funded by a social levy on financial institutions trading profits. As an incentive the levy then can be claimed as a tax write-off based on a philanthropic community/corporate donation. A central funding agency attached to an existing financial institution or a mobile institution that operates according to the no-frills marketing concepts that have been adopted by the John Symonds banking network would be ideal. This lending system must be offered by a successful operator who has the ability to service a small business market and is both highly mobile and versatile.

- The establishment of a results oriented Indigenous Australian business/industry training program that will facilitate access to both postgraduate and undergraduate tertiary education. Components of this recommendation include:
  1. The introduction of business and/or industry funded scholarships for commerce/economics and management programs at universities.
2. The provision of government taxation incentives to industry organisations which support the tertiary education of high achieving Indigenous students and provide valuable business/industry on-the-job training. These industry organisations would offer:

- scholarships to Indigenous students to successfully undertake MBA or business management programs,
- other incentives to these indigenous students, for example a living allowance that is more attractive than Abstudy, and
- a minimum two year employment contract.

3. Industry organisations would receive:

- a taxation offset from the federal government for the cost of the scholarship and fifty percent of the wage of the student upon the successful completion of a two year employment contract,
- the services of a MBA, or commerce/economics/management graduate for two years for only half of the relevant wage payable.

4. Students would receive:

- two years of valuable business/industry employment experience, and
- a business/industry orientated university degree.

Undergraduate scholarships are also needed for talented Indigenous students. Industry focused scholarships are also needed to entice young Indigenous students to stay longer at, and graduate from high school. All of these proposed programs should provide business/industry participants with attractive taxation incentives and produce carefully considered outcomes.

- Racism and anti-racism educational programs need to be implemented. Concepts raised in the early 1970’s by Al Grassby the Minister of Immigration in the Whitlam administration need to be re-visited, re-addressed and re-implemented. Indigenous Australian studies need to be taught in school from kindergarten to year twelve levels in a respectful rather than a tokenistic manner. Indigenous culture needs to be embraced by the education curriculum within Australia to ensure every child who attends an educational institution is aware and
appreciative of Australia’s Indigenous culture. This also applies to every
discipline within tertiary institutions. Every law, medical, nursing, teaching,
commerce/economics, policing/justice and humanities student must undertake
Indigenous studies as a core subject in their certificate, diploma, or degree. A
basic education in Indigenous studies is an essential step in the eradication of
ignorance that breeds contempt and perpetuates racial stereotyping. New Zealand
has taken a progressive step and incorporated Maori studies in their curriculum. It
is time for Australia to do likewise.

- Indigenous business incubators need to be created with links to established
mainstream businesses and Indigenous business operators, both of which provide
mentoring programs. These could be done through established local government
business centres. They also need to be associated with vocational educational
training centres and other educational centres including high schools. This does
not require a reinvention of the wheel. It involves an examination of effective,
established business incubator programs in mainstream Australia and the
identification of their strong points. With this knowledge in hand, the
development of Indigenous incubators in association with established operations
would ensure economies of scale and the maximisation of trade/market
connections. No doubt other minority groups could also be incorporated into this
program in addition to rural revitalisation programmes. From the writer’s
observations in the Northern Territory, Victoria, Queensland and Hawaii, the
adaptation of successful working models can lead to their take-over by public
service agencies. Indigenous business needs to be removed from the ambit of a
public service provider and repositioned in a commercial environment that is
customer and supplier orientated. Institutional provision of services to Indigenous
Australia is rarely effective. There are too few successful examples in Australia’s
colonial history. If privately owned industry wise practitioners are paid on a result
outcomes basis, then there is a stronger possibility that Indigenous business
incubators will be introduced, effectively managed and be potentially successful.

- Corporate Australia needs two for one taxation incentives and multi-dimensional
benefits for involvement in Indigenous small business creation. For example all
government tenders should include incentives to encourage industry/business to appoint Indigenous owned and managed enterprises as their suppliers and/or subcontractors. Those tenders would receive favourable treatment for the commitment to social justice and their support of Indigenous owned small enterprise. If corporations assist in the establishment of Indigenous owned and run enterprises by supplying trade finance for working capital or extending opportunities for formal industry training, they should also receive government incentives such as tax reduction. If they develop a subsidiary, Indigenous owned and managed by Indigenous operators they should also receive taxation incentives and be granted preferential status in tender procedures with government instrumentalities. None of these recommendations are new. They are all part of the small business promotional scheme in the United States. Australia needs to reconfigure these initiatives to suit the Australian context and monitor their application to ensure they produce effective results. In addition mainstream industry in Australia needs to shoulder some of the responsibility for the development of Indigenous business. It should not only be a government initiative. Those businesses that participate should be given favourable assistance to promote the development of Indigenous business expertise.

- The employment of Indigenous people who are keen to establish their careers should also be encouraged through two to one taxation offsets. For example, for every career oriented Indigenous member of staff employed beyond 12 months the company receives an offset of $2 for every $1 spent in overheads such as superannuation or insurance for the second year of their employment. Other payroll tax concessions could also be considered. The desired outcome is the employment of Indigenous Australians in career based positions to assist in their development of business expertise. This must be long term employment, not short-term traineeships. Employers’ incentives must be large enough to ensure they create a working environment that is attractive for Indigenous people. Larger firms for example would provide an attractive opportunity for an Indigenous business liaison person to work in the procurement of government contractors or suppliers. Other envisaged employers could include accountancy firms and most,
if not all, service providers.

- Redevelop business plan and business advice centres to nurture nascent Indigenous entrepreneurs. It is important that these centres operate on the following basis: all advisors must be culturally sensitive, formally qualified professionals with real business experience. These centres must be run on a no cost basis, within state based operations. These should be preferably local government economic development cells or private industry service suppliers who are appointed on a contractual basis, remunerated on an incentive basis and measured against real business outcomes, not administrative statistical targets. This office should create an encouraging and uplifting rather than an auditing and policing environment. Indigenous entrepreneurs need to be trained and nurtured, not criticised for business failure.

- Establish a networking program that is coordinated by the business plan business advice offices and linked to the incubators, the mainstream business operators and the Indigenous business mentors. This includes a face to face mentoring program that involves regular contact and discussion of simple issues such as debtor/creditor control, marketing, product development and liaison with government agencies over matters like taxation requirements. It is important to utilise Indigenous mentors with proven track records in business success and business operators with sound industry networking capabilities. Local government economic development cells should play a proactive part in this development.

- The redevelopment of business training schemes. There is a need for low cost business development programs to be regularly run in central locations as well as the development of ‘block release’ intensive education programs for Indigenous entrepreneurs.

- The establishment or redevelopment of existing state based business support agencies into a business support network to provide confidential advice on issues such as credit checks, credit management, cash flow management and human resource issues. Advisors must have access to mainstream financial agencies and professional business resources. These agencies must be interactive so as to monitor (not police) Indigenous entrepreneurs and ensure they have access to
information that will increase their chances of success and business survival.

At the end of the day business success is dependent on the fortitude of the individual, their hard work, their grit, their determination, their ability to access capital and a little bit of luck. The findings of this research and the recommendations are not final. The field of endeavour and scholarship will continually evolve. The driving motivator to complete this work is for two groups, initially the Indigenous business person, written from an Indigenous business graduate's perspective, and within an Indigenous methodological framework. Secondly it has been compiled so that policy makers, bureaucrats, and people working in the fields of Indigenous enterprise can start to understand the plight of Indigenous entrepreneurs based on the results of qualitative research.

The development of Indigenous entrepreneurship is also to a large extent the responsibility of Indigenous Australia. Indigenous Australia needs to re-evaluate its position, think smarter and consolidate its efforts. There needs to be a dramatic change in Indigenous leadership. Indigenous people need to stop blaming others and take responsibility for the building of a better future. At no time does the writer suggest that non-indigenous Australians should forget the shameful way in which Indigenous Australians have been, and still are treated; rather it is time to move forward to create a better future. Indigenous entrepreneurs can provide the necessary leadership to achieve self-determination through economic independence. The government is not the solution to Aboriginal problems. The government can and should help, but, it is ultimately the responsibility of the Indigenous entrepreneur to seize the opportunity, move beyond their comfort zone and work towards the goal of economic independence. Indigenous Australia needs to commit itself as a group to the support of its Indigenous family members in the struggle for self-determination and the creation of better life chances. However this cannot be achieved without support from the wider population and all three tiers of government in meaningful and long-term plans as previously mentioned.

It took over two hundred years of colonial abuse to get Indigenous Australia into the current social and economic quandary. It may take another two hundred years of rebuilding to allow segments of Indigenous Australia to be productive members of the contemporary societal structure. It must however have a commencement point where the
rebuilding commences. Perhaps people that include Noel Pearson in the Cape York Projects have created the foundations of this turnaround.

For the thousands of Indigenous Australians without secondary education or life skills who are living in poverty and can expect to die fifteen years or more before the average European Australian then this is too little too late. There is a social and economic crisis within Australia. If there is a social conscious within the Australian populace, it is time that unilateral support is given to Indigenous Australia. It needs to commence with basic health and education facilities which is not a mammoth task as some strategists believe. For economic rebuilding it begins with one small group, the nascent Indigenous entrepreneur, their family and their communities. It should also include the Australian public and all three tiers of government. Then and only then can racism be addressed together with the commencement of a structured long-term economic and social rebuilding of Indigenous Australia including their networks, social capital and financial capital foundations.

In conclusion, this work is the culmination of almost fifteen years of part-time study. This began with an Associate Diploma in Management Accounting, was subsequently followed by a Bachelor of Business majoring in Human Resource Management and Small Business Management, and a Master of Business Management. This work has built on the shoulders of those who have gone before the writer, be they of Indigenous or non-indigenous lineage. It is hoped that both Indigenous and non-indigenous scholars of the future will build on this work and add to the development of knowledge within a field that is of vital importance to the future of Indigenous Australian peoples, that being Indigenous entrepreneurship.
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The study examines Indigenous Entrepreneurs from the perspective of an Indigenous Australian. Dennis Foley patriarchal descent is Wiradjuri and his matriarchal is Gai-mariagal. The research project looks at the possible change in cultural values when an Indigenous person enters business and how the Indigenous entrepreneur manages their cultural obligations when in business.

The information from these interviews will be collated and published in Dennis's PhD and other academic publications in which the participant's identity will remain confidential. More importantly the research findings will be used in curriculum development to teach Indigenous students business knowledge. If we can teach tomorrow's youth from the experience of today's Indigenous entrepreneurs, the pain and transition into self-employment and financial independence may be alleviated to some degree.

This is the aim of this research.

The interview process will usually involve two or three visits, the first is to get to know the researcher, Dennis Foley so that he may introduce himself and explain the research project. This should take only ten to fifteen minutes of the participant's time. The second visit is to go through the attached interview format. An audio recording will be used to ensure accuracy of documenting the interview. A typed copy and a copy of the tape can be made available for the participant if you require. The second visit and interview may take from between half of one hour to three hours; the average is usually around one hour. If a third interview is necessary, (with the participant's consent) this should be only brief, following up on issues raised in the second meeting.

If at any time the participant wishes the interviewer to return to explain issues or go over points, please do not hesitate to advise Dennis.
The study has been cleared by the Behavioural & Social Sciences Ethical Review Committee of the University of Queensland in accordance with the National Health and Medical Research Council's guidelines. You are free to discuss your participation in this study with project staff. Please feel free to discuss your participation in this study with project staff.

Please contact Dennis Foley, Ph.D. Student, the Graduate School of Management, University of Queensland, Brisbane QLD 4072. His direct contact address is:

Riawunna
University of Tasmania
GPO Box 252-06
HOBART TAS. 7001
AUSTRALIA

Phone 613 6226 2772
Fax. 613 6226 2575
E-mail Dennis.Foley@utas.edu.au

If you would like to speak to an officer of the University not involved in this study, you may contact the Ethics Officer on (07) 3365 3924.

CONSENT FORM

I have read the above and agree to participate in this study by answering the attached questionnaire. I acknowledge that all audio recordings of responses will be typed and returned to me for authentication. I realise that all the information that I provide in the completion of this questionnaire is entirely confidential and will not be disclosed to any other person within or outside the university. I also realise that I am free to withdraw from the research process at any stage and can, upon request to the Research Officer, have this questionnaire returned to me and information supplied by me removed from the research process. This consent form will be stored separately from the rest of the survey to ensure confidentiality.

Signature                                      Date
1. Business/Trading Name:

2. Address:

3. Structure:

4. Number of Principles

Are they active in the day to day operation of the business?

5. Background, education and previous business experience?

6. Type of Industry?

7. Who are your clients?

8. Who is your opposition?

9. Are you a member of a professional industry body? If so details?

10. In the establishment of this or previous business have you received advice from any professional, such as an accountant, Dept. of Small Business, Chamber of Commerce etc.?

11. Do you have a plan, a business plan or any form of structured approach to the business?

12. If not why?
13. How long have you been established?

14. What business training or industry specific training have you had prior to commencing in business?

15. List top 5 milestones since being in business? What are they, why do you consider them to be achievements?

16. Since commencing business what are the 5 low spots that have worried you the most? Why?

Did they effect the business long/short-term operation of the business?

17. Has your Aboriginality or the Aboriginality of your staff or associates ever impeded you in the operation of your business?

18. Have you experienced any difficulties in dealing with financial institutions or creditors? If so please explain?

19. Can you detail any examples of difficulties in dealing with customers?

20. What is your definition of success? Are you achieving this or do you think you are heading towards it, if so explain. If not why not?

21. Do you have contact with other Indigenous Businesspersons? Who are they (Trading Names?)

22. Would you like to become a member of a state or a national Indigenous Business Organization?

23. Do you see any advantages in such an organization? Should it be independent or would you suggest that initially it be created to operate in partnership with an established organization such as the Australian Institute of Management - etc?
24. Personally, what are some of the difficulties that you have experienced as an Indigenous person operating in business?

25. If you had to do it all again would you rather work in small business or work for wages?

27. Have you had to compromise your culture or your cultural beliefs in the process of operating in business?

28. By being in business has this effected your family or the quality of family life? List both positive and negative aspects?

29. Would you encourage other Indigenous peoples to enter into business? What advice would you give them?

30. What traditional values do you still practice and/or acknowledge?

Copyright Dennis Foley, Graduate School of Management, University of Queensland 2001.

No contents, findings or extracts from this data is to be copied in part or full by any persons other than those authorised by the writer.

Indigenous Cultural integrity is to be maintained, the details within are confidential and not to be used without the interviewees' permission. The 'interviewee' agrees to allow Dennis Foley to use this data without disclosing the interviewees' identity by name or geographic location in the compilation of his Ph.D. Thesis and subsequent research thereon. Some data, maintaining confidentiality may be used in media articles promoting the research.

signed Dennis Foley date

agreed .................................................. date 1 1200112

print name of signatory
PhD Minority Comparative Interview Format.

1. Name
   Business/Trading Name:

2. Address:

3. Background, education and previous business experience.

4. Type of Industry, short bio.

5. How long have you been established?

6. Education/business training or industry specific training.

7. Business motivators and/or why are you in business?

8. Have you experienced racism/difficulties in dealing with financial institutions or creditors?

9. What is your definition of success?

10. Have you had to compromise your culture or your cultural beliefs in the process of operating in business?

11. By being in business has this effected your family, or the quality of family life? List both positive and negative aspects?

12. What values do you regard as important in business?