

The Entrepreneur in the Community

Linda Dyer, Ph.D.

Faculty of Commerce & Administration

Concordia University

1455 de Maisonneuve Blvd. West

Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3G 1M8

Office telephone: 514-848-2936 FAX: 514-848-4292 e-mail: dyer@vax2.concordia.ca

Christopher Ross, Ph.D.

Concordia University

Abstract

This paper presents a theoretical framework in which the relationships between ethnic entrepreneurs and the communities in which they work can be understood. The nature of social ties that affect ethnic entrepreneurs is described. Drawing on concepts from the family business literature, it is proposed that entrepreneurs will have an ambivalent relationship with their employees, customers, co-ethnic business people and the community at large. Several propositions to be tested in future research are developed.

Introduction

In August 1993, Johnson Products Company Inc., a US firm specializing in hair-care products, was sold to IVAX Corporation, a cosmetics & pharmaceutical conglomerate, for \$67 million. Widespread consternation and vigorous debate ensued. Central to the controversy was the fact that Johnson Products had been founded by black entrepreneurs and managed by them for almost 40 years, and IVAX was a white-owned firm (Edmond, 1993). Many members of the black community objected to the sale. They claimed that allowing the firm to fall in white hands was a betrayal of black business development; the resources of Johnson Products would no longer be used to the benefit of the black community; profits and jobs would flow elsewhere. Moreover, keeping black businesses in the black community establishes a legacy that is important for future black entrepreneurs. Other commentators defended the deal, noting that retained earnings and loans are rarely adequate to meet the capital requirements of a successful, growing business. Their view was that strategic partnerships and massive influxes of new equity capital are the key to continued growth for medium-sized companies. In short, there are insufficient resources in the black business community alone; mergers with non-black firms are inescapable and indeed desirable for firms like Johnson Products (Edmond, 1993).

This case raises an interesting question about the relationship between entrepreneurs and the social environments within which they found and develop their businesses. In fact, examination of American firms similar to Johnson Products reveals that it is primarily when companies are institutions of special significance to the community--when they come to be seen as symbols of black economic progress--that entrepreneurs' decisions to sell or merge with other

firms become controversial (Reynolds, 1995). In some cases, then, business enterprises acquire a social meaning, highlighting the notion that the individual entrepreneur is not independent of the community in which he or she operates. Canadian case histories, too, describe the role successful black-owned firms play in the black community. The Toronto company, Mascoll Beauty Supply (which, incidentally, got its start representing Johnson Products in Canada), is seen as “a shining example of how business can contribute to the larger [black] community” (Cannon, 1996, pg. 99). *The purpose of this paper is to explore the interaction between entrepreneurial activities and the social community in which they occur.* In particular, the sub-field of ethnic entrepreneurship as well as the literature in family business will be examined since both areas may serve to bring into focus some communal aspects of entrepreneurial behaviour.

How Has Entrepreneurship Been Studied?

Predictably, theorists have been unable to achieve a consensus on the most acceptable approach to entrepreneurship. Various authors have noted the plurality of definitions of entrepreneurship in the literature (Gartner, 1990; Kilby, 1971). In general, researchers are agreeing to disagree, recognizing that a single definition is less important than providing a full description of the participants and assumptions in any specific study (Brockhaus, 1994). To many, the term “entrepreneur” conveys the image of a lone, creative, risk-taking individual (Cummings, 1980). The “self-made man” who seizes on an idea, starts a business and becomes successful is an important business legend (Lovell-Troy, 1980). Thus an early and popular approach to research in entrepreneurship tried to identify the personality traits and abilities of those individuals who become successful entrepreneurs. Characteristics such as a high need for achievement, risk-taking propensity, tolerance for ambiguity, high need for autonomy and independence, innovation and creativity have all been said to characterize entrepreneurs (Hornaday & Aboud, 1971; McClelland, 1987).

While interest in individual personality profiles has contributed substantially to the entrepreneurship literature, this has by no means been the only approach. An alternative to the personality models defines the entrepreneur in terms of the behaviours and functions that s/he performs in the organization. In this formulation, the entrepreneur recognizes windows of opportunity, marshals resources, designs organizational systems and implements strategies to exploit the opportunity (Ibrahim & Goodwin, 1986; Stevenson, Roberts & Grousbeck, 1989). Economists (e.g. Kent, 1984) describe how entrepreneurs take initiative and organize resources to produce consumer satisfaction or technological productivity.

A third major approach has looked at the social forces that shape entrepreneurs. Early socialization has been found to influence the decision to make a career as an entrepreneur. The presence of entrepreneurial role models in the family (Matthews & Moser, 1996), or childhood insecurities stemming from rejection from a father or the hardships of poverty result in driving ambition, resistance towards authority and a tendency to take risks. Together, these may create difficulties for the individual in fitting in to a traditional organization, hence the inclination to become an entrepreneur (Kets de Vries, 1977). Gender, religion, ethnicity and immigrant status are other social attributes that might explain why an individual has trouble getting a job and developing a career in an existing organization. Labour market disadvantages may mean that

entrepreneurship is one of the few available roads to achieving economic success (Kets de Vries, 1977; Waldinger, Aldrich & Ward, 1990).

In most of these formulations in the general entrepreneurship literature, the primary spotlight is on the individual--understanding the individual's personality, motivation, career choices or actions. The impact of collective action and community ties is underplayed (Light, 1980). It is in the study of ethnic entrepreneurs that the community dimension has been most evident. Let us now turn to examine this area in greater detail.

Ethnic Entrepreneurship

“Ethnic” in this context usually refers to a group of individuals who share a common culture, have a feeling of belonging and of a common ancestral origin. Much of the research has focused on immigrants who form an ethnic minority in their adopted country, such as Greeks in the United States, West Indians in the Netherlands or Vietnamese in Canada, (Boissevain et al, 1990; Juteau & Pare, 1996; Lovell-Troy, 1980). Native-born ethnic minorities or sub-cultures, for instance Jewish- or African-Americans, or Indians in the Caribbean, are also included under the rubric of ethnic enterprise (Handy, 1989; Rosentraub & Taebel, 1980; Ryan & Barclay, 1992).

Theories of ethnic entrepreneurship can be grouped into two major categories: the Waldinger et al (1990) model presents a comprehensive overview of these two streams of theory. On the one hand, economic and market conditions affect the frequency of new businesses start-ups as well as the types of business in which entrepreneurs of various ethnicities are likely to become involved. For example, ethnic entrepreneurs may provide goods and services that serve the unique needs of co-ethnics; these enterprises face little competition from entrepreneurs of the majority culture who are ignorant of and uninterested in these ethnic needs. In other cases, there are relatively low barriers to entry within particular business sectors, for instance in small grocery stores in urban areas or in the taxi industry. Immigrant entrepreneurs can enter these niche markets without the need for heavy capitalization, and often can achieve competitive advantage by working longer hours for less pay than is the norm in the wider community. At times, business sectors have been abandoned by the majority culture for various reasons, and the consequent vacancies are left open to “middlemen” minorities (Bonacich, 1973) and other ethnic entrepreneurs (Waldinger et al, 1990).

Within the second category of theory is the interest in the characteristics of particular ethnic groups which might encourage entrepreneurial activities. In the Waldinger et al (1990) model, blocked mobility is one such characteristic. As noted earlier, immigrants' limited knowledge of the language or culture of the majority, or discrimination against some ethnic minorities lead to difficulties in securing jobs in existing firms; a viable alternative in this inhospitable work environment is striking out on one's own. Among immigrants, too, the traits of risk-taking and ambition are likely to be higher than the norm; the decision to emigrate to a foreign land often stems from an acute desire to get ahead and tolerance for uncertainty and risk. Certain cultures, too, may value small business activities more than others (Rosentraub & Taebel, 1980; Ryan & Barclay, 1992).

Another aspect of group characteristics is resource mobilization within the ethnic group--the existence of social networks that provide resources and support to co-ethnic entrepreneurs. The operation of these social networks is of considerable relevance in our attempts to understand reciprocal interactions between the entrepreneur and his or her community; we shall examine this area in the following section.

Social Networks in Ethnic Groups

Waldinger et al (1990) propose that social networks emerge as immigrants arrive in the new country and seek information about housing and employment from earlier migrants of their own ethnicity. Physical proximity as the newcomers settle in the same neighbourhoods, and the resulting frequent interactions with co-ethnics, promote a developing sense of commonality and identification. Though immigrants are often accompanied by family members, it is rare that the entire family network from the country of origin will be transplanted. These missing familial connections increase the need to cultivate non-family links for social or economic support, feeding the strength of the social ties within the ethnic group (Waldinger et al, 1990). Several examples of this pattern exist in the literature. Light (1972), for example, describes "immigrant brotherhood" among the Chinese and Japanese settlers in the United States. Similarly Lovell-Troy's (1980) work with Greek entrepreneurs found evidence of a broad clan structure which extended beyond the nuclear family.

In addition to these intra-group interactions, labour market competition with others outside the ethnic group breeds awareness of ethnicity and ethnic solidarity within the group (Olzak, 1983). Moreover as migration and spatial concentration continues, a critical mass is achieved, making possible the formation of ethnic institutions--churches, mutual aid societies, credit associations or other formal or informal organizations--which may take collective action to improve the lot of members. Participation in these institutions reinforces ethnic consciousness and a sense of belonging in the social network (Light, 1972; Waldinger et al, 1990). While most of the work in this area has described the experiences of immigrants, it is likely that similar processes create a feeling of ethnic solidarity within any group who live and work in close proximity, and who perceive differences between themselves and others in the broader society.

Once established, social networks contribute to the creation and development of new enterprises. The ethnic credit association is important in this regard. The availability of start-up capital for would-be entrepreneurs from such associations has received considerable attention (Light, 1972). The ethnic community is also the source of inexpensive or unpaid labour that may be vital to the establishment of the enterprise. Strong ties within the group allow the entrepreneur to draw on the labour of family members and fellow-ethnics who are often prepared to work longer hours for less recompense than is the norm in the society at large (Boissevain et al, 1990). In the same vein, the ethnic group may be a training ground for future entrepreneurs as they start out working in the businesses of co-ethnics. Loyalty from customers within the ethnic community and trade alliances with other ethnic firms also provide resources upon which new entrepreneurs may draw as they establish and grow their firms.

In general, then, there are various resources in ethnic social communities that aid the creation of new entrepreneurial ventures. This notion is of central relevance to the present paper which focuses on the impact on entrepreneurs of social networks within the ethnic community. As we stated at the outset, the aim of this paper is to explore patterns of entrepreneurial activities in the community context in which they occur. Our goal differs from much of the preceding work in that the dependent variable of primary interest is not the initial decision to set up a business-- rather the focus is on activities subsequent to the creation of the ethnic firm. Social structures and bonds within the ethnic community are proposed to affect ongoing business activities in ethnic firms, well beyond the time of their establishment.

A Mixed Blessing?

While the bulk of the literature on social networks emphasizes the helpful contributions of collective ethnic action, Ram (1994) complains about the overwhelmingly positive tone of this work. In his interviews with Asian entrepreneurs in Britain, respondents were less than enthusiastic about their business activities and choices within and beyond the ethnic enclave. The content and tone of their reports reflected passive acceptance of their status in an inhospitable environment, rather than appreciation for competitive advantages derived from ethnic social networks. Ram (1994) notes that "the use of such networks often represent a means of negotiating racism rather than a positive strategic choice on the part of small firm owners (page 42)." What is more, it becomes clear from the stories participants told that social networks may be as much a constraint as they are an opportunity. Strong links with family members and other co-ethnics play a contradictory role in the pursuit of business activities. Along with the helpful resources community networks provide, come problems that interfere with good business practice.

Although Ram does not expand on this point at any length, it is instructive to recall that familial ties are well known to be a mixed blessing in business affairs. The family business literature is rife with examples of how the family network may compromise economic rationality, even as it facilitates certain aspects of firm performance. It is our contention that a parallel can be drawn between the experience of ethnic solidarity and family bonds. While "family" has some connotations that may not generalize to a broader ethnic grouping, it is possible that "ethnic solidarity" in entrepreneurship can be usefully compared with family ties in business organizations. The family business literature may provide a conceptual framework through which the relationships of entrepreneurs with their ethnic communities may be understood. Note that the interest is not in the role of the family or ethnic group in creating entrepreneurs, but in the processes by which the sense of obligation to a family or ethnic group shapes the beliefs and activities of business people. Nor are we especially interested in examining how ethnic entrepreneurs may be similar or different from "non-ethnics" in the ways in which they involve family members in their businesses. Rather, family business research may help us understand how the existence and activities of ethnic enterprises might affect the demands and expectations of customers, employees, business partners, other community members, as well as the entrepreneur him- or herself.

Parallels Between Family Business and Ethnic Entrepreneurship

Those who operate family businesses maintain that building a firm with people with whom you have a fundamental connection and who you care about can be more satisfying than building a non-family business (Ibrahim & Ellis, 1994). On the other hand, a tradition of research maintains that family involvement is antithetical to effective business practice (Dyer & Handler, 1994). Clearly there are advantages and disadvantages when emotional bonds are combined with business practices. A systematic consideration of the pros and cons of family business has been presented by Davis and Tagiuri (1989); this is the model we shall use to explore benefits and problems of ethnic entrepreneurs' relationship with the ethnic community. Davis & Tagiuri (1989) define the family firm as any company in which one family controls ownership, at least two family members are managers in the business, and non-family members are also employed. The authors note seven key attributes which characterize these family firms and propose that each attribute may bring benefits as well as drawbacks to the firm; the success of the company is dependent on how well these benefits and drawbacks are managed. The present review emphasizes those issues that may speak to the entrepreneurship parallel.

The first key attribute of the Davis and Tagiuri framework is that family members working in the business may have three *simultaneous roles*--as relatives, owners and managers. The role of family member implies concern for the well-being of relatives and a desire to maintain the unity of the family. As an owner, longevity and profitability of the business are important to the individual. As a manager, the smooth functioning of the firm's operations come into focus. When these three roles occur simultaneously as is the case for family members working in the family firm, the result may be a strong sense of loyalty, support for each other's decisions, understanding of weaknesses and pride in the strengths of other family members. Negative outcomes are also possible, however. Families usually value unity and repress competition; in business, on the other hand, some internal competition may be healthy. The difficulty of reconciling these opposing values of cooperation and competition creates anxiety, and one value may be suppressed in favour of the other. In some cases, family members may feel that their needs have been sacrificed for the needs of the business. The *emotional involvement* (a second key attribute) that is common in family relationships can make both positive and negative outcomes more extreme. Loyalty, trust and motivations are more intense because of their emotional content; on the down side, resentment and guilt are more severe.

What insights can be gleaned from these attributes of family business for understanding ethnic entrepreneurs in their communities? First, *simultaneous roles* may make participants in the ethnic enterprise feel strong bonds of solidarity and concern with the welfare of co-ethnics. Loyalty, pride and empathy may make owners, partners and employees cooperate to ensure the efficient functioning and long-term success of the firm. When ethnic unity predominates as a value, discipline and rules may be deemed unnecessary since co-ethnics would and should work hard for the good of the firm (Waldinger et al, 1990). When the goals of all members are consistent, then, the business outcomes can be very positive.

More generally, ethnic allegiance affects the expectations participants have of one another, and unfortunately, these expectations may also contain the seeds of discord. As already noted, several researchers have found that the ethnic community is used by entrepreneurs as a source of hard-working but cheap labour (Boissevain et al, 1990). It is conceivable that employees may come to resent their situation, and feelings of exploitation may cause conflict between the role of fellow-ethnic and the role of unhappy employee. Ethnic employers, on the other hand, may feel betrayed when employees do not work as hard as expected, and seem to trade on their “preferred” status as co-ethnics to avoid doing the job. Equally disappointing would be the notion that co-ethnic customers are not loyal and are too willing to take their business to other firms. Simultaneous roles may mean that one party tries to solve a business problem and the other responds by appealing to ethnic ties. In the same way a “business-is-business” attitude may leave co-ethnics feeling mistreated or rejected. Though the presence of *emotional involvement* is less likely to operate within ethnic networks (as compared with family bonds), the possibility still exists that emotion may enhance the positive and exacerbate the negative effects.

Another attribute discussed in the Davis and Tagiuri family business framework is *shared identity*. The family name is a clear example of this shared identity. Each action of employee-relatives influences the reputation of all the other family members as well as the business as a whole. The family therefore monitors the behaviour of members closely, which may be beneficial in promoting awareness of the business/family mission. Frequently, however, family members resent the constant surveillance and need for conformity. In addition, those who do conform to the family image may also resent the actions of their relatives who do not conform.

Ethnic entrepreneurs, particularly those who are visible minorities, *share an identity* that is perceived both within and outside the ethnic group. They may believe that their actions, as well as the actions of their co-ethnics in business, reflect on the reputation of the entire group. This shared identity might lead to constant monitoring of their own and their fellow-ethnics activities. Perhaps this would encourage ethical and efficient business behaviour. In other cases, conflict could occur when others transgress and are judged to be a “discredit to the race.” Since ethical misbehaviour of an entrepreneur, supplier or employee tarnishes the reputation of the whole ethnic business community, co-ethnic transgressors may be judged more severely than outsiders. From another angle, entrepreneurs and others who feel constantly watched by co-ethnics might strain at the reins, craving freedom from these confines.

In the Davis and Tagiuri family business model, a *common history* shared by family members means that they have an intimate knowledge of each other’s strengths and failings. They also develop, over time, deeply-engrained patterns of behaving towards each other. In addition, special words and phrases relating to common family experiences may evolve into a *private language*, largely incomprehensible to outsiders, that eases communication among relatives. Both history and language combine with a third factor--the fact that family members frequently pass on information about each other--to create a heightened *mutual awareness* of each other’s circumstances, reactions to work pressures, physical well-being, and so on. Advantages to the family firm of a common history and family language may include relatives drawing on one another’s known strengths and trying to complement weaknesses, communicating well, and acting easily and in unison at work. Mutual awareness, too, can provide insights about how family

members might support each other in their business activities. Of course, if the history of the relationship has been bad, relatives can undermine each other much more effectively because of their insider knowledge and their ability to create pain through skilful use of the family language; destructive patterns of behaviour are difficult to overcome when they are well-established. Attacks from family members might come at any time, and gossip among relatives might make privacy at work seem unattainable.

Ethnic groups probably do not have the same level of common history or mutual awareness as families do, yet co-ethnics might experience a weaker version of some of these attributes, benefits and problems. Often the ethnic sub-culture does have *modes of expression, body language, spoken language and cultural knowledge* that are more comprehensible within the group than outside. These may enable better and more rapid communication, making it easy to work together and negotiate business deals with one another. The workplace would be a congenial environment when people use cultural insights to support each other. In interactions with suppliers and customers, familiarity with language and comportment might breed trust and good public relations. On the other hand, insider knowledge and language may be used for ill as well as good. Criticism from within the ethnic group can be tailored by knowledgeable co-ethnics to be especially hurtful, making the workplace especially disagreeable. Entrepreneurs may feel vulnerable to rumours which would spread rapidly throughout the ethnic community; the firm would be a fishbowl, with their activities under constant scrutiny.

Finally, in the family business model, Davis and Tagiuri note that the firm may take on a *symbolic meaning* for family members, particularly those of the founder's generation and his or her offspring. Strong attachments may develop in which the firm may seem to be a member of the family, akin to a child, marriage partner, parent or sibling. The symbolism may pose problems if, for example, the entrepreneur finds it difficult to relinquish control over his or her symbolic child. This may stunt business development. In other cases, sibling rivalry may be incited if the firm is seen as appropriating the attention and resources human family members want, and struggles over organizational control may result. In the more positive scenario, these symbolic ties may unite relatives in their dedication to company goals and their wish for longevity of the firm.

The parallel for the firm in the ethnic group is this: the enterprise takes on a *special meaning* for founder, other participants in the business, and the ethnic community as a whole. It is a symbol of the fecundity of ethnic group (a child), a caretaker for weaker members (a parent), a companion of long-standing who has always been there (a sibling or marriage partner). Symbolic meaning may cause the firm to be cherished by all, leading to vigour and long life for the business; it may lead to battles for control and emotional confrontation.

Conclusions and Research Directions

In summary, the family business parallel offers specific insights about ethnic entrepreneurship. Relations between entrepreneurs and the communities in which they operate will often be ambivalent because of the overlapping roles of fellow-ethnic and business participant (partner, employee, supplier or customer). The relationship that the entrepreneur has with the ethnic community as a whole may be equally ambivalent. A number of testable propositions are

listed below which examine these ambivalent relationships. These are all predicated on the assumption (which must also be tested) that ethnic entrepreneurs recognise a shared identity with co-ethnic business participants. An interpretive research paradigm, using in-depth interviews will permit exploration of these propositions. Out of such a research programme could come understanding of ethnic entrepreneurs' links with the community in their ongoing business activities.

Propositions about entrepreneurs and employees: Ease of communication is high between entrepreneurs and their employees. Entrepreneurs expect loyalty from co-ethnic employees and use parental imagery when describing the firm and the employees. Feelings that employees are making special demands based on non-business, social ties are common. Employees find communication to be easy and the workplace to be a comfortable one. Their imagery of the entrepreneur and the firm is that of caretaker. Alternatively, employees feel exploited by the entrepreneur, or judged more harshly than employees outside the ethnic group.

Propositions about entrepreneurs and clients: Entrepreneurs find communicating and understanding the needs of customers to be unproblematic. They expect loyalty from customers and are bitter if they do not get it. Entrepreneurs feel the customers observe them closely and talk to others about their observations. Customers make special demands of co-ethnic entrepreneurs based on non-business links. They feel pride in the existence of the firm, or keen disappointment if the firm fails them.

Propositions about entrepreneurs and co-ethnic business people: Entrepreneurs feel that the actions of any co-ethnic business person--partner, supplier or other firm--reflect on all. They feel trust for fellow-ethnics and find that negotiations with them are easy and satisfying. They especially resent it if trust turns out to be unjustified. Entrepreneurs feel that other business people observe them closely and discuss their actions and their affairs with others. They report feeling constrained by norms of conformity.

Propositions about entrepreneurs and the ethnic community at large: Entrepreneurs feel responsible to the broader ethnic community and think it important that they and their firm are recognized as significant contributors to the community. They also feel scrutinized by the community at large, and may resent continual surveillance. Members of the ethnic community see the firm as a symbol of ethnic progress, a caretaker of less fortunate members of the ethnic group, and a permanent fixture in their lives. They feel that the whole community has a stake in the existence of the firm, and should have influence in company decisions.

It will be apparent that these propositions contain both positive and negative outcomes. As noted earlier, the overlapping roles of fellow-ethnic and entrepreneur give rise to key attributes that are inherent in ethnic enterprise; these attributes and their contradictions cannot be eliminated. Rather, the challenge for business is to manage these attributes intelligently, working to maximize potential benefits and minimize potential problems (Davis & Tagiuri, 1989). Further research may reveal the circumstances in which positive business outcomes predominate, and the conditions in which negative outcomes overshadow the positive. With this understanding,

strategies may be developed to diminish the problems and enhance the advantageous impact of the entrepreneur's community ties.

References

- Boissevain, J., Blaschke, J., Grotenbreg, H., Joseph, I., Light, I., Sway, M., Waldinger, R. & Werbner, P. (1990). Ethnic entrepreneurs and ethnic strategies. In Waldinger, R., Aldrich, H. & Ward, R. *Ethnic entrepreneurs*. Sage Publications.
- Bonacich, E. (1973). A theory of middleman minorities, *American sociological review*, 38, 583-594.
- Brockhaus, R. (1994). Entrepreneurship and family business research: Comparisons, critique and lessons. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, Fall, 25-38.
- Cannon, M. (1996). Looking good, doing good, *Report on business magazine*, December, 99-104.
- Cummings, S. (1980). *Self-help in urban America*, Kennikat Press Corp., N.Y.
- Davis, J. & Tagiuri, R. (1989). The advantages and disadvantages of the family business, Owner Managed Business Institute. Reprinted in Ibrahim, A.B. and Ellis, W. (1994). *Family business management*, Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co.
- Dyer, W. & Handler, W. (1994). Entrepreneurship and family business: Exploring the connections. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, Fall, 71-83.
- Edmond, A. (1993). Should black businesses be sold to whites? *Black enterprise*, November, 45-51.
- Gartner, W. (1990). What are we talking about when we talk about entrepreneurship, *Journal of business venturing*, 5, 15-28.
- Handy, J. (1989). *An analysis of black business enterprises*, Garland Publishing, New York.
- Hornaday, J. & Aboud, J. (1971). Characteristics of successful entrepreneurs, *Personnel Psychology*, 24, 141-153.
- Ibrahim, A.B. and Ellis, W. (1994). *Family business management*, Kendall/Hunt Publishing.
- Ibrahim, A.B. & Goodwin, J. (1986). Perceived causes of success in small business, *American journal of small business*, 11, 41-50.
- Brockhaus, R. (1994). Entrepreneurship and family business research: comparisons, critique and lessons, *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, Fall, 25-38.
- Juteau, D. & Pare, S. (1996). L'entrepreneurship ethnique, *Recherche*, jan-fev, 18-28.
- Kent, C. (1984). The environment for entrepreneurship, Lexington Books.
- Kets de Vries, M. (1977). The entrepreneurial personality: A person at the cross roads, *Journal of management studies*, XIV, 34-57.
- Kilby, P. (1971). Hunting the Heffalump. In P. Kilby (1971), *Entrepreneurship and economic development*, N.Y. Free Press, 1-43.
- Light, I. (1972). *Ethnic enterprise in America*, University of California Press.
- Light, I. (1980). Asian enterprise in America: Chinese, Japanese, and Koreans in small business. In Cummings, S. (1980). *Self-help in urban America*, Kennikat Press Corp., N.Y.
- Lovell-Troy, L. (1980). Clan structure and economic activity. In Cummings, S. (1980). *Self-help in urban America*, Kennikat Press Corp., N.Y.

- Matthews, C. & Moser, S. (1996). A longitudinal investigation of the impact of family background and gender on interest in small firm ownership. *Journal of small business management*, 34, 29-43.
- McClelland, D. (1987). Characteristics of successful entrepreneurs, *Journal of creative behavior*, 21, 219-233.
- Olzak, S. (1983). Contemporary ethnic mobilization, *Annual review of sociology*, 9, 355-374.
- Ram, M. (1994). Unravelling social networks in ethnic minority firms, *International small business journal*, 12, 42-53.
- Reynolds, R. (1995). Must black firms stay in black hands? *Black enterprise*, August, 191-198.
- Rosentraub, M. & Taebel, D. (1980). Jewish enterprise in transition. In S. Cummings, *Self-help in urban America*, Kennikat Press Corp., N.Y.
- Ryan, S. & Barclay, L. (1992). *Sharks and sardines*, University of the West Indies Multimedia Production Centre.
- Stevenson, H., Roberts, M. & Grousbeck, H. (1989). *New business ventures and the entrepreneur*, Third edition, Irwin, 6-19.
- Waldinger, R., Aldrich, H. & Ward, R. (1990). *Ethnic entrepreneurs*. Sage Publications.