Universidad del Desarrollo
Facultad de Economía y Negocios
Doctorado en Economía de Negocios

CONTEXTUALIZING INDIGENOUS VENTURING: EMERGING INSIGHTS FOR CONTEXT-BASED INDIGENOUS ENTREPRENEURSHIP RESEARCH

SEBASTIÁN ANDRÉS BARROS CELUME
Universidad del Desarrollo
Chile

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Business Economics at Universidad del Desarrollo for the academic degree of Doctor in Business Economics.

THESIS DIRECTOR:
DR. IGNACIO PAVEZ

January, 2024
CONCEPCIÓN, CHILE

STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY, AUTHORSHIP AND CONTRIBUTIONS

I hereby declare that this doctoral thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree or diploma in any university or other institution of higher learning. To the best of my knowledge, this thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the manuscript itself.

I also declare that this dissertation is an original research project written primarily by me, and the contributions made by my co-authors have been properly recognized.

This dissertation is based on the following original articles developed during my PhD candidature. Each author's contribution is outlined as follows:

1. *"Indigenous entrepreneurship in place: towards a placed-based understanding of Indigenous venturing"*
   - Sebastián Barros (sole author)

2. *"Embedded venturing in disembedded markets: Exploring the embedding process among migrant Indigenous entrepreneurs"*
   - Sebastián Barros (first and corresponding author)
   - Mariana Lazzaro-Salazar (second author)

_____

(Signed)

Sebastián Barros Celume

January, 2024

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My deepest gratitude to the PhD in Business Economics at Facultad de Economía y Negocios, Universidad del Desarrollo, and Agencia Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo (ANID) Doctorado Becas Chile 21210086 for their diligent commitment and generous financial support.

I'm forever in debt for the invaluable help and caring support of Ignacio Pavez, my thesis advisor, who did most of the heavy lifting for the successful completion of my PhD program. I look up to him both as a friend and social researcher. Likewise, I acknowledge the disinterested and amazing support of Pablo Muñoz, who in practice served as my thesis co-advisor. I also recognize Carlos Poblete, who inspired me during one of his courses to focus this doctoral thesis on the interesting sub-field of Indigenous entrepreneurship. I am humbled and honoured to have been guided by all three of them.

I would also like to acknowledge the following people, in no particular order, all of whom were paramount either for the making of this thesis or in my training as an entrepreneurship researcher: Mariana Lazzaro, a great mentor and co-author of one of the chapters comprising this project; Maribel Guerrero, for toughening me up and push me to keep moving forward through extremely hard work; Julián Díaz, for helping me arrange several conversations with Indigenous entrepreneurs from Chile, Colombia, and Peru; Claudia Yáñez, for encouraging me to believe in myself and my work; and Ling Li, for making me feel I was not alone throughout the ups and downs of this doctoral journey. I expect all of them to keep being my friendly colleagues in years to come.

I would also like to thank Verónica, my life partner, whose loving companion during the last year allowed me to see myself, my career, and life in general on a more positive note. Finally, I thank Maximilian, my nephew, for shining the brightest light among myself and my dearest ones: my sister Carolina, my mother Ivonne, and my father Patricio.

Sebastián Barros Celume

January, 2024

Concepción, Chile

ABSTRACT

We have a limited understanding of entrepreneurship beyond Western-developed contexts. Commonly, mainstream entrepreneurship research relies on assumptions which do not always hold across different segments of the population, such as Indigenous peoples, a still marginalized and under-researched segment of society. Despite its relevance for emancipation, economic independence, and sustainable development among Indigenous communities worldwide, Indigenous entrepreneurship remains largely understudied in our field. Therefore, in this doctoral thesis composed of two research articles, I examine some underexplored aspects of Indigenous venturing, focusing on the cultural backgrounds and contextual specificities in which Indigenous entrepreneurship takes place. In doing so, I seek to stress the need for more inclusive research, urging a reconsideration of some of our common knowledge and taken-for-granted entrepreneurial perspectives.

In the first article of this dissertation, I explore the interface between Indigenous entrepreneurship and place, considering both the 'material' and 'socially constructed' dimensions of place. Specifically, I examine Latin American Indigenous individuals from different ethnicities, engaging in venturing across urban, remote, and rural locations. My findings put into perspective the key influence of place in Indigenous venturing, ranging from deeply embedded and relational ventures in remote settings to Western-influenced business approaches within urban areas. Overall, I contribute with an empirical typology that provides a more detailed understanding of the context-laden and highly idiosyncratic nature of Indigenous entrepreneurship, focusing on the emergence, orientation, main outcomes, and constraints among Indigenous ventures from different places and groups of people.

Building on embeddedness theory, in the second chapter of this dissertation I seek to gain new insights into the embedding process among Indigenous entrepreneurs migrating from their native settlements into urban environments. My findings reveal that migrant Indigenous entrepreneurs engage in distinctive prosocial and sustainable ventures, bringing their context-laden traditions, beliefs, and values to the urban realm through their businesses. Based on this evidence, I showcase the pivotal role that their home contexts play in their agentic embedding within host contexts. I also contribute to a multi-contextual understanding of embeddedness, considering both distal and proximal contexts at a time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

RESEARCH PROPOSAL

Antecedents

Globally, Indigenous peoples encompass approximately 476 million individuals spread across 90 countries on the five continents, representing over 5,000 distinct cultures with nearly 4,000 unique languages. Despite constituting less than 5% of the global population and representing one of the poorest segments of society, Indigenous peoples occupy 20% of the land surface on the planet, which contains around 80% of the world's cultural and biological diversity (Berkes 2018). In numerous cases, Indigenous communities are characterized by distinct social, cultural, economic, and institutional features that set them apart from the settler States in which they live (Salmon, Chavez, and Murphy 2021).

While Indigenous worldviews may not be the same across Indigenous groups, one central aspect among many of them is the acknowledgement of the 'interconnections, interrelationships, and interdependencies' between human beings and the natural and spiritual realms (Tynan 2021). Whereas Western-centric worldviews are dual, creating a hierarchical division between nature and human society, Indigenous worldviews transcend modern anthropocentric perspectives on the human-nature relationship and personhood, by considering animals, plants, and other 'natural' manifestations as agentic beings (Parathian 2019). Generally, Indigenous communities have a deep connection to their ancestral lands and natural ecosystems, viewing themselves as stewards entrusted to ensure that human interactions are respectful of the environment, other groups of people, and living organisms. This calling involves caring for, respecting, conserving, and promoting the well-being of everyone within and beyond their communities and lands (Athayde, Stepp, and Ballester 2016). The application and promotion of these beliefs and values can be seen in Indigenous peoples' traditions, laws, ceremonies, and customs (Baba and Fortin-Lefebvre 2021).

In the last couple of decades Indigenous entrepreneurship has emerged as a research field of its own (Parhankangas and Colbourne 2022), differing from ethnic entrepreneurship which predominantly examines venturing among immigrants, major ethnic groups (Cooney 2021), and/or other disadvantaged segments of the population (Pidduck and Clark 2021). Indigenous entrepreneurship can be defined as a 'new economic enterprise, by and for the benefit of Indigenous people as a means of overcoming disadvantage through active participation in the global economy on a competitive business-based basis' (Hindle and Moroz 2010, 363). Indigenous entrepreneurship scholars have focused on the influence of Indigenous cultures, values, and traditions on the creation and growth of new business ventures (Persaud, Nelson, and Satterfield 2021). A recurring research theme has revolved around the alignment of resources—land, human, cultural, and financial—to meet multidimensional objectives (Murphy et al. 2020). These objectives are usually met through a long temporal perspective, deep territorial anchoring, and high organizational hybridity among Indigenous ventures (Baba and Fortin-Lefebvre 2021). Overall, entrepreneurship scholars have pressed for a deeper understanding of Indigenous venturing as a catalyst for reducing the poverty gaps and for bettering the living conditions among Indigenous entrepreneurs, their communities, and ancestral lands worldwide (Colbourne and Anderson 2020).

Motivation and theoretical gaps

Most entrepreneurship research relies on Western assumptions (Bruton et al. 2021), possibly foreign to non-Western perspectives (Muñoz and Kimmitt 2018). For instance, neoclassical assumptions representative of first-world economies (e.g., rational agency,

utility functions representing individual preferences, profit maximization, future orientation, etc.) (De Witt et al. 2016; Lévesque and Stephan 2020) shape current discourses, portraying successful entrepreneurs as Schumpeterian superheroes (Brattström and Wennberg 2021). These hegemonic views are taught in most business schools and underlie most top research journals (Baker and Welter 2020). However, within Indigenous entrepreneurship, these assumptions don't seem to hold. Indeed, in many cases, what drives Indigenous entrepreneurs are community, often land-based relational principles and tenets (Pio and Waddock 2021). Therefore, current understandings of entrepreneurship may be built out of constrained economic, social, and cultural assumptions, possibly foreign to Indigenous individuals (Peredo and McLean 2013). In this sense, exploring the contextual specificities in Indigenous entrepreneurship may challenge prevailing assumptions, putting into question the notion that entrepreneurship is primarily based on individualistic and instrumental relationships and interchanges.

Despite the combined efforts of numerous scholars and policymakers to promote entrepreneurship as a universal tool for self-development among Indigenous peoples, the lack of specificity has hindered the success of such initiatives so far (Salmon, Chavez, and Murphy 2021). Even though recent research has highlighted the impact of context on the emergence, growth, and decline of business ventures (Shirokova, Beliaeva, and Manolova 2022), context-sensitive comparisons in Indigenous entrepreneurship remain few and far between (Scheyvens et al. 2021). However, contexts matter as they influence the thoughts, emotions, and behaviours of entrepreneurs. In other words, contexts shape their mindsets (Daspit, Fox, and Findley 2021), identities (Radu-Lefebvre et al. 2021) and how entrepreneurs 'do contexts', that is, their agentic enactment of place (Muñoz, Kimmitt, and Spigel 2023). Hence, contextualizing Indigenous entrepreneurship should be relevant for

emphasizing differences (e.g., variations, idiosyncrasies, deviations, outliers) in meanings, patterns, and magnitudes (Berkes and Adhiraki 2006), and for questioning assumptions (Dana 1995). Accordingly, given the essential importance of studying entrepreneurship focusing on the contexts in which it happens, we may need to reassess what we think we know to gain a deeper understanding of the role context plays among Indigenous entrepreneurs and their ventures. Consequently, my doctoral thesis follows this line of inquiry.

Objectives and overview

To address my research objectives properly, I divided this dissertation into two articles. Essentially, each article contributes a unique perspective, providing a better understanding of how the material and socially constructed nature of context interplays with Indigenous entrepreneurship. Taken together, this collection of articles seeks to enrich our knowledge of the interplay between Indigenous venturing and the contexts in which it unfolds. Both articles are exploratory in nature and employ qualitative methods (consider suggestions for qualitative research on business topics in [Plakoyiannaki, Wei, and Prashantham 2019; Hlady-Rispal, Fayolle, and Gartner 2021]). Next below I briefly summarize each article.

Article 1. Indigenous entrepreneurship in place: towards a placed-based understanding of Indigenous venturing

Through an exploration of urban, remote, and rural Indigenous entrepreneurs from two Latin American countries (Diaz et al. 2022), my first article examines the role of place

in Indigenous venturing. Overall, places are spaces invested with meaning (Wright et al. 2022) that engender multiple contexts at a time (e.g., social, economic, cultural, environmental, etc.). Delving deep into some of these contexts, I provide an empirical typology of Indigenous entrepreneurs from different locations. Overall, remote Indigenous entrepreneurs create traditional ventures which are deeply socially and ecologically embedded, primarily focusing on the interrelationships with their communities and natural environments. In contrast, urban Indigenous entrepreneurs tend to venture out of self-interest, exhibiting a certain detachment from the places in which they live. Instead, rural Indigenous entrepreneurs find themselves navigating between contrasting Western and Indigenous influences and demands. In essence, the findings of this article emphasize entrepreneurship as a function of place, considering places as the material dimension of physical things and as the spatial expression of human experience. Based on this empirical evidence, I provide insights for a more detailed and contextualized understanding of Indigenous entrepreneurship phenomena. I also suggest future research studies to further explore entrepreneurship as a suitable alternative for poverty alleviation and for improving the lives of overlooked social actors.

Article 2. Embedded venturing in disembedded markets: Exploring the embedding process among migrant Indigenous entrepreneurs

Although embeddedness helps to understand how entrepreneurs build ties in new contexts, we lack a clear understanding of their embedding within significantly different new contexts. Such is the case of Indigenous entrepreneurs migrating from rural lands into urban areas. Generally, business activities within urban areas exhibit a disconnection from

community and nature and are mostly driven by market-based assumptions. Hence, migrant Indigenous entrepreneurs might face conflicting Western and Indigenous logics they need to overcome, potentially preventing them from adapting to urban settings. On the one hand, Indigenous entrepreneurs may struggle to embrace the dominant culture. Adding to this concern, modern institutions and market agents may favour Western for-profit ventures over traditional Indigenous ones. Therefore, in this article, I approached a diverse group of recently migrated Mapuche entrepreneurs, the largest Indigenous group in Chile (de la Maza 2016). My findings reveal that Mapuche entrepreneurs engage in distinct prosocial and sustainable ventures, bringing their context-laden traditions, beliefs, and values to the wider society through their businesses. By bringing elements from their native settlements with them, their home contexts allow them to embed themselves within urban locations, capitalizing on several business opportunities in the process. With this project, I contribute to a multi-contextual understanding of embeddedness, by explaining how entrepreneurs integrate different contextual influences from their past to overcome current challenges and successfully adapt to the contexts of their present.

ARTICLE 1. INDIGENOUS ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN PLACE: TOWARDS A PLACED-BASED UNDERSTANDING OF INDIGENOUS VENTURING[1]

[1] A previous version of this article was awarded by the International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation as the best paper in the 'Conference on Engaged Scholarship for the Future of Entrepreneurship', celebrated at the University of Leeds, UK, in January 2023.

Indigenous entrepreneurship in place: towards a placed-based understanding of Indigenous venturing

Abstract

Our understanding of 'everyday entrepreneurship' has often been obscured by theoretical approaches that overlook the bond between people and places. For example, the multiplicity and heterogeneity of Indigenous entrepreneurs from different places remain largely under-studied. To address this concern, we explore the unfolding dynamics of Indigenous venturing in the specific places it comes into being. Concretely, we study urban, remote, and rural Indigenous entrepreneurs from Latin America. Our findings highlight entrepreneurship as a function of place, considering both the 'material' and 'socially constructed' nature of place. Overall, remote Indigenous entrepreneurs create traditional ventures which are deeply socially and ecologically embedded, primarily focusing on the interrelationships with their communities and natural environments. Instead, urban Indigenous entrepreneurs often venture according to Western perspectives, out of self-interest and somewhat detached from their places. Finally, rural Indigenous entrepreneurs operate between their remote and urban counterparts, having to manage contradicting Western and Indigenous demands. In sum, entrepreneurship at large (Indigenous or otherwise) is an eminently place-based endeavour as it collates in a specific time and space, leading to the emergence of context-laden and highly idiosyncratic business practices. Based on our empirical evidence, we provide insights for a more nuanced and contextualized understanding of entrepreneurship phenomena.

Keywords: Indigenous entrepreneurship; Place; Context; Latin America.

Introduction

Entrepreneurship does not happen in a vacuum. On the contrary, it happens in place and, thus, understanding entrepreneurship implies focusing on such places. Importantly, places are more than mere locations or geographical spots where entrepreneurship occurs. Places are also 'landscapes of meaning' that inform the social reality entrepreneurs face (Redhead and Bika 2022), bringing forth 'a sense of belonging, purpose and identity' (Kelly and Nicholson 2022, 142). This holds especially true for Indigenous entrepreneurs, who have a deep physical, emotional, and spiritual connection to their ancestral lands (Banerjee and Arjaliès 2021).

Despite the great development of Indigenous entrepreneurship as a research field in recent years, scholars have often neglected the interplay between Indigenous venturing and the specific places in which it happens. For instance, Indigenous entrepreneurs are becoming increasingly urban worldwide, migrating from their traditional lands into metropolitan areas in search of better opportunities and job prospects. In these new places, they might face new challenges and concerns, which could potentially jeopardize their traditional ways of being, knowing, and doing (Becerra et al. 2018). Nevertheless, there exists a paucity of studies between different places to test the validity of existing assumptions (Padilla-Meléndez et al. 2022). This glaring omission in the literature has led to the pursuit of 'one-size-fits-all' research and policy initiatives, with lacking degrees of success. However, places matter as they determine the political and economic conditions in which Indigenous entrepreneurs operate, the degree of government support, their connection to the global economy (Macpherson et al. 2021), and the social constraints with which they struggle, among other influences and specificities (Persaud, Nelson, and Satterfield 2021). These influences may

prove to be quite different among urban, rural, and remote Indigenous entrepreneurs. Therefore, places are essential for researching Indigenous entrepreneurs: first, for the development of public programs better tailored to suit their local needs, and second, for gaining fine-grained empirical insights into the creation, growth, and decline of their ventures.

From such a starting point, we answer the twofold call of Padilla-Meléndez et al. (2022) to conduct Indigenous entrepreneurship research both cross-country and across urban, rural, and remote locations. Specifically, we seek to explore Indigenous entrepreneurship in place avoiding imposing our overarching imageries, common knowledge, and preconceptions over them. Our guiding exploratory research question is: How does place distinctly matter for Indigenous entrepreneurs? To answer this question, we engaged with a diverse group of twenty-three urban, remote, and rural Indigenous entrepreneurs from Chile and Colombia. Although they belong to different ethnic groups, they all share a deep attachment to their ancestral lands. Our conversations with them focused on the relationship between their ventures and places, emphasizing both the 'material' and the 'socially constructed' nature of such places. This allowed us to observe 'invisible' facets of entrepreneurship in place, sometimes 'hidden' from our current theoretical perspectives. We used the 'Indigenous entrepreneurship model framework' as a guidance (Croce 2017), to generate a structured picture of entrepreneurs based on their localization. Accordingly, all data were allocated into three categories: urban, remote, and rural, followed by a detailed analysis searching for relationships within the data grouped under each of these categories. Given that places engender multiple contexts at a time (Muñoz, Kimmitt, and Spigel 2023),

we focused on five multi-level contextual dimensions, spanning temporal, social, environmental, economic, and cultural contexts.

Understanding 'place' as the geographical location plus the social practices attached to such location (Wright et al. 2022), we found Indigenous entrepreneurship to be heavily contingent on place. As expected, our findings ranged from traditional-based ventures with a strong sense of belonging to place (in the case of remote Indigenous entrepreneurs) to modern-based ventures somewhat disembedded from place (in the case of urban Indigenous entrepreneurs). Regarding rural Indigenous entrepreneurs, we found they often faced conflicting Western and Indigenous demands, largely shaped by the polycontextual nature of their places and their swift transformation into urban settings. Based on this evidence, we present an empirical typology of five contextual dimensions across entrepreneurs from three distinct locations. By providing a multi-context perspective of entrepreneurship in place, we help to push the place approach to entrepreneurship forward by highlighting both the 'objective' and 'subjective' nature of place (Welter, Baker, and Wirsching 2019). In this sense, we argue that the interaction between entrepreneurship and place should be accounted for as essential for sensitizing our theorization and setting the boundaries of its generalizability across different backgrounds and groups of people (Shirokova, Beliaeva, and Manolova 2022).

We structure this article as follows. First, we overview entrepreneurship in place and Indigenous venturing to set the theoretical framework upon which a set of interviews with Indigenous entrepreneurs are conducted. Then, we carefully present our context of study, methods design, and main findings. Next, we make sense of such findings to elaborate on

new and insightful research topics on Indigenous entrepreneurship at the interface with place. Finally, we reflect on the main limitations of our project.

Theoretical framework

Reflecting on place in entrepreneurship

'Entrepreneurship means different things to different people at different times and in different places and both its causes and its consequences likewise vary' (Baker and Welter 2020, i). Overall, entrepreneurship emerges in specific places in a myriad of manifestations and forms. Such places play a key role in understanding what is happening in entrepreneurship, as they shed 'new light onto seemingly well-known entrepreneurship phenomena' (Welter, Baker, and Wirsching 2019, 321). Therefore, as entrepreneurship emerges from the interaction between individuals and their places, making sense of entrepreneurship requires that we contextualize it, that is, explain it in place (Gaddefors and Anderson 2019).

Likewise, as explanations of social phenomena are context-bound, places serve as boundary conditions for our theories. Hence, contextualizing our research can be useful for problematizing existing knowledge and for filling entrepreneurship with practical and real-life meaning, 'in ways that challenge assumptions of mainstream research' (Baker and Welter 2020, 119). Overall, contextualizing entrepreneurship research holds great potential for exploring a plurality of practices, experiences, and meanings, and for revisiting old assumptions and shedding new light on current theories and models. Moreover, contextualizing our theories can 'challenge the adequacy of simple, it can challenge beliefs about accuracy, and can throw into stark relief the limits of our claims to generality' (Baker

and Welter 2020, 75), compelling us to seek fine-grained empirical answers. Plain and simple, places allow us to improve entrepreneurship research and the inferential value of our findings.

Notwithstanding, despite the central importance of place in explaining entrepreneurship, theory about place effects on entrepreneurship and vice versa is still underdeveloped (Shepherd et al. 2019). Indeed, a functionalist view of entrepreneurship as an economic function has limited our understanding of entrepreneurship in place, namely, its emergence in a specific economic, ecological, and socio-cultural space. Arguably, such functionalist views 'explain' rather than 'understand' entrepreneurship, prioritizing isolated outcomes at the expense of 'contextualized' understanding (Cunningham and Fraser 2022). Unfortunately, such views have become quite hegemonic, downplaying the broader subjectivities, contingencies, social interplay and, overall, complex, and multi-layered conditions from which 'everyday entrepreneurship' really emerges. Given this, we seek to contribute with context-based research at large, improving our 'theoretical understanding of place in entrepreneurship' (Welter and Baker 2021, 1).

Indigenous entrepreneurship in place

Most entrepreneurship research relies on Western assumptions, representative of first-world societies. Being entrepreneurship highly dependent on cultural backgrounds and place, such perspectives might not make much sense (or no sense at all) to people from the 'margins' or the 'others', namely, those living at the 'periphery' of the developed modern world (Muñoz and Kimmitt 2018). In this regard, one segment worth our attention is Indigenous peoples. Overall, there are around 476 million Indigenous peoples spread across 90 countries and

comprising over 5,000 cultures. Even though they account for less than 5% of the world's population and are part of the poorest 15%, they occupy 20% of the land surface of the planet, which contains 80% of its biodiversity (Colbourne and Anderson 2020). Because of this, they are regarded as the stewards and guardians of the Earth (Berkes 2018).

In line with the above, one common aspect among several Indigenous groups is their strong attachment to their ancestral lands. This connection to the land implies more than just geographic proximity. It also implies fostering deep 'interconnections, interrelationships, and interdependencies' between Indigenous communities, their natural landscapes, and spiritual ancestors (Banerjee and Arjaliès 2021). Despite this, Indigenous entrepreneurship has often been approached as a homogenous phenomenon across different places and groups of people. Facing this concern, Croce (2017) proposed a 'contextualized Indigenous entrepreneurship framework'. Based on their geographical localization, she distinguished between urban, remote, and rural Indigenous entrepreneurs. Generally, urban Indigenous entrepreneurs remain underrepresented or regarded as immigrant entrepreneurs. They carry out their ventures within dominant market-based models. As a result, they struggle to accommodate their cultural paradigm with Western cultural ones. In several such cases, they need to trade off their traditional way of living with place-specific (and often antithetical) demands (Persaud, Nelson, and Satterfield 2021). Instead, whereas urban Indigenous entrepreneurs are threatened by cultural assimilation and even hostility towards them, remoteness, due to its unique challenges (e.g., thin populations, lack of infrastructure, isolation from urban areas, etc.) often prevents remote Indigenous entrepreneurs from creating and growing new ventures altogether. In turn, and keeping in line with the mixed nature of the rurality, rural Indigenous entrepreneurs represent a middle ground between their urban and rural

counterparts. Commonly, they pursue both Western and Indigenous ends, facing several challenges and cultural tensions in the process.

Since places are endogenous in explaining entrepreneurship, and not mere background for which we simply 'control' (Chalmers and Shaw 2017), we are set to explore the interplay between urban, rural, and remote Indigenous entrepreneurs and their places, emphasizing both the 'objective' and 'subjective' nature of such places. Next below, we carefully describe our research approach, context of the study, empirical design, and the analytical steps we followed, to make the case as to why we effectively tackled our research question and objectives.

Methods

Research approach

Although the places we inhabit exist independent of our perceptions, places are also to some extent 'socially constructed.' In this sense, places emerge from social interactions in which individuals 'negotiate their socially constructed definitions of reality' (Johnson and Duberley 2003, 1290). In such a regard, places are embedded in personal experiences and shared understandings and, thus, there exist as many places as social actors perceiving them (Wright et al. 2022). Accordingly, places are not only out there, but also 'in there.' In other words, places are not only external, but they also emerge 'from within' individuals.

Despite the above, entrepreneurship research has often accounted for the 'exogenous' nature of place, dismissing the knowledgeability of social actors involved in the creation and enactment of such places (Chalmers and Shaw 2017). As a result, places have been mostly understood as the external circumstances, conditions, and environments that enable and/or

constrain entrepreneurial action. Unfortunately, this conceptualization is problematic since it posits places as a mere antecedent or boundary condition for entrepreneurship.

Since knowledge about social phenomena is eminently plural, precarious, and local, we aim to avoid the pitfalls of such misleading and reductionistic generalizations. Hence, we adopt a social constructionist stance, seeking to provide a 'better understanding of the lived experiences of entrepreneurs and how their interactions play out in context and place' (Van Burg et al. 2022, 46). In general terms, we see places as 'meaningful locations' (Cunningham and Fraser 2022), and research inquiry as the process of bringing such meanings together. Therefore, we aim to offer a contextualized account of entrepreneurship, seeking to understand 'the phenomenon from the perspective of those engaged in it' (Baker and Welter 2020, 169). We believe that such an approach could serve to contest and reframe grand narratives and taken-for-granted understandings (Brattström and Wennberg 2021), enriching some of our underlying theoretical and practical assumptions on Indigenous entrepreneurship.

Context of study

We conducted this research project on Indigenous peoples from Latin America. Particularly, several Latin American developing countries have become increasingly concerned about the welfare of their Indigenous communities given their high numbers (i.e., forty-one million approximately among all such countries) considering their overall populations (e.g., as much as 62,2% of the total Bolivian population self-identify as Indigenous). Most Latin American Indigenous inhabitants reside in highland regions and rural areas. Almost one million live in the Amazon region, one of the planet's largest and

most biodiverse locations, extending over sizeable areas of Brazil, Peru, and Colombia, among other countries. Even though some Indigenous entrepreneurs have succeeded at sustainable development and at galvanizing their struggles through venturing, and despite some public programmes oriented in such a direction, participation of Latin American Indigenous peoples in entrepreneurship is still lacking (Macpherson et al. 2021).

For this project, all Indigenous entrepreneurs were from Chile and Colombia. All Chilean participants were Mapuche. Colombian participants, on the other hand, were from different ethnicities, including, Ticuna and Kokama among others. In broad terms, Mapuches are a heterogeneous group of Indigenous inhabitants from South-Central Chile. A small portion also lives in certain regions of southwestern Argentina and some locations of Patagonia. Mapuches represent almost 80% of the total number of Indigenous inhabitants in Chile (i.e., approximately 12.8% of the overall Chilean population) (INE 2018). While most Mapuches live in large cities and are much used to Western views of business, their relationship with the Chilean State and corporate groups has been problematic, even violent, over the centuries (Maher et al. 2023). Although some policies have helped the Mapuches to develop, these initiatives have also established new bonds of dependence and control by the Chilean State and market agents over them. In such a regard, policies supporting entrepreneurship that have not taken into account Mapuche heritage and cultural understandings have prompted Mapuche traditions to lose ground against Western influences and practices (Daher, Jaramillo, and Rosati 2020). In recent decades, a large portion of Mapuches have migrated from rural to metropolitan locations in search of better jobs and wealth prospects. As a result, the vast majority of Mapuches currently live in Santiago de Chile, the main and largest Chilean city.

For their part, several Colombian Amazon tribes inhabit remote protected areas, subsisting based on hunting, fishing, and farming. Most of these groups are highly egalitarian and without a remarked social stratification. Although the Colombian State has forced them to transition from a semi-nomadic into an agricultural sedentary lifestyle, in many ways they still subsist according to their old traditions and customs. For example, they grow 'yucca'[1] in 'chacras'[2] located in places with great biodiversity; they inhabit household 'malocas'[3]; they rely on a strong barter-based economy; and many of them still speak their first languages. In short, they organize in traditional ways that reflect their communal and relational hunter-gatherer lifestyles (Morales et al. 2021). Over the last couple of years, many of these groups have become strategic partners for wildlife conservation with non-Indigenous agencies. In this sense, 'Traditional Ecological Knowledge' has been key to conserving numerous mammal-endangered species (Berkes 2018). In addition, they have started community-based tourism ventures, integrating sustainable development with cultural preservation. In doing so, they have been willing to trade off some aspects of their traditional lifestyles for income security. All in all, such initiatives have helped several Amazon Indigenous groups secure their food sovereignty, cultural heritage, and overall well-being.

Finally, rural, and urban Colombian Indigenous entrepreneurs are somewhat used to Western-based businesses. Nevertheless, in many cases, given the geographical, institutional, economic, and infrastructural conditions of the Colombian territory (e.g., low access to financing, poor road connectivity, etc.), Colombian Indigenous peoples are often prevented from engaging and succeeding in venturing. Overall, we believe that having two highly different sub-groups -one much more isolated from modern influences (e.g., Amazon Indigenous entrepreneurs) and other predominantly mixed with Western populations (e.g.,

urban Mapuche entrepreneurs)- gives us the possibility to account for the great diversity among them.

Data collection

We approached 23 Chilean and Colombian urban, remote, and rural Indigenous entrepreneurs from different regions and fields. We conducted semi-structured interviews with all of them from mid-February to mid-May 2021. Specifically, eleven participants corresponded to Chilean Mapuche. Out of these, six were urban and five, rural. All Mapuche interviews were done by the author of this article, who is also a Chilean native. In turn, the remaining twelve interviews were conducted by a Colombian colleague with Colombian entrepreneurs from different ethnicities and backgrounds. Seven of these interviews were arranged with Ticuna, Kokama, Uitoto, and Cubeo entrepreneurs from the Amazon natural region. In addition, two interviews were conducted with Yanakuna entrepreneurs from the Cauca Department. Also, one interview was conducted with a Zenú entrepreneur from the Sucre Department. Additionally, a Kamëntsá entrepreneur from Bogotá, the capital and largest city of Colombia, was approached for an interview. Lastly, an Arhuaco entrepreneur from the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta (i.e., an isolated mountain range in the north of Colombia) was also reached for this study. In total, twelve participants were female and eleven were male.

Because of the COVID-19 sanitary restrictions we faced at the time, all Mapuche interviews took place through the Google Meet video communication platform. Instead, Colombian interviews were carried out through mobile phones, as the internet speed in their locations was minimal (even non-existent). In the specific case of the seven entrepreneurs

from the Amazon natural region, their interviews were especially hard to conduct, given the unstable mobile phone signal in their locations. These interviews had to be done at very specific schedules since there was only a glimpse of signal during a certain few hours of the day. For instance, one respondent had to climb a hill to catch some signal to resume our conversation. All interviews were conducted in Spanish, recorded, and transcribed verbatim. Their lengths ranged from 60 to 120 minutes long, averaging around one hundred minutes each. Ultimately, we came up with 2,200 minutes of recorded audio, equivalent to over 35 hours of recorded conversation. Some of the main features of our participants are summarized in Table 1.1. All personal data has been anonymized to secure their privacy and comply with our ethical procedures and standards. In this regard, we note that all participants signed a consent form. Overall, despite the communication barriers, and the many restrictions we faced (e.g., budgetary, time constraints, COVID-19), we believe to have gathered a rich group of entrepreneurs from two different countries and diverse locations and occupations.

Table 1.1. Primary Data Overview

Gender	Name	Country	Localization	Area	Ethnicity	Age	Occupation
Female	Matilde	Chile	Hualqui, Biobío	Rural	Mapuche	52	Manufacturer and seller of traditional plant-based care products
	Roberta	Chile	Angol, Araucanía	Rural	Mapuche	45	Poultry breeder, egg producer, and distributor
	Celeste	Chile	Hualqui, Biobío	Rural	Mapuche	41	Traditional jeweller
	Francisca	Chile	Angol, Araucanía	Rural	Mapuche	29	Traditional jeweller
	Ignacia	Chile	San Pedro de la Paz, Biobío	Urban	Mapuche	42	Traditional jeweller
	Cristina	Chile	Cañete, Biobío	Rural	Mapuche	63	Traditional tapestry weaver
	Johanna	Chile	San Pedro de la Paz, Biobío	Urban	Mapuche	65	Traditional tapestry weaver
	Estela	Chile	San Pedro de la Paz, Biobío	Urban	Mapuche	37	Independent cook
	Carolina	Chile	San Pedro de la Paz, Biobío	Urban	Mapuche	30	Energy subcontractor
	Blanca	Chile	San Pedro de la Paz, Biobío	Urban	Mapuche	32	Pastries and baking cook
	Betty	Colombia	La Montañita, Caquetá	Rural	Uitoto	49	Local Indigenous leader and policymaker
	Clarita	Colombia	Leticia, Amazonas	Remote	Ticuna	50	Heritage interpreter
Male	Andrés	Chile	Concepción, Biobío	Urban	Mapuche	38	Cybersecurity venture founder

Rogelio	Colombia	Popayán, Cauca	Urban	Yanakuna	34	Indigenous-based ecotourism entrepreneur
Pedro	Colombia	Bogotá, Cundinamarca	Urban	Kamëntsá	44	Production and commercialization of coca leaf-based products
Jonás	Colombia	Argelia, Cauca	Rural	Yanakuna	49	Cultural rescue and preservation coordinator
Cristián	Colombia	San Antonio de Palmito, Sucre	Rural	Zenú	39	Vegetal fibre craftsman
Felipe	Colombia	Puerto Nariño, Amazonas	Remote	Ticuna	46	Tourist guide
Antonio	Colombia	Leticia, Amazonas	Remote	Kokama	48	Tourist guide
Roberto	Colombia	Leticia, Amazonas	Remote	Kokama	53	Wildlife conservation centre manager
Ignacio	Colombia	Leticia, Amazonas	Remote	Ticuna	42	Amazon tourism promoter
Orlando	Colombia	Pueblo Bello, Cesar	Remote	Arhuaco	52	Organic coffee and cocoa farmer
Javier	Colombia	Carurú, Vaupés	Remote	Cubeo	54	Cassava farmer, fisher, and hunter

Data analysis

Once we manually transcribed all conversations, we categorized them according to their commune of residence (in the case of Chile) and municipality (in the case of Colombia) as they both constitute the smallest administrative subdivisions for their respective countries. Focusing on communes and municipalities allowed us to capture the social, spatial, and economic undergoing processes within clearly defined geographical boundaries. Our understanding of rurality is in line with the Chilean Planning Office ODEPA for the National Policy for Rural Development[4], which defines rural territories as those 'enabled by the dynamic interrelation between people, economic activities and natural resources, mainly characterized by a low population density (<150 hab./km2), with a maximum population of 50,000 inhabitants and whose basic unit of organization and reference is the commune' (Muñoz and Kimmitt 2019, 10). We made that same definition extensible to Colombian municipalities. Therefore, entrepreneurs from communes or municipalities with such figures were classified as rural. In turn, entrepreneurs from communes or municipalities above 50,000 inhabitants and population densities higher than 150 hab./km2 were considered urban. Finally, entrepreneurs from communes or municipalities with extremely low population densities (<10 hab./km2) and fewer than 50,000 inhabitants were classified as remote.

After the foregoing, we sought to understand how participants articulated their meaning from the milieu. Although every Indigenous group (or individuals within such groups for that matter) is different from one another, we wanted to find regularities and common patterns among them. Thus, we looked for key patterns and themes using thematic analysis. For this purpose, all relevant transcripts were first coded using 'open coding' techniques to identify segments with potential significance. This process resulted in the codification of 253 fragments of text. Afterwards, every incident was compared with each other to group them according to their similarity. This led to the emergence of forty initial categories. A continuing and iterative process of data analysis and literature review informed several adjustments to our initial categorization to provide theoretical support and further refinement of our grouping. At last, we ended up identifying five contextual dimensions for analysis (i.e., temporal, social, environmental, economic, and cultural). In what follows, all five dimensions are covered in detail, making distinctions between urban, remote, and rural Indigenous entrepreneurs, with solid evidence (in the form of quotes and excerpts) supporting our claims.

Findings

We grouped the following subsections according to our five contextual dimensions for analysis. Each dimension allowed us to explore more in-depth the interaction between Indigenous entrepreneurs and their places. As contextual dimensions often overlap (i.e., 'contexts-within-contexts'), clear-cut distinctions between them were too simplistic and, thus, futile to intend. Moreover, as narratives among participants mix facts (sometimes limited, even contradictory) with value-laden interpretations, we do not claim nor seek

generalizability of our findings. Instead, we seek to understand entrepreneurship in place, where entrepreneurs make sense of the places in which they operate and where both entrepreneurship and its places shape and reshape each other recursively all the same.

Temporal context

Regarding their temporal orientation, remote Indigenous entrepreneurs' involvement is primarily with their past. They value their old traditions and customs, looking to their history for shared knowledge, meaning, and capabilities. Primarily, they engage in entrepreneurship to keep their ancestors' way of life alive. For example, Felipe, an Amazon Ticuna tourist guide, comments: '*I venture from a knowledge that comes from my grandparents and my grandparents' grandparents.'* First and foremost, he aims to restore and promote Indigenous culture and values, as he expands later in the conversation: *'We venture to make our way of life and our vision known, based on sustainability and conservation so that people know what we do here and where do we come from.'*

Instead of retrieving their traditional ways, rural Indigenous entrepreneurs engage in entrepreneurship mainly out of necessity and lack of job prospects. In this regard, Cristina, a Chilean Mapuche tapestry weaving artisan from Cañete, accounts: *'There are no job opportunities here. Families have no way to survive if they don't come up with something to sustain themselves.'* Like Cristina, Cristián, a Zenú vegetal fibre craftsman from rural Colombia, also seeks to get ahead to provide for his family: *'I'd like to provide my children with everything they need. I have three mouths to feed.'* Mostly, rural Indigenous entrepreneurs seem eminently present-oriented as they focus on the now, seeking short-term

benefits to maintain their family welfare and to deal with ongoing contingencies and hardships.

On the other hand, urban Indigenous entrepreneurs engage in venturing to pursue self-development and achievement. For example, Andrés, a Mapuche cybersecurity entrepreneur from the city of Concepción, states: *'To be an entrepreneur is working hard to grow and develop yourself.'* Similarly, most of them seem self-driven and self-efficient, aiming to turn their business ideas into future benefits, as Carolina, a Mapuche independent energy subcontractor from near Concepción, claims: *'Entrepreneurship is taking advantage of business opportunities at the right time. It's having an idea and carrying it out. Turn it into something real so you can benefit later on.'* As such, we see urban Indigenous entrepreneurs navigate their temporal contexts by orienting to the future, as they are more forward-thinking, risk-taking, and prospective than their remote and rural counterparts.

Social context

Regarding their social orientation, remote Indigenous entrepreneurs look for community approval for engaging in entrepreneurship. In this sense, Ignacio, an Amazon Ticuna tourism promoter, explains: *'Being part of the bird clan is what makes me who I am and what I do. We are allowed to engage in tourism ventures but under the rules of the community.'* He further adds: *'Business is not only individual but collective. Here, the businesses belong to everyone (...) The community always comes first.'* Likewise, Orlando, an Arhuaco coffee and cocoa farmer from the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta, feels part of a community whole that is bigger than himself: *'We are one body, one purpose. Although we may have different thoughts, the underlying things are the same and, in that sense, we work*

towards the same. We are part of a community, not just sole persons.' In short, remote Indigenous entrepreneurs operate as collective economic agents, leaning mostly towards community-based ventures.

Meanwhile, rural Indigenous entrepreneurs rely on their family ties for venturing. For instance, Matilde, a Mapuche manufacturer and seller of care products from Hualqui, comments: *'I work with my whole family. Although I make the lotions, both my husband and sons have a saying about what I do and whom I sell.'* They often take part in extended families, as Cristina illustrates: *'My mother, who is ninety years old, myself, my children and grandchildren, and my sisters' children and grandchildren live all on the same farm. By staying close, we venture together and support each other in any way we can.'* Accordingly, rural Indigenous entrepreneurs build their social contexts by operating as household agents, leaning mostly towards family business types.

By contrast, urban Indigenous entrepreneurs rely mostly on themselves, as Andrés states: *'I'm the sole proprietor of this venture. I work alone as it fits who I am. I like making my own decisions without having to ask anyone. Whether I fail or succeed, it's up to me.'* As his words suggest, he values independence and autonomy, just like Rogelio, a Yanakuna ecotourism entrepreneur from Popayán comments: *'I decided to become an entrepreneur to have financial freedom, time flexibility and to do whatever I wanted to do.'* In the same line, he complements: *'I respect where I come from and I feel proud about my roots, but business has little to do with that. I do business primarily because of me, my interests, and the chances I was given in life.'* Therefore, urban Indigenous entrepreneurs operate as individual agents, gravitating, in most cases, towards self-employment.

Environmental context

Related to their connection with the natural environment, remote Indigenous entrepreneurs seek to conserve and preserve their ancestral lands. To illustrate this point, Antonio, a Kokama tourist guide from Amazonia, comments: *'We are not landowners, nor expansionists. We rather protect and prevent nature from having imbalances.'* Arguably, they feel as one with nature, like Javier, a Cubeo farmer, fisher, and hunter from the tropical rainforest, explains: *'We are linked to our Mother Earth. Our reason for being is the water, the air, the wind, the fire, the sacred plants, and the knowledge that comes from the ancestral (...) They remind us of where we come from.'* Overall, remote Indigenous entrepreneurs believe their ancestral lands require ongoing maintenance to ensure the prosperity of themselves and future generations. Given so, they bond to their ecological contexts through a series of spiritual, cultural, and social practices.

In the meantime, rural Indigenous entrepreneurs feel a strong connection with their family lands. As a result, they seek to protect and preserve them. For instance, Celeste, a Mapuche traditional jeweller from next to Biobío River[5], recalls: *'This farm belonged to our grandparents. Unfortunately, tourists throw their garbage everywhere. So, every morning we pick it up. We even take a boat out to the river to pick up floating garbage. We want these landscapes to remain clean.'* Moreover, they relate with nature, by living and acting attentively to their surroundings. In this regard, Cristián reflects: *'We don't practice cults and ceremonies anymore. However, we're very attentive to the dates and cycles of the moon to do the sowing. When we ignore these old things we still believe in, the crops end up lost or plagued.'* In brief, rural Indigenous entrepreneurs engage in complementary relationships with their natural environments, caring about discrete living entities and local organisms, and seeking mutual benefits for themselves, families, and lands.

On the other side of the coin, urban Indigenous entrepreneurs tend to focus on their immediate parties over their local environments. For example, Blanca, a Mapuche pastries and baking cook from South-Central Chile recognizes: *'The only thing I look up to are my clients and suppliers. Unluckily, I don't have the time nor the energy for anything else.'* Besides, they report living and working isolated from their surroundings, as she further expands: *'I'm indoors cooking all day long. I only leave home to make deliveries (...) There are times when I spend full days without leaving the kitchen.'* For her part, Johanna, a traditional Mapuche tapestry weaver from the same commune as Blanca, reports feeling detached from nature during most of her work time: *'I only see green when I go to the countryside to visit my relatives. Where I work now, there is only grey and concrete.'* In sum, urban Indigenous entrepreneurs seem to venture somewhat disembodied from their natural environments.

Economic context

Concerning their economic orientation and intended results, remote Indigenous entrepreneurs aim to reach for social, ecological, and spiritual balance. In this sense, Roberto, a Kokama wildlife conservation manager from Amazonia, states: *'For me and my people well-being is having good health, belonging to the community and being in harmony with our territory. Because that is what we have been taught, that's what the gods want, and that's what we should do.'* Complementing this idea, Clarita, an Amazon Ticuna heritage interpreter, explains: *'Venturing must be inward, towards oneself. You can have many companies, but if you don't have your internal company organized and balanced, which is yourself and your family, you are not doing anything worthy.'* In addition, remote Indigenous

entrepreneurs seek to maintain intercultural relations for the sake of self, others, and nature, as Felipe claims: *'We like to collaborate and teach others our way of life and how we take care of nature. We also like to learn from everyone from abroad, because you also have interesting things that are often new to us.'* In general terms, remote Indigenous entrepreneurs seek balanced outcomes that address multiple human, ecological, and spiritual ends.

Rural Indigenous entrepreneurs, instead, seek themselves, their families, and lands to be well each day. In this regard, Jonás, a Yanakuna cultural rescue and preservation coordinator from the town of Argelia, explains: *'It's essential you have health and food for yourself and your family. As long as you have what you need to survive daily, you're fine. You don't need anything else.'* In the same vein, Roberta, a Mapuche poultry breeder and egg trader, seeks household income security: *'Economic sustenance is what I'm looking for. That's why I'd like to give stability and financial security to my children (...) Having my own house, paying for a good school, and saving for any emergency that may arise.'* Overall, rural Indigenous entrepreneurs aim to do the right thing each time, expecting that it will lead themselves and their families to do sufficiently well.

In the case of urban Indigenous entrepreneurs, they seek self-fulfilment, as Ignacia, a traditional Mapuche jeweller from San Pedro de la Paz, states: *'I venture because it's what I like. Mapuche jewellery is what really satisfies me. Besides, it allows me to earn more money than I would do working as a sales clerk.'* Such is also the case of Estela, a Mapuche independent cook from the same commune: *'I don't mind about other people's backgrounds. Whether they are White, Black, or Chinese, I don't care. I'm here to sell my products and earn some bucks. Me being Mapuche shouldn't be relevant for anyone else either.'* Furthermore, it would seem that the main reason for venturing is to grow their profits, as Carolina argues: *'I'll be honest: I do this for the money. I've got lots of bills to pay. I want to grow my business*

to earn more (...) We all compete for the same. Nowadays you can't do anything without money.' Ultimately, urban Indigenous entrepreneurs aim to be better with each passing day, mainly out of self-interest and willingness to maximize their personal gains.

Cultural context

Regarding our last category for analysis, our findings reveal the cultural challenges and contextual constraints Indigenous entrepreneurs face. Such challenges differently shape the nature of opportunities they create and/or exploit. For example, remote Indigenous entrepreneurs feel threatened by geographical isolation and material scarcity. As a token of such struggles, Ignacio illustrates: *'You only get here by plane, but we've been closed for a month due to COVID and there're no plans to reopen. It's possible to arrive by the river, but that route's rough since it takes 30 days from Putumayo*[6]*.'* He then goes into further detail about their day-to-day difficulties: '*Communication around here is exceedingly difficult as there's barely satellite coverage for phone calls. We also have no resources for the roofs of our houses, and we lack fuel for cutting wood, among other things.'* Along with the above, they sense looming modernization threats, like Clarita dramatically comments: *'We live in the border area between Brazil and Peru and that's not good because there're extractive companies from those places getting closer to our lands, exploiting, and destroying everything in their way. What'll happen when they finally get here?'*

Rural Indigenous entrepreneurs instead, face growing pressures to migrate to larger towns. As a fitting example of this, Betty, a Uitoto social leader from La Montañita, regrets: *'It's becoming harder to plant our lands. Fields have been forgotten because many have left. It's not easy to obtain food from our lands anymore. We've got to compete with technologies*

and pesticides that've put our agricultural practices at risk.' Overall, the longer rural Indigenous entrepreneurs have lived in their family fields, the more rooted they feel and the greater their sense of belonging. Therefore, the harder it becomes to migrate to the city. Along with this concern, they sense an ongoing Westernization process. For instance, Francisca, a Mapuche jeweller from Angol, candidly admits: *'We have our language, Mapudungun, but there are few who still speak it, it's disappearing. I don't know anyone who speaks it. Although, I'd like to learn it someday. However, as Mapuche, we need a roof over our heads first.'*

Meanwhile, urban Indigenous entrepreneurs claim a lack of support from Western institutions. In this sense, Pedro, a Kamëntsá producer and trader of coca leaf-based products from Bogotá, bitterly complains: *'Our initiative pays taxes. We also comply with the law. However, the government doesn't support us. All they do is make demands and bury us in bureaucracy. That's discrimination! They should be more concerned with helping Indigenous peoples to succeed.'* Moreover, they feel removed from Indigenous life by and large, as Estela recognizes: *'I haven't had any close contact with Mapuche culture. Also, don't ask me if I have been in any Indigenous group because the answer is no. With the hustle and bustle of every day, I wouldn't have time for that.'* Bottom line, whereas remote Indigenous entrepreneurs persist based on their endangered customs and traditions, rural Indigenous entrepreneurs experience growing pressures to migrate to larger towns, risking leaving their families and lands. Differently, urban Indigenous entrepreneurs detach from their roots and fit into modernity to economically succeed, moving on from their Indigenous communities and closely assimilating to Western lifestyles but feeling rejected and marginalized by the broader society in several such cases.

Discussion

Towards a place-based understanding of Indigenous entrepreneurship

The central importance of place in entrepreneurship cannot be overstated. Along with the 'material' nature of place (e.g., economic resources, market conditions, technological landscape, etc.), places also produce a 'local ontology' or 'moral space' of what is considered acceptable practices by locally embedded social actors (e.g., rites, imageries, uses, social conventions, memories, etc.) (Cunningham and Fraser 2022). As a result, places lead to the emergence of highly synthetic and context-sensitive entrepreneurial manifestations. In other words, a local sense of place informs what entrepreneurship is and/or should be, enabling or constraining its emergence within its boundaries (Anderson, Warren, and Bensemann 2019).

In line with the above-mentioned, our findings highlight entrepreneurship as a function of place, considering both the 'objective' and 'subjective' nature of place. Particularly, we have shown remote Indigenous entrepreneurs leaning towards social venture types given their collectivistic tenets. Overall, their interactions with their natural environments are based on direct personal experience. They feel like one with place, emphasizing multidimensional ecological ends. Moreover, they seek balanced outcomes, and their preferences are frugal and conservationist. Furthermore, they survive by relying on their local resources, communities, and endangered traditions, which could negatively contribute to 'over-embeddedness,' potentially preventing them from social enmeshment, broader and denser social networks, and new opportunities to economically succeed. On the opposite, we have shown urban Indigenous entrepreneurs perceiving themselves as somewhat independently and separately relating to the places they inhabit. They mostly embrace modern worldviews (e.g., individualism; secularized views of nature; biotic and abiotic

factors as instrumental to human needs; etc.) (Banerjee and Arjaliès 2021). Moreover, they lean towards self-employment seeking to control the future by holding linear views of material success. Finally, they venture by disembedding from their ethnic roots. At last, we have shown rural Indigenous entrepreneurs operating somewhere between urban and remote Indigenous entrepreneurs. Often, they engage within and between places by selectively coupling the new with the old, seeking to meet their basic needs through family business venture types (Murphy et al. 2020). Unfortunately, in many of these cases, they face cultural tensions trading off their ancestral traditions with modern-based Western influences and demands.

In summarizing, our typological developments (which we present in Table 1.2) help to explain why remote Indigenous entrepreneurs, especially those from the Amazonia, share a stronger attachment to the land than most Mapuche or even Colombians from urban locations. Indeed, Amazon participants share many similarities with other Indigenous communities from the Ecuadorian, Brazilian, Peruvian, Bolivian, and Venezuelan Amazon rainforests (Gambon and Rist 2019). Mapuches instead, although numerous and collectively strong, are located exclusively in Chile and Argentina. Overall, by living at the tip of the Southern Cone, isolated from other Indigenous groups, and surrounded by large metropolitan areas, their behaviours and ways of thinking are much more like modern perspectives. Despite the contextual challenges they often face, most of them seem quite mixed and integrated with Western lifestyles, which are typically found in urban environments such as theirs.

Table 1.2. Typological developments

	Remote Indigenous entrepreneurs	Rural Indigenous entrepreneurs	Urban Indigenous entrepreneurs
Temporal context	***Past-oriented:*** Engaging in entrepreneurship to preserve Indigenous roots Aiming to restore cultural integrity and identity	***Present-oriented:*** Engaging in entrepreneurship to address ongoing needs Aiming to get ahead to provide for the family	***Future-oriented:*** Engaging in entrepreneurship for personal development and prosperity Aiming to set ideas in motion to harvest the fruits of their labours in the future
Social context	***Community-based (community venturing):*** Depending and relying on the entire community Feeling part of a community whole bigger than oneself	***Family-based (family business types):*** Depending and relying on kinship ties Feeling part of an extended family	***Individual-based (self-employment):*** Depending and relying on oneself Feeling independent and autonomous from others
Environmental context	***Interconnectedness:*** Focusing on conserving and preserving ecosystems and biodiversity Being one with nature	***Complementarity:*** Focusing on protecting and bonding with family lands Being and doing within nature	***Separateness:*** Focusing on closest stakeholders and interested parties Being and doing somewhat detached from the milieu
Economic context	***To be in harmony:*** Reaching social, ecological, and spiritual balance Achieving well-being for self, others, and nature	***To be well:*** Reaching family welfare and local prosperity Achieving household income security	***To be better:*** Reaching personal fulfilment Achieving wealth and profitability
Cultural context	***Subsisting based on an endangered way of life:*** Experiencing isolation and scarcity Sensing looming modernization threats (ecological and cultural loss)	***Experimenting polycontextual tensions and demands:*** Experiencing growing pressures for migrating to the city Sensing increasing cultural assimilation	***Facing social exclusion:*** Experiencing a lack of support from Western institutions and the broader society Sensing removed from Indigenous life by and large

Contributions, limitations, and avenues for future research

By exploring the impact of place among Indigenous entrepreneurs, we contribute with an empirical typology of five contextual dimensions across three groups of entrepreneurs from different locations. Our typology shows Indigenous entrepreneurs being closely intertwined with the specific geographical and socio-cultural spaces in which they are grounded (Müller and Korsgaard 2018). Hence, since entrepreneurship implies connecting and relating within and between contexts (Gaddefors and Anderson 2019), our project provides a deeper understanding of Indigenous entrepreneurship in place. Unfortunately, one

major shortcoming of most mainstream research is that it often fails to consider the spatial and socio-cultural dimensions within which entrepreneurs are embedded. For instance, up to this point, we know little about how an Indigenous entrepreneur in a Westernized setting engages and, in turn, is affected by such a setting (Padilla-Meléndez et al. 2022). To address this concern, we make the case for a place-based research approach to capture the contextualized and highly subjective nature of Indigenous entrepreneurship across different places and groups of people.

We also contribute by advancing the learnings of historically marginalized groups. Specifically, we argue that studying minority entrepreneurs holds great potential for understanding their opportunities and drawbacks between different places (Cooney 2021). Particularly, while we have shown that urban Indigenous entrepreneurs may become acculturated, remote Indigenous entrepreneurs may suffer from various forms of material deprivation. In turn, rural Indigenous entrepreneurs might experience economic pressures to migrate to larger towns, leaving their family lands, and facing growing cultural tensions in the process. Arguably, such challenges may differently hinder Indigenous individuals' drive to engage and succeed at venturing. Therefore, based on the evidence we managed to collect, we stress the need to engage more closely with the places in which minority entrepreneurs operate to increase the social benefits and reduce the poverty gaps that afflict them (Peredo 2023). In this regard, we believe that alternative ontological and epistemological approaches could broaden our understanding of intercultural and inter-group variation among entrepreneurs and how such differences shape their business ventures (Welter and Baker 2021). Such a perspective could help us increase the validity of our interpretations and identify new opportunities for ‘decolonizing’ our research (Hamann et al. 2020; Woods, Dell, and Carroll 2021; Smith 2020; Schneider and Kayseas 2018). In the same vein, and from a

practical standpoint, we believe that interventions aimed at supporting 'transitional' entrepreneurs should encourage culturally sensitive access to entrepreneurship with a consistent philosophical approach to entrepreneurs' values and identities (Pidduck and Clark 2021).

As with any other human endeavour, this project is not without its limitations. First, we conducted all interviews through digital devices, which meant losing important observational data for an exploratory study of this nature. Thus, related future studies could follow an ethnographic design to get a more detailed picture of Indigenous venturing. Second, given that we only collaborated with Indigenous entrepreneurs from Latin America, our theoretical and practical contributions might not be extensible to other ethnicities or regions (Villalba-Eguiluz and Etxano 2017). Either way, bigger and more diverse groups of participants could help increase the accuracy and validity of our interpretations. Third, although we referred to the reciprocal link between place and entrepreneurship, we did not cover in detail the underlying mechanisms enabling such a two-way relationship. Hence, future studies could integrate 'top-down' effects of place on venturing, as place-specific influences impact the emergence, orientation, and outcomes of entrepreneurship. Likewise, future studies should also integrate 'bottom-up' processes of venturing changing places, as entrepreneurs differently impact the contextual dimensions (or 'configurational spaces') with which they relate (Welter 2011). Such an approach would certainly contribute to a better understanding of the dynamic and multilevel interrelationship between entrepreneurship and place. Finally, this project presented a static snapshot of entrepreneurship, based on cross-case rather than longitudinal analysis. However, entrepreneurship may very well dynamically unfold in different paths and directions. Furthermore, given that places are intersectional, entrepreneurs may engage with various places throughout their journeys, being embedded in

one or more at different points in time (Alshareef 2022). Therefore, related future studies of the intertemporal trajectories of urban, remote, and rural Indigenous entrepreneurs may complement our work by shedding new light on their journeys and how they dynamically evolve.

Conclusion

Places matter for entrepreneurship. They are an inherent part of entrepreneurship and not the backdrop in which entrepreneurship simply occurs. As entrepreneurship is intimately tied and inextricably linked with its immediate places, the interplay between venturing and place should demand our scholarly attention. In this study, we have explored Indigenous entrepreneurship as a function of place, contributing to context-sensitive research at large. Overall, given how little we still know about entrepreneurship in place (Indigenous or otherwise), we argue that more place-based research is needed. We hope this work is a promising step forward in that direction.

Interest statement

The author reports there are no competing interests to declare.

Notes

[1] South American plant. One of the major sources of food carbohydrates in the tropics.

[2] Traditional farms located on communal agricultural lands.

[3] Longhouses inhabited by Indigenous people from the Amazon.

[4] Política Nacional de Desarrollo Rural 2014–2024. ODEPA Gobierno de Chile. www.odepa.gob.cl/.

[5] Second largest Chilean river.

[6] Department of Southern Colombia.

ARTICLE 2. EMBEDDED VENTURING IN DISEMBEDDED MARKETS: EXPLORING THE EMBEDDING PROCESS AMONG MIGRANT INDIGENOUS ENTREPRENEURS[2]

[2] A previous version of this article was awarded by the Institute for Small Business and Entrepreneurship as the best paper in the 'Minority Entrepreneurship Track' at the ISBE Conference celebrated in the city of York, UK, in October 2022.

Embedded venturing in disembedded markets: Exploring the embedding process among migrant Indigenous entrepreneurs

Abstract

Embeddedness helps to understand how entrepreneurs build ties in new contexts, gaining access to local information, social networks, and economic resources. Regardless of its importance, we lack a clear understanding of embeddedness beyond Western-developed contexts. For instance, although being characterised by a distinct embeddedness, little research exists on Indigenous entrepreneurs migrating from their ancestral lands to urban settings, despite the increasing numbers of such migration processes worldwide. To face this concern, we investigate the embedding of Chilean Mapuche entrepreneurs transitioning from the rurality to significantly different urban environments. To explore their accounts and experiences, we use thematic and detailed linguistic analysis. Our findings reveal that migrant Mapuche entrepreneurs engage in distinctive prosocial and sustainable ventures, bringing their context-laden traditions, beliefs, and values to the wider society through their businesses. By bringing elements from their native settlements, their home contexts play a key role in their agentic embedding in the city. We contribute with this project to a multi-contextual understanding of embeddedness, highlighting the contextual specificities of the embedding process among a historically overlooked group from the Global South. We also contribute by gaining new insights into the essential role that home contexts play in successfully adapting to host contexts.

Keywords: Indigenous entrepreneurship; embeddedness; worldviews; positioning theory; discourse analysis; Mapuche.

Introduction

According to Karl Polanyi, one of the most prominent economic anthropologists and sociologists from the twentieth century, economic exchanges take place within larger institutional, and socio-cultural systems, which depend on several non-market institutions, such as family, government, and religion, just to name a few (Nowak and Raffaelli 2022). Building ties in such structures allows access to local information, social networks, and economic resources, both unique to those environments and considered legitimate by locally embedded social actors.

Following a Polanyian embeddedness perspective, modern markets have become increasingly disembedded from nature and society, determining social and ecological interactions rather than serving them. Unfortunately, the disembedding of modern markets from nature and society can pose enormous social and ecological threats to our planet (Banerjee and Arjaliès 2021). As social researchers, we need to think ahead to the future we would like to create, envisioning new avenues for facing these challenges (Gümüsay and Reinecke 2021). In this regard, numerous scholars have argued that Indigenous entrepreneurship could help in this direction, given its multidimensional economic goals. Indeed, Indigenous venturing is often embedded in society, governing institutions, and the natural environment, and usually aims for complex, community-oriented, and environmentally-driven objectives (Peredo 2023).

However, little do we know about what detaching from one context to enter a completely new one means to Indigenous entrepreneurs and their ventures. As previous research suggests, embedding in new ecological and socio-cultural contexts requires considerable time and effort from entrepreneurs, especially when such new contexts are significantly different from previous ones (Harima 2022). Such is the case of Indigenous

entrepreneurs transitioning from the rurality and/or reserves to urban locations. As economic practices within Western-based markets are significantly different from traditional Indigenous ones, Indigenous entrepreneurs might feel constrained to pursue contradicting economic, social, and environmental ends, potentially preventing them from adapting to urban settings.

Considering that entrepreneurship is a highly contextualized phenomenon, depending on the embeddedness between entrepreneurs and their local environments, perspectives contingent on contextual and cultural specificities remain largely scarce in our theorisation, despite several calls in such direction (Welter and Baker 2021). Consequently, we seek to explore the embedding process among migrant Indigenous entrepreneurs and what it means in practice to the emergence, orientation, and main outcomes of their ventures. In such a regard, the experience of Indigenous entrepreneurs moving from rural to urban contexts might help us understand their specific practices to adapt and, thus, their distinct way of embedding. Moreover, given how little we know about Indigenous entrepreneurs operating outside rural settlements, the accounts and struggles of urban Indigenous entrepreneurs demand our scholarly attention. We are guided by the following exploratory research question: How do rural Indigenous entrepreneurs embed themselves within urban environments?

Following this line of inquiry, we engaged with Mapuche entrepreneurs, the largest Indigenous community in Chile. All participants had recently moved from rural to urban environments. To understand their embedding process in a more grounded manner, we employed a twofold analytical approach: both thematic analysis and micro and macro-level discourse analysis. Our findings reveal that migrant Mapuche entrepreneurs engage in distinct prosocial and sustainability-driven ventures, bringing their ancestral traditions and

values to the urban realm through their businesses. By bringing elements from their native settlements with them, they successfully adapt to places not their own, making them their own, capitalizing on business opportunities, resources, and social networks within urban locations. In this way, migrant Mapuche entrepreneurs integrate contextual influences from their past to overcome current challenges and successfully adapt to the contexts of their present.

Given the dire need for more diverse and pluralistic entrepreneurship research, we contribute with this project to a nuanced and detailed understanding of embeddedness in a developing market from the Global South. We also contribute by taking multiple contextual dimensions into account at a time, as we consider the influence of both distal and proximal contexts (Alshareef 2022). Specifically, we show migrant Indigenous entrepreneurs relying on context-specific cultural influences, highlighting the key role that their home contexts play in adapting to significantly different host contexts. Finally, we reflect on the distinctive embedding process among urban Indigenous entrepreneurs, whom we still know very little about, despite them becoming increasingly urban worldwide (Padilla-Meléndez et al. 2022). Overall, recently migrated Indigenous entrepreneurs do not separate economic transactions from their urban milieu, as they often integrate social and environmental goals into hybrid business ventures. Hence, we argue that urban Indigenous entrepreneurship represents a Polanyian alternative 'other than' the mainstream for re-embedding the disembedded modern market back into nature and society.

We organize this article as follows. First, we overview embeddedness and Indigenous entrepreneurship. Next, we carefully explain our context of study. Then, we present our methods design and main findings, supporting the latter with representative evidence from

participants. We end this article by discussing compelling and insightful new perspectives of embeddedness in Indigenous venturing.

Theoretical foundations

Embeddedness as the link between entrepreneurship and context

> *'Our deepest human sense of belonging is rooted in our connection to place. Transcending boundaries of time and space, place offers rootedness in a world we work extraordinarily hard to make familiar, safe and survivable.'* (Kelly and Nicholson 2022, 141).

Entrepreneurship is shaped by the contexts in which it happens. Contexts can spur or constrain entrepreneurial activity, differently influencing the failure and success among entrepreneurs. Thus, we need to understand the lived experience of entrepreneurs in the specific contexts in which they venture. An important topic in the relationship between entrepreneurship and its contexts is that of recently migrated entrepreneurs. A great challenge for many migrants concerns 'how to modify spaces in urban contexts so as to accommodate, re-signify, and provide continuity to cultural rites, practices, and everyday activities' (Becerra et al. 2018, 1). In other words, how to recreate culturally meaningful places, generating identification to their newer spaces of residence. We argue that a suitable theoretical lens to address this relevant topic is through embeddedness theory.

In simple terms, embeddedness represents the nature, level, and degree of the link between individuals and their contexts. Overall, individuals are usually embedded in several contexts at once, and embeddedness can take place at different levels and to different extents (Wigren-Kristoferson et al. 2022). Regarding entrepreneurship, embeddedness is the process

whereby entrepreneurs build ties in new contexts to leverage economic resources, information, and social networks allocated within such contexts. In particular, as opportunities might be unavailable to entrepreneurs not embedded within certain local structures, the embedding process allows entrepreneurs to identify and access specific choices and courses of action contingent upon such structures (Redhead and Bika 2022). Importantly, entrepreneurs might be under-embedded in newer contexts, especially when such new contexts are significantly different from previous ones. In this regard, one group worthy of attention is Indigenous entrepreneurs transitioning from rural to urban contexts. Since Indigenous individuals are strongly attached to their ancestral lands (Kelly and Nicholson 2022), migrating to urban locations might represent a cultural clash hard to overcome for many of them.

Embeddedness in Indigenous entrepreneurship

> *'Identity for Indigenous peoples is grounded in their relationships with the land, with their ancestors who have returned to the land and with future generations who will come into being on the land. Rather than viewing ourselves as being in relationship with other people or things, we are the relationships that we hold and are part of.'* (Wilson 2008, 80).

Even though Indigenous peoples account for less than 5% of the world's population and represent one of the poorest segments of society, they occupy 20% of the land surface, which contains 80% of the cultural and biological diversity of the planet (Colbourne and Anderson 2020). Traditionally, Indigenous businesses take place in contexts of rich social and ecological interactions that are influenced by the communities' worldviews, their specific needs, and the local ecosystem in which they live. Unlike capitalist economies, Indigenous

peoples organize their livelihoods based on the values of relationship, responsibility, reciprocity, and redistribution (or 4 relational 'Rs'), rather than on neoclassical principles of rational choice and utility maximization.

Generally, Indigenous peoples see the world as made of deep 'interconnections, interrelationships, and interdependencies' between the human, ecological, and spiritual realms. Whereas Western thinking is piecemeal and dualistic, creating a hierarchical and dichotomous division between nature and society (i.e., humans transcend other living beings), Indigenous worldviews imply 'living the present in harmony, that is, assuming and respecting differences and complementarities (among humans and between humans and non-humans) from an ecological perspective that could be described as holistic and mutualistic' (Vanhulst and Beling 2014, 56). Often, Indigenous worldviews are experiential, customary, practical, and eminently local, implying a strong attachment to Indigenous ancestral lands. Whereas Western hegemonic paradigms seek to minimize complexity, Indigenous worldviews are non-reductionist, reject categorizations, and usually remain non-systematized (e.g., orally transmitted, fragmented, and heterogeneous).

Indigenous worldviews are relevant as they exert a pervasive influence on Indigenous entrepreneurs, propelling them to address several economic, social, and ecological ends within their ventures. As modern markets have become increasingly disembedded from nature and society, and given the myriad of wicked global problems we face as a result (Sharma et al. 2022), a growing number of scholars have argued that Indigenous venturing could serve as a basis on which to build a shift of ethos of Western-based economies (Peredo 2023). Nevertheless, since entrepreneurship is enabled and/or constrained by local norms and uses, and judged within local value systems (Welter and Baker 2021), Indigenous entrepreneurs transitioning from reserves to urban environments might face emerging

frictions they need to get by to successfully adapt. Put simply, embedding within modern markets might be extremely hard to orchestrate for Indigenous entrepreneurs. Although caring about environmental conservation and cultural preservation, in several such cases, a tense coexistence between Indigenous 'relational' worldviews and Western 'commercial' praxis may arise.

Context of study: migrant Mapuche entrepreneurs

The Mapuches are a heterogeneous group of Indigenous inhabitants from South-Central Chile and South-Western Argentina. The Mapuches (or 'people from the land' in Mapudungun, their native language) are by far the largest Indigenous community in Chile. Nearly 80% of the total Indigenous inhabitants (12,8% of the Chilean population) self-identify as Mapuche (1,745,147 individuals as of 2018) (INE 2018). Overall, Mapuches are recognized for their strong social and ecological values, 'an existence based more on being than on having, and ideas about the interaction between human beings and nature that are based on respect and non-exploitation' (Daher, Jaramillo, and Rosati 2020, 2). Such logics underlie most of their business practices, which are often rooted in their context-specific and highly distinctive views about the world. Specifically, Mapuches see the world as ecological communities made up of all forms of existence (both humans and non-humans) grounded in deep contextual connections. Their worldviews play a significant influence in Mapuche venturing, emphasizing a communitarian, regenerative, and overall restorative business perspective.

Unfortunately, the relationship between Mapuches and the Chilean State has been troubled since the very inception of the latter (Macpherson et al. 2021). For centuries,

Mapuches have been victims of land dispossession, marginalization, and political repression, all of which have systematically prevented Mapuches from living according to their traditional ways of being and doing (Maher et al. 2023). The Chilean State has also failed dramatically at improving the living conditions of the Mapuches, who, on average, are much poorer than the rest of the Chilean society. In this scenario, over the last three decades, several Chilean governments have introduced a growing number of entrepreneurial programs aimed at helping the Mapuches reduce income gaps, alleviate poverty, and foster their inclusion in the broader society. Although entrepreneurship is a highly divisive topic for many Mapuches, being criticized for its individualistic and neoliberal nature, it has also been recognized to contribute to the development, social enmeshment, and cultural revitalization of the Mapuches. Overall, despite some concerns, Mapuches have actively demanded more public programmes supporting entrepreneurship and social welfare. These demands have exceeded political claims for autonomy and self-determination, despite the increased media visibility of the latter. Furthermore, the lack of economic prospects has propelled younger Mapuches to leave their rural communities behind in search of better opportunities, mostly in large metropolitan areas to work as self-employed. As a result, most Mapuches live in Santiago de Chile, the main and largest Chilean city (INE 2018).

Naturally, the increasing number of Indigenous entrepreneurs in urban locations has its pros and cons. Even though urban areas favour economic growth, productivity, and innovation over Indigenous multidimensional goals, social researchers have also argued that Indigenous venturing within urban locations can still be sensitive and respectful of Indigenous traditions and values (Stewart et al. 2017). On the contrary, others posit that modern markets that do not take into account Indigenous customs and uses may prompt Indigenous culture to lose ground against Western influences, forcing Indigenous

entrepreneurs to conform to their mindset. In this regard, recent studies have shown that managing both Indigenous and Western perspectives can certainly be problematic as it may lead Indigenous entrepreneurs to face identity struggles and overall cultural loss (Persaud, Nelson, and Satterfield 2021). More so, along with legitimizing themselves to their own people for pursuing venturing, they may also need to legitimize themselves to differently-oriented Western communities and markets for trading and doing business with them. More bluntly, they might feel pressured to be both Indigenous and Western 'worth' at the same time.

Although some of these concerns have been explored in previous studies, the literature does not address the specific challenges of rural Mapuche entrepreneurs who have recently migrated to urban contexts. Furthermore, we know little to nothing about Mapuche entrepreneurs, even less so within large metropolitan areas, where most Mapuches currently live. Hence, we may take for granted some cultural features of the Mapuches (e.g., attachment to the land, heritage, communal orientation, and so on), which may change during their embedding and doing of business in the city. Last but not least, research in our field needs to further reflect on how Indigenous entrepreneurs adapt to modern settings (e.g., strategies to cope with failure, uncertainty, and even hostile treatment towards them), their integration of dissimilar cultural influences, and their contribution to Western-based markets through their distinct practices and backgrounds. Therefore, by exploring the embedding process among migrant Mapuche entrepreneurs within urban environments, we seek to provide insights on urban Indigenous entrepreneurship at large (Mapuche or otherwise), a neglected phenomenon among business scholars so far.

Methods

Research approach

> *'To understand places as contexts for entrepreneurship, it is useful to examine historical narratives and collective memories that shape peoples' sense of what is desirable and what is feasible for the future, which is to ask, what are the opportunities for entrepreneurship.'* (Welter and Baker 2021, 4)

Narratives have the potential to shape entrepreneurship. The right story can spur entrepreneurship, just as the wrong one can impede it. Since narratives depend on the audience, milieu, and specific circumstances from which they emerge, we adopt a social constructionist stance to explore the experiences of migrant Mapuche entrepreneurs. Social constructionism focuses 'on the processes through which language and discourse produce entrepreneurial knowledge in the form of understandings and meanings' (Jones, Latham, and Betta 2008, 332). According to this approach, discourses possess 'positioning' intentions, as narrators locate themselves and identify with certain roles and identities in their stories. In this way, they build themselves and others through discursive strategies, constructing their own narrative and sense of self (Georgakopoulou 2016).

As with any endeavour involving human interactions, entrepreneurship can be seen as a discursive process in itself (Cunningham et al. 2022). Considering that interactions with others can change our perceptions of social reality, discourses hold the potential for creating and/or changing meanings in entrepreneurship. Consequently, we believe that social constructionism is a fitting theoretical framework to tackle our research question and objectives.

Data collection

Aligning with the motivation of our study, we engaged with a diverse group of 27 Mapuche entrepreneurs from Araucanía and Biobío, the two Chilean regions with the largest Mapuche populations behind 'Región Metropolitana' (or 'Metropolitan Region' in Spanish). Our selection criteria purposefully involved Mapuche self-employed and small business owners who migrated from rural to urban communes during the last five years. Communes are the smallest administrative subdivisions in Chile. Specifically, urban communes are characterized by population densities higher than 150 hab./km2 with over 50,000 inhabitants. In turn, rural communes have population densities lower than 150 hab./km2 with a maximum of 50,000 inhabitants (Muñoz and Kimmitt 2019). Overall, focusing on communes allowed us to capture the environmental and socio-cultural contexts of participants within clearly defined spatial and geographical boundaries.

Data collection took us two months, from the beginning of February to the end of March 2021. We contacted participants through our social networks. In several cases, we asked participants to introduce us to their Mapuche acquaintances willing to participate in our study. All interviews were conducted in Spanish, the native language of both researchers and took place through the Google Meet® video-communication platform, due to the COVID-19 sanitary restrictions we faced at the time. We conducted 21 individual semi-structured interviews. To capture further contextual divergence, we conducted one group interview with 5 female Mapuche artisans from the commune of Cañete and one interview with a non-Indigenous key informant, a male psychotherapist with in-depth knowledge of Mapuche worldviews and businesses. For triangulation purposes (i.e., 'use of multiple data sources for a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon'), we engaged with some participants through Facebook and Instagram during the entire research process, to get a

better comprehension of their experience as entrepreneurs. Through these digital platforms, we learned plenty about their culture and ventures (e.g., crafts, value proposals, relationships with their customers, etc.). Out of the twenty-seven total participants, 20 were female and 7 were male. All interviews were audio and video recorded and transcribed verbatim. The length of these interviews ranged from 45 minutes to 120 minutes. The average length of each was around 60 minutes. Ultimately, we came up with 1,450 minutes of recorded conversation, that is, roughly 24 hours of conversational data.

Most participants worked in the following fields: herbal medicine, handicrafts, agriculture, chicken raising, and gastronomy. Additionally, there were also entrepreneurs from non-traditional Mapuche fields. For instance, one participant ran a computer and television service centre. In general, male participants reported more years of schooling than their female counterparts and the economic status among males seemed much better, overall. All of them (except for one) had college degrees (see Table 2.1 for a summary of participants). All the data we present has been anonymized to protect participants' privacy and comply with our ethical procedures. In this regard, we note that all participants signed a consent form.

Table 2.1. Primary Data Overview

Gender	Participant	Type of interview	Age	Years in the city	Main occupation
Female	Juanita	Individual	35-45	4	Producer and seller of organic products made from traditional herbs and plants
	Marta	Individual	35-40	3	Producer and seller of organic products made from traditional herbs and plants
	Lucía	Individual	30-40	5	Independent hairdresser
	Camila	Individual	45-65	2	Plant grower and seller
	Verónica	Individual	30-35	4	Producer of events, pastries, and cocktails
	Mirta	Individual	60-70	2	Traditional jewellery artisan
	Eugenia	Individual	40-50	1	Traditional jewellery artisan
	María	Individual	25-30	3	Traditional jewellery artisan

	Clotilde	Individual	40-50	1	Traditional jewellery artisan
	Claudia	Individual	65-75	3	Independent traditional cook
	Andrea	Individual	40-50	5	Poultry breeder, egg producer, and distributor
	Alondra	Individual	30-35	5	Owner of a computer, and television service centre
	Betty	Individual	55-65	3	Producer and seller of phytotherapy products
	Olga	Individual	40-50	2	Indigenous-based ecotourism entrepreneur
	Johanna	Individual	35-40	2	Independent traditional cook
	Úrsula	Group	Unknown	3	Traditional loom artisan
	Clementina	Group	Unknown	1	Traditional loom artisan
	Javiera	Group	Unknown	2	Traditional loom artisan
	Daniela	Group	Unknown	3	Traditional loom artisan
	Sofía	Group	Unknown	3	Traditional loom artisan
Male	Antonio	Individual	40-45	5	Car upholsterer
	Guillermo	Individual	38	5	Nascent cybersecurity entrepreneur
	Julián	Individual	35-40	4	Berry producer, and seller
	Gregorio	Individual	47	5	Indigenous-based ecotourism entrepreneur
	Ernesto	Individual	45-50	3	Traditional jewellery artisan
	Alberto	Individual	35	3	Indigenous-based ecotourism entrepreneur
	Tomás	Individual	30-35	3	Non-Mapuche psychotherapist, expert in Mapuche worldviews (key informant)

Data analysis

Given that we largely ignore what entrepreneurs do, feel, and think when they agentically interact with their contexts (Wigren-Kristoferson et al. 2022), our data analysis involved two steps. First, we used thematic analysis to categorize extracts in which participants reflected on their embedding process. For this purpose, we read all interviews in detail several times in search of such extracts. This resulted in the identification of 36 quotes from women, which led to 54 NVivo10® axial codes, and 25 quotes from men, which led to 41 NVivo10® codes. Further independent recodification and data depuration by both authors resulted in the final selection of excerpts. As a second step, we used discourse analysis to understand participants' experiences and tensions (i.e., 'conflicting missions, demands, and modes of operation' [Persaud, Nelson, and Satterfield 2021, 2]), and how they managed their embedding through discursive moves in actual talk. To this end, we carefully selected a group

of extracts following the considerations of authenticity and potential to illustrate recurrent discursive phenomena. Accordingly, the quotes we present below are then representative of the values, practices, and reflections that we commonly observed in the data. We analysed these examples in detail employing a sociolinguistic approach to micro (i.e., linguistic) and macro (i.e., ideological) level discourse analysis, using concepts of the model of 'positioning' proposed by Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2008). This approach allowed us to view Mapuches' discursive constructions (i.e., how they position a sense of 'self' regarding dominant speeches) as adaptation strategies and coping mechanisms situated in time and space and as interactionally functional.

In the following section, we explore the accounts of recently migrated Mapuche entrepreneurs, how they navigate the hindrances and opportunities when becoming part of new ecological and socio-cultural environments, and how they make sense of their embedding process. Due to the complex and intertwined nature of social phenomena, our grouping of findings should not be taken in a clear-cut manner. Instead, as we illustrate next below, the numerous contextual dimensions with which Mapuche entrepreneurs interface often overlap and intersect in multiple ways.

Findings

Embedding in new ecological contexts

Most participants were concerned with the large-scale environmental degradation looming over their daily lives and surroundings. During the last couple of decades, Chile has experienced increasing desertification due to the damaging effects of global warming, monocultures, and the introduction of foreign plant species for logging, mainly pines and

eucalyptus (Garreaud et al. 2020). The combined effect of these events has led to biodiversity loss, deterioration of farmlands, and extended wildfires, floods, and droughts in large portions of South-Central Chile, where most participants live. In some cases, rural locations have even been abandoned due to a lack of fresh water for irrigation and drinking. Clotilde, a former farmer, illustrates this dramatic situation:

There is no water left in the groundwater, the rivers are drying up. The springs that used to be in the countryside are no longer there (…) People are growing less because there is no grass for animals to eat. So, nature is being lost more and more every day (Extract 1).

In many cases, the loss of natural resources for survival has caused participants to shift from traditional agricultural practices in rural environments to self-employment in larger towns. For example, when arriving in the city, Clotilde had to become an artisan to get by. Regarding this escalating environmental crisis, participants believe that the Chilean productive matrix is too narrow, heavily focusing on the primary sector of the economy without much care over protecting biodiversity and ecosystems. In this sense, Guillermo, a nascent digital entrepreneur, laments:

I believe that Chile is in bad shape because, deep down, the biggest corporations rely on cutting down trees, drilling into the ground, and depredating the sea. This generates fires. There's no biodiversity. Birds have nowhere to be if we're full of pines and eucalyptus. So, it's like Chile is losing itself (Extract 2).

Interestingly, as participants reflect on such challenges, they seem to distance themselves from the situations they narrate as they employ the noun 'people' (Extract 1 or E1) (a noun that is used to express generalizations), passive voice ('nature is being lost' – E1) and the name of the country ('Chile' – E2) as a deictic resource that builds a sense of displacement from such problems. This allows participants to deny responsibility for the

environmental collapse caused by businesses while, at the same time, the deictic use of 'Chile' also helps to build a sense of collective consciousness (note that the use of the pronoun 'we' – E2 – in this context may be interpreted as 'we Chileans' since no other alignments are displayed in this narrative), avoiding ethnic identification but favouring, instead, spatial in-grouping orientations. Like Guillermo, participants' accounts often reflect Mapuche and Western perspectives that are sometimes contested, sometimes used to support their choices, and sometimes used to build positive positionings of themselves and their ventures, aiming to interactionally manage their self-constructions and sense of self. Generally, these perspectives are balanced out, allowing them to preserve the overall integrative nature of their narratives.

Regarding their distancing from environmental damage, we find displacement discourses through which, for instance, participants distance themselves from unsustainable business practices. In such a regard, their discourses shift to display their ethnic alignments as they explicitly draw on Mapuche ideologies to illustrate their ecological ties, namely, their caring relationships with the natural environment. For example, Johanna, an independent cook, comments: *Being connected to nature is fundamental for the Mapuche. Nature gives us everything* (Extract 3). Generally, participants explain they relate to their local environments seeking peaceful interactions. According to Mapuche worldviews, being at peace with nature involves harmonious and thoughtful relations, as María, a jewellery artisan, claims: *The Mapuche vision is to be at peace with nature* (Extract 4). In the same regard, Úrsula, a traditional loom artisan, explains:

> *Our way of working is seeking to be in good relations with our environment, with our land, with everything. Producing, working is not exploiting and over-exploiting the birds, the land, the plants, or whatever. It is to be more in balance* (Extract 5).

Often, ‘balance of nature’ discourses imply limits to economic growth, arising from the notion that exponential economic development has put at risk the environment. While these discourses provide examples of pro-environmental and sensitive behaviour, they also have an underlying anthropocentric focus as human power takes precedence over nature even when this power is used for good (consider E5 above). Thus, participants’ narratives display certain alignments with Western-based views of human power over nature (Hedlund-de Witt 2012). Discursively, these assumptions seem to fade out when participants refer to ‘Traditional Ecological Knowledge’ (Colbourne and Anderson 2020). For instance, Ernesto, based on the hunter-gatherer knowledge inherited from his grandparents, teaches us about the natural resources at our disposal during each calendar season. According to his conception of time, he comments that by adapting to the seasonal cycles and endogenous rhythms of ecosystems, we can have all we need to live well without depredating the environment; he states: *You have a feeding cycle. Do you need to destroy the ecosystem? No, you consume what’s available. I live off the season. Because the land is mother (…) Destroying the land is like destroying ourselves* (Extract 6). In other cases, participants debate between environmental care and the need to make a living, as Alberto, an ecotourism entrepreneur, reflects:

We Mapuches think of Mother Earth as a living entity. So, could it be that what I'm doing, although profitable, is ethical for the Mapuche way of thinking? For example, cutting down a native forest by slashing and burning? No, maybe it’s not ethical (Extract 7).

Importantly, most participants expose the competitive disadvantages they face and how that prevents their access to the resources and opportunities ingrained within their new contexts. For example, they complain extensively about how other entrepreneurs -ranging from big corporations to necessity self-employees- deplete and pollute their local ecosystems,

without worrying about the externalities they generate. In this sense, Ernesto tells us that preserving biodiversity for future generations underlies most of his endeavours. He shares a story illustrating this point:

> *I respect nature. I have a self-imposed hunting quota. In the shrimp season, shrimp are the fattest. If they have eggs, I send them back to their caves so they can breed. If they are small, I also send them back, so they can develop fully. But they [fairground workers] don't do that because they fish with the net and what has fallen in the net, fell and that's it. They don't give a [swearing]* (Extract 8).

Overall, by employing discourses of environmental entrepreneurship, participants self-position as 'sustainably', marketizing their products and ventures as healthy and eco-friendly, respectively. For instance, Julián, a berry producer, states: *The vision of my company is to sell health. Wellness, that's the vision of my business* (Extract 9). As the interview goes on, he further adds: *Everything I produce I try to do it without polluting the land. I also use as little water as possible (...) All my products are grown using drip irrigation* (Extract 10). In the same vein, Betty, a producer of phytotherapy products, comments: *I don't work with any chemicals. All my products are made from herbs and lahuen*[1] *I collect in the hills. These plants I sell don't grow in the city, nor do they have synthetic fertilisers* (Extract 11). More so, participants distance themselves from environmentally uncaring competitors by looking to 'being well' rather than 'being better', a vision that is compatible with plenty of South American Indigenous groups. This seems especially true among female participants, as most of them employ discourses of sufficiency instead of efficiency. In the literature, discourses of sufficiency can be understood as part of holistic frameworks of transformational circular economies (Friant, Vermeulen, and Salomone 2020). Such philosophies favour local production through collaborative structures that are believed to lead to slower, simpler, and

more meaningful lives. As a suitable example, Marta, a producer of organic products made from traditional herbs, explains:

> *The essence of life is what's natural. I mean, I don't need a lot of money to survive. I can get through the day with just what I need because we Mapuche live from day to day, and we help each other however we can* (Extract 12).

In sum, we started this study by assuming that Mapuche entrepreneurs departing from their rural settlements were under-embedded in their newer contexts. However, attachment to their native lands certainly remains after they migrate. Overall, Mapuche entrepreneurs engage in distinct environmental ventures, bringing their ancestry to urban locations. Their deep connection to their ancestral lands allows them to mobilize ethnic capacities, histories, imageries, and overall cultural heritage to adapt. In this sense, sustainable Mapuche venturing provides an outlet for migrant Mapuches to successfully embed within disembedded markets, making a difference within such markets. Thus, within urban locations, Indigenous entrepreneurship can still be an endeavour 'where traditional knowledge and ritual and symbolic elements are expressed and recreated' (Ramírez-Cendrero, García, and Santillán 2017, 116).

Embedding in new socio-cultural contexts

We found emerging needs when Mapuche entrepreneurs embed themselves in new socio-cultural contexts. As participants narrate their embedding process, they refer to several demands they face, including material deprivation and scarcity. We find such needs particularly salient in the case of women, which is why their ventures are mostly carried out of necessity. These demands also bring about certain complications, particularly in relation

to their roles as mothers and carers of their homes. Because of this, their ventures must be flexible enough to allow a favourable work-family balance, that is, being able to raise their children and provide financial support for them by working from home. As a result, most women practice the crafts inherited from their ancestors. For example, Claudia, a traditional cook who learned the craft from her mother, recalls:

> *What I've learned are things that my mom taught us. For example, I know how to make toasted flour, bread kneaded with cracklings, tortillas, cracked wheat, wheat coffee. So, she remembered what her mother taught her in the fields, and then she taught me* (Extract 13).

Overall, her venture is flexible enough so she can work from home to raise her granddaughter. Like her, most female participants value compatibility between their venture and household chores, as seen with female entrepreneurs from different backgrounds and fields (Cesaroni, Sentuti, and Pediconi 2021). Such is also the case of Juanita, a producer of organic products, who leans on kinship ties for venturing. Based on these ties, she runs a successful and well-known business in Concepción, one of the largest Chilean cities. She recalls learning from her grandfather about traditional species found in the deep forest: *There I began to learn about the qualities and properties of the herbs and how to preserve them and dry them so that they do not lose their smell, flavour, or healing properties* (Extract 14). Generally, venturing is a fitting endeavour among females for meeting household and business demands and for leveraging family influences, life experiences, and capabilities. Similar to Juanita and Claudia, other participants also acknowledge and show their respects to their elders, as Daniela, a loom artisan, elaborates:

> *[Ancestors] are very important. They've always been important in our culture. Because they are the ones who know, they are the ones who teach the grandchildren*.

Mapuche ancestors have a lot of wisdom, a lot of understanding, even though most of them were illiterate. They didn't know how to read or write; in fact, my mother doesn't read or write. But if I listen to my mother for whole afternoons, wow! She gives so much wisdom, so much learning, so many things (Extract 15).

In general terms, modern societies highly value formal education, academic achievements, and economic success derived from them. This helps to explain why so many Mapuches migrate from rural communities to larger towns to provide educational opportunities for their children. Therefore, the fact that participants acquired their knowledge from illiterate members of their families may conflict with Western standards. In such a regard, they use their narratives to position the wisdom of their elders as essential to their embedding in the city. Typically, building positive other-self positionings helps them not only to display their cultural alignments with the Mapuches but also to differentiate their ventures against others (see E21 below). In this sense, Verónica, a producer of events, highlights female Mapuche history and how that encouraged her to start her own venture:

Without a matriarch, Mapuches did nothing because she was the one who had the wisdom, she was the one who connected with nature, she was the one who looked for the energy in the earth... It was a woman. And when I learned that it was a huge inspiration (Extract 16).

In several cases, when reflecting on Mapuche stereotypes in the mainstream cultural context, women comment on their female-based empowerment views. These perspectives defy conceptions of hegemonic masculinities and male chauvinism. At the same time, they challenge self and others' assumptions and expectations of precolonial Mapuches by which females were expected to practice their crafts in domestic contexts (instead of running their businesses), re-signifying Mapuche matriarchy and positioning it as vital to their overall

success. In the same vein, male participants also contest widespread misconceptions about them. For instance, Gregorio, an ecotourism entrepreneur, complains about the supposed lack of business orientation among the Mapuches:

> *There are many researchers, and excuse me, I don't know what field you're from, but above all anthropologists have such a romantic vision of Mapuches, as if we lived like [swearing] hippies, as if we never did business, as if we never had wealth* (…) *What's trade? It's exchanging, only nowadays money is in between. But exchanging… We Mapuches always did that* (Extract 17).

In order to adapt to their new socio-cultural contexts, Mapuche entrepreneurs position their ventures as part of a cultural legacy. For example, Andrea, a poultry, and egg producer, rediscovered how to raise the 'Araucana' (or 'Gallina Mapuche' in Spanish), a rare breed of domestic chickens from Southern Chile. These chickens lay blue-shelled eggs, one of the few breeds in the world to do so. Through joint ventures and the creation of a cooperative with Mapuche traders from her neighbourhood, she was able to successfully produce and distribute eggs from Araucana in the old Mapuche fashion, proving herself as a legitimate businesswoman to local stakeholders and various overseas markets; she recalls: *Until a while ago eggs were laid by hens and nothing else. We didn't have something that came from our own culture* (Extract 18). Overall, her business allows her to build a positive self-orientation while developing an appreciation of her past. Such valuing of past knowledge comes in sharp contrast with future-oriented views of entrepreneurship, which often dismiss the inherent value of traditions and history (Welter and Baker 2021). Moreover, ties of belonging to the Mapuches offer both her and other participants a unique ethnic capital and shared understanding to seize idiosyncratic opportunities linked to their new environments. As such, migrant Mapuche entrepreneurs rely on the distinctiveness of their culture, driving strategic

differentiation to occupy previously unknown and/or non-targeted markets, for instance, by infusing their efforts with symbolic and cultural value (e.g., branding Mapuche history and culture).

Furthermore, participants believe their products have a ceremonial, liturgical purpose. From this viewpoint, entrepreneurship serves as the basis for sharing not only Traditional Knowledge (as in Extract 22 below) but also mystical wisdom. For example, Eugenia, a traditional Mapuche jeweller, thinks of herself as a spiritual carrier. She believes the artefacts she creates have a sacred meaning. More so, these cultural artefacts possess hidden energies and powers, which are passed onto her clients who value such attributes and, therefore, wear such crafts: *When you make a piece of jewellery you are portraying the whole history of the Mapu[2], the whole history of the Wenumapu[3]. The whole history of the universe. From beginning to end* (Extract 19). To further differentiate themselves, participants work to discursively position their businesses as a contribution to society, amidst the ideological differences with Western perspectives. For instance, female participants align with wider gender roles as Mapuche caregivers, implying that their products help others and that they approach venturing unselfishly. In this regard, Marta comments that she sells her medicinal plants for cheap: *I sell herbs cheaply, within people's reach; that's what I do* (Extract 20). When necessary, she is even willing to give them away: *If a person needs some herb and has no money, I will give it to them. It's what we Mapuche do* (Extract 21). Hence, besides economic viability and self-sufficiency, participants seek multifaceted objectives, such as contributing to the broader community, even by supporting others without self-interest. In the case of Camila, a plant seller, her main satisfaction is teaching her clients about the medicinal properties of her plants: *My venture is my priority. More than anything, to teach others what ailments Mapuche plants are good for. That's my main goal* (Extract 22). Overall,

venturing allows Camila to pass down Mapuche insights not only to Mapuches but also to non-Mapuches, helping her engage with broader social networks, sustain her ethnicity and, at the same time, carve a distinctive market niche of her own.

In summary, migrant Mapuche entrepreneurs draw elements from their native environments to become part of new socio-cultural contexts. Their distinct culture and business logics propel them toward prosocial ventures. Specifically, their home contexts serve as repositories of ancestral knowledge and shared capabilities for embedding themselves within dissembedded markets. In this sense, their unique territory and background allow them to successfully adapt to places not their own, making them their own, gaining access to the local resources, information, and social capital within such. Overall, entrepreneurship reinforces migrant Mapuches' historical purpose and ethnic identity: it gives continuity to their atomized culture (it keeps it alive), through economic exchanges filled with endogenous meaning. As a result, urban Indigenous entrepreneurship is not only a way of making a living, it is also 'a way of getting back to historical forms of economic activity which were fundamental to an Indigenous way of life' (Gallagher and Lawrence 2012, 12).

All in all, economic transactions among migrant Mapuche entrepreneurs remain within ecological and socio-cultural structures, demonstrating that another way beyond the mainstream is indeed possible. Although the Mapuches have been previously documented as mobilizing 'native knowledge within the new urban space of residence and from the elders to the younger generations' (Becerra et al. 2018, 12), our evidence specifically emphasizes such cultural transmission through their venture development process.

Discussion

Embeddedness implies being aware of the connections and interdependencies between economic interactions and the communities and local ecosystems in which they are set. According to Karl Polanyi, who questions the conceptual validity of self-regulating markets, isolating economic analysis from societal concerns is bound to be flawed. In this regard, individuals are not atomized decision-makers living in a vacuum, but rather, are implicated in networks of social, institutional, and cultural relationships. Accordingly, business should serve as a function of social and environmental systems, beyond market specifics. In such cases, economic outcomes may contribute to society and the overall environment.

However, modern markets have become increasingly detached from everything else. More so, instead of businesses being embedded within social and ecological relationships, such relationships have now become embedded within the economic system, at the expense of social and environmental concerns. Despite the emergence of several prosocial and sustainable ventures within Westernized contexts, ubiquitous market-based logics tend to hinder its proliferation and survival in ways that remain consistent with entrepreneurs' overall beliefs and values. Adding to this concern, the creation and growing of such businesses have become increasingly difficult among marginalized segments of the population. Such is the case of rural Indigenous entrepreneurs transitioning to urban locations. Given the growing demand for more research on prosocial and environmental entrepreneurship (Vedula et al. 2022), we engaged with recently migrated Mapuche entrepreneurs, seeking to understand how their socially and ecologically embedded ventures came into being within disembedded modern markets. As revealed above, our evidence suggests that migrant Mapuche

entrepreneurs integrate contextual influences from their past to adapt to their current environments.

The implications of our project are manifold. Firstly, we contribute to a multi-contextual understanding of embeddedness, providing a deeper examination of how entrepreneurs integrate elements from their native contexts to seize opportunities linked to their host contexts. Strikingly, the exploration of embeddedness considering multiple contexts at a time remains understudied (Korsgaard et al. 2022). In fact, previous research among migrant entrepreneurs has primarily focused on their proximal contexts, largely neglecting the role of their distal contexts (Alshareef 2022), therefore, reinforcing the assumption that home contexts play only a marginal role in their ventures and overall embedding process (Harima 2022). Notwithstanding, balancing embeddedness 'by exploiting the advantages of a context, while also exploring new contexts, becomes a central issue for entrepreneurs' (Korsgaard et al. 2022, 8). Accordingly, an embeddedness perspective that takes multiple contextual levels into account simultaneously can provide 'a broader understanding of how contexts –through cognition, culture, and institutional and social structures –stimulate or hinder business activities' (Larsen, Lauvås, and Sørheim 2022, 250).

Secondly, we acknowledge recent calls to explore the accounts of entrepreneurs through discourse analysis, a largely underutilized analytical tool in entrepreneurship (Van Burg et al. 2022), but with great potential for providing novel insights on how entrepreneurs cope with uncertainty, confusion, and ambiguities, and for envisioning entrepreneurship as a storytelling device in itself. Likewise, we contribute by employing positioning theory to understand embeddedness as an agentic process instead of something that entrepreneurs passively experience in a somewhat unilateral and linear way. This is an important issue since

in most existing literature on the matter, ‘the entrepreneurs’ agency has become lost and the entrepreneur has become reactive to the embeddedness' (Wigren-Kristoferson et al. 2022, 51). Nonetheless, depending on their skills, beliefs, and values, entrepreneurs differently embed and disembed from their contexts. Indeed, despite predominant deterministic views, ‘everyday entrepreneurs’ take an active part in their embedding process and, in this sense, both discourse analysis and positioning theory help underscore entrepreneurial agency and entrepreneurs themselves as context-makers and agents of change instead of passive individuals.

Finally, we expand entrepreneurship research beyond Western-developed contexts, by giving closer attention to urban Indigenous entrepreneurs from the Global South. In such a regard, we highlight Polanyi’s economic anthropology for studying embeddedness among Indigenous entrepreneurs, given his predominantly substantivist, relational, and overall reciprocal views (Nowak and Raffaelli 2022). Much to our surprise, there exist scant studies of urban Indigenous entrepreneurs despite their distinctive embedding structure and worldviews (Colbourne and Anderson 2020). Nevertheless, we believe that the potential contributions of Indigenous entrepreneurship should be accounted for due to their unique integration of social and environmental goals into single business ventures (Morales et al. 2021). Consequently, we champion Mapuche worldviews (and Indigenous worldviews in general) as an essential Polanyian framework for re-embedding the disembedded modern market back into nature and society and for contributing to the ‘public good’ within such markets (Vedula et al. 2022).

Adding to the above, since views about social and environmental problematics are intersubjective and intercultural, they demand that we understand worldviews. Unfortunately, prosocial and sustainability discourses are mostly based on Western scientific knowledge,

dismissing contributions from the 'periphery.' However, it is this Western 'instrumental, materialistic position that has frequently been claimed to lead to the exploitation and destruction of nature' (Hedlund-de Witt 2012, 76). Indeed, whenever the natural environment is perceived as devoid of an intrinsic spiritual dimension, it is more often viewed in an instrumental and materialistic fashion, even when humans and nature are seen as physically interconnected. Supporting this idea, growing evidence suggests that 'the spiritual or metaphysical connection between humans and their surrounding world may turn out to be substantial in explaining individual differences in sustainable behaviours and lifestyles' (Hedlund-de Witt 2012, 78).

Therefore, to learn how to better contribute to prosocial and sustainable business outcomes, we believe that looking back to our roots may provide us with valuable insights. Indeed, we argue that Indigenous worldviews could be a key source of wisdom to face some of our grand social and ecological challenges. In such a regard, our exploring of the ecological, and socio-cultural embedding process among migrant Mapuches offers a relational perspective full of untapped potential. Moreover, we think that Indigenous entrepreneurship at large might shed some light on how a sustainability mindset is deployed within Western-based markets. Such type of knowledge might help transition Twenty-First Century businessmen from a simplistic, siloed, and binary understanding of the human-nature relationship, into a socially and ecologically embedded mindset, namely, one that is caring towards the environment and others and, thus, committed to social and ecological well-being.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes

[1] It may refer to Herbertia, a plant in the family Iridaceae.

[2] Mother Earth in Mapudungun.

[3] The earth above or the sky in Mapudungun

CONCLUSION

Closing remarks on context

Does context explain or simply describe entrepreneurship? Put differently, 'can knowledge be created about entrepreneurship, or can knowledge only be generated once contextualization has occurred?' (McMullen, Ingram, and Adams 2020, 2). According to Gaddefors and Anderson (2019), a proper approach for tackling such questions and, therefore, contextualizing entrepreneurship research at large, can be reached by critically analysing entrepreneurial engagements 'with' contexts rather than simply 'within' a context. Above all, a greater engagement with and within contexts can help us 'theorize contexts instead of contextualizing theories,' hence, avoiding context-based biases or what Hamann et al. (2020) would have called 'essentializing contexts'. Such contextual reflexivity could allow us to question and complement different embedded assumptions to engage in 'dialogical contextualism.' Plain and simple, it could allow us to improve entrepreneurship research 'increasing the inferential value of our findings' (Newbert, Kher, and Yang 2022, 1).

Despite this, context has often been overlooked when it comes to Indigenous venturing (Croce 2017). In practice, Indigenous entrepreneurship has been grasped as being different from conventional entrepreneurship, but at the same time as a somewhat uniform, monolithic phenomenon across Indigenous communities (Croce 2020). Contesting this notion, I would argue that Indigenous entrepreneurship should not be analysed as a homogeneous phenomenon across different places and groups of people. As I have shown in the preceding articles, Indigenous entrepreneurship is characterized by the complexity among Indigenous individuals, their multidimensional objectives, their degree of embeddedness, and their familiarity with both Indigenous and Western perspectives. Since contexts are filled with imageries, heritage, and meanings, they influence values, behaviour, and outcomes

underpinning business activities. Consequently, contextual specificities may well lead Indigenous entrepreneurs to different experiences, opportunities, and entrepreneurial journeys altogether.

Concluding reflections on Indigenous worldviews

Worldviews are relevant to explain what is happening in entrepreneurship. Therefore, paying attention to worldviews could lead us to theories more consistent with the contexts within which entrepreneurs venture. Worldviews are 'complex constellations of ontological presuppositions, epistemic capacities, and ethical and aesthetic values that converge to dynamically organize a synthetic apprehension of the exterior world and one's interior experience' (Hedlund-de Witt 2014, 8315). Accordingly, worldviews encompass comprehensive and idiosyncratic bodies of knowledge and philosophical assumptions for making sense of the world (Hart 2010; Woods, Dell, and Carroll 2021). Nonetheless, despite the overarching nature of worldviews and their 'potential to function as an integrative framework with which to investigate the interaction of beliefs, values, and attitudes' (Hedlund-de Witt 2012, 75), worldviews have been largely neglected in entrepreneurship research.

Throughout this manuscript, I have shown that Indigenous worldviews are significantly different to Western ones. Whether Western worldviews see individuals, objects, different entities and structures as separately and independently existing from one another (de Witt 2015; Hedlund-de Witt 2012), Indigenous worldviews are premised on the notion that 'all things exist in relatedness' (Tynan 2021). These 'relational' worldviews are 'learnt through individual and collective experience, conveyed by oral tradition, and guided by

experiential learning, through close and complex relationships with nature often including both natural and supernatural elements' (Parathian 2019, 28). Given the sustainable and prosocial outcomes among numerous Indigenous ventures worldwide, the adoption of Indigenous worldviews (to some degree or extent) might help Western leaders and businessmen to better face pressing societal concerns (Banerjee and Arjaliès 2021). Adding to this, drawing from worldviews can help us to develop policies better tailored to suit specific and context-sensitive individual's needs. In such a regard, co-envisioning responses from the bottom-up, by acknowledging the agency and different ways of thinking among individuals (Emirbayer and Mische 1998; Wagenschwanz 2021), could lead to more effective public programmes and social interventions. In this sense, the construct of worldviews offers methodological and ontological pluralism (Santos 2012) for capturing the highly subjective and ever-changing nature of social reality.

Final thoughts on relationality

Despite the benefits of positivistic approaches (e.g., parsimony, reliability, replicability, etc.), these perspectives are not always suitable for studying complex, multi-layered phenomena (Czarniawska 2017; Valentinov, Roth, and Will 2019), such as venturing. Especially, one major drawback in mainstream entrepreneurship research is that it often fails to integrate multi-level and interconnected dynamics, drawing an artificial separation between context and venturing (Hernes and Bakken 2003). As a result, plentiful entrepreneurship research is often reduced to comparisons between variables devoid of context.

On the contrary, relational approaches represent an alternative to positivism and the separation between research objects, subjects, and themes (Hosking 2004). Notably, relationality comes in sharp contrast with conventional perspectives that assume entrepreneurship (i.e., a relational process in itself) as separate, disengaged, and independent from context. Indeed, relationality assumes entrepreneurship and context in constant and mutually interacting flux (Gaddefors and Anderson 2017; Steyaert 2007), therefore, rejecting the idea of entrepreneurs as isolated and self-sufficient (Tatli et al. 2014). Consequently, relational perspectives may have better explanatory potential for bringing to light relationships between change and stability, structure and process in ways that are not possible with singular epistemologies (Hosking 2011). Hence, I would argue that relationality could help us move the entrepreneurship field beyond dialectic ordering mechanisms for processing phenomena, into more holistic and comprehensive frameworks and ways of thinking (Klag and Langley 2020; Jack, Plahe, and Wright 2022).

REFERENCES

Alshareef, Sara. 2022. “Does Location Matter? Unpacking the Dynamic Relationship between the Spatial Context and Embeddedness in Women’s Entrepreneurship.” *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 34 (3–4): 294–318. https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2022.2047798.

Anderson, Alistair, Lorraine Warren, and Jo Bensemann. 2019. “Identity, Enactment, and Entrepreneurship Engagement in a Declining Place.” *Journal of Small Business Management* 57 (4): 1559–1577. https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12406.

Athayde, Simone, John Stepp, and Wemerson C. Ballester. 2016. “Engaging Indigenous and Academic Knowledge on Bees in the Amazon: Implications for Environmental Management and Transdisciplinary Research.” *Journal of Ethnobiology and Ethnomedicine* 12 (1): 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13002-016-0093-z.

Baba, Sofiane, and Emilie Fortin-Lefebvre. 2021. “Indigenous Entrepreneurship, Marginal Ontologies, and Sustainable Development Goals.” In *Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure*, edited by W. Filho, A. Azul, L. Brandli, A. Salvia, and T. Wall, Springer N, 542–53. Switzerland AG: Springer Nature.

Baker, Ted, and Friederike Welter. 2020. *Contextualizing Entrepreneurship Theory*. *Contextualizing Entrepreneurship Theory*. Routledge.

Bamberg, Michael, and Alexandra Georgakopoulou. 2008. “Small Stories as a New Perspective in Narrative and Identity Analysis." *Text and Talk* 28 (3): 377–396. http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/text.2008.28.issue3/text.2008.018/text.2008.018.xml

Banerjee, Subhabrata, and Diane-Laure Arjaliès. 2021. “Celebrating the End of Enlightenment: Organization Theory in the Age of the Anthropocene and Gaia (and Why Neither Is the Solution to Our Ecological Crisis).” *Organization Theory* 2 (4): 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1177/26317877211036714.

Becerra, Sandra, María Merino, Andrew Webb, and Daniela Larrañaga. 2018. "Recreated Practices by Mapuche Women That Strengthen Place Identity in New Urban Spaces of Residence in Santiago, Chile." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 41 (7): 1255–1273. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1287416.

Berkes, Fikret. 2018. *Sacred Ecology*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Berkes, Fikret, and Tikaram Adhiraki. 2006. "Development and Conservation: Indigenous Businesses and the UNDP Equator Initiative." *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* 3 (6): 671–690. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJESB.2006.010920.

Brattström, Anna, and Karl Wennberg. 2021. "The Entrepreneurial Story and Its Implications for Research." *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 0 (0): 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1177/10422587211053802.

Bruton, Garry, Shaker Zahra, Andrew Van de Ven, and Michael Hitt. 2021. "Indigenous Theory Uses, Abuses, and Future." *Journal of Management Studies*. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12755.

Cesaroni, Francesca, Annalisa Sentuti, and Maria Pediconi. 2021. "Fading and Transformation: How a Woman Entrepreneur's Multiple Identities Interact throughout Her Life." *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research* 27 (4): 1033–1053. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-04-2020-0239.

Chalmers, Dominic, and Eleanor Shaw. 2017. "The Endogenous Construction of Entrepreneurial Contexts: A Practice-Based Perspective." *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship* 35 (1): 19–39. https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242615589768.

Colbourne, Rick, and Robert Anderson. 2020. *Indigenous Wellbeing and Enterprise: Self-*

Determination and Sustainable Economic Development. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Cooney, Thomas M. 2021. *The Palgrave Handbook of Minority Entrepreneurship*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave.

Croce, Francesca. 2017. "Contextualized Indigenous Entrepreneurial Models: A Systematic Review of Indigenous Entrepreneurship Literature." *Journal of Management and Organization* 23 (6): 886–906. https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2017.69.

Croce, Francesca. 2020. "Indigenous Women Entrepreneurship: Analysis of a Promising Research Theme at the Intersection of Indigenous Entrepreneurship and Women Entrepreneurship." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 43 (6): 1013–1031. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2019.1630659.

Cunningham, James, and Simon Fraser. 2022. "Images of Entrepreneurship: Divergent National Constructions of What It Is to 'Do' Entrepreneurship." *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 00 (00): 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2022.2071997.

Cunningham, James, Lin Xiong, Hina Hashim, and Mohammad Yunis. 2022. "Narrating the 'Social': The Evolving Stories of Pakistan's Social Entrepreneurs." *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 34 (7–8): 668–685. https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2022.2077990.

Czarniawska, Barbara. 2017. "Bruno Latour and Niklas Luhmann as Organization Theorists." *Management Research: European Perspectives* 35: 73–86. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315194394.

Daher, Marianne, Andrea Jaramillo, and Antonia Rosati. 2020. "Opportunities and Tensions in Supporting Intercultural Productive Activities: The Case of Urban and Rural Mapuche Entrepreneurship Programs." *Culture and Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X20908526.

Dana, Leo-Paul. 1995. “Entrepreneurship in a Remote Sub-Arctic Community.” *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 20 (1): 57–72. https://doi.org/10.1177/104225879502000104.

Daspit, Joshua, Corey Fox, and Kyle Findley. 2021. “Entrepreneurial Mindset: An Integrated Definition, a Review of Current Insights, and Directions for Future Research.” *Journal of Small Business Management* 00 (00): 1–33. https://doi.org/10.1080/00472778.2021.1907583.

De la Maza, Francisca. 2016. “State Conceptions of Indigenous Tourism in Chile.” *Annals of Tourism Research* 56: 80–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2015.11.008.

De Witt, Annick. 2015. “Climate Change and the Clash of Worldviews: An Exploration of How to Move Forward in a Polarized Debate.” *Zygon* 50 (4): 906–921. https://doi.org/10.1111/zygo.12226.

De Witt, Annick, Joop de Boer, Nicholas Hedlund, and Patricia Osseweijer. 2016. “A New Tool to Map the Major Worldviews in the Netherlands and USA, and Explore How They Relate to Climate Change.” *Environmental Science and Policy* 63: 101–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2016.05.012.

Diaz, Julian Andrés, Felipe Rifo, Sebastian Barros, and Sergio Rifo. 2022. *Mapping the Research about Organisations in the Latin American Context: A Bibliometric Analysis*. *Management Review Quarterly*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-022-00296-3.

Emirbayer, Mustafa, and Ann Mische. 1998. “What Is Agency?” *American Journal of Sociology* 103 (4): 962–1023. https://doi.org/10.1086/231294.

Forsström-Tuominen, Heidi, Iiro Jussila, and Johanna Kolhinen. 2015. “Business School Students’ Social Construction of Entrepreneurship: Claiming Space for Collective Entrepreneurship Discourses.” *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 31 (1): 102–120.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2014.08.001.

Friant, Martin, Walter Vermeulen, and Roberta Salomone. 2020. “A Typology of Circular Economy Discourses: Navigating the Diverse Visions of a Contested Paradigm.” *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* 161 (2019): 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.104917.

Gaddefors, Johan, and Alistair Anderson. 2017. “Entrepreneursheep and Context: When Entrepreneurship Is Greater than Entrepreneurs.” *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research* 23 (2): 267–278. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-01-2016-0040.

Gaddefors, Johan, and Alistair Anderson. 2019. “Romancing the Rural: Reconceptualizing Rural Entrepreneurship as Engagement with Context(s).” *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation* 20 (3): 159–169. https://doi.org/10.1177/1465750318785545.

Gallagher, Bryan, and Thomas Lawrence. 2012. “Entrepreneurship and Indigenous Identity: A Study of Identity Work by Indigenous Entrepreneurs in British Columbia.” *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* 17 (4): 395–414. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJESB.2012.050162.

Gambon, Helen, and Stephan Rist. 2019. “Worldview Matters: Mosetene Ontology and Resource Use in the Pilón Lajas Indigenous Territory and Biosphere Reserve in the Bolivian Amazon.” *Human Organization* 78 (1): 54–63. https://doi.org/10.17730/0018-7259.78.1.54.

Garreaud, René, Juan Boisier, Roberto Rondanelli, Aldo Montecinos, Hector Sepúlveda, and Daniel Veloso-Aguila. 2020. “The Central Chile Mega Drought (2010–2018): A Climate Dynamics Perspective.” *International Journal of Climatology* 40 (1): 421–439.

https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.6219.

Georgakopoulou, Alexandra. 2016. “From Narrating the Self to Posting Self(Ies): A Small Stories Approach to Selfies.” *Open Linguistics* 2 (1): 300–316. https://doi.org/10.1515/opli-2016-0014.

Gümüsay, Ali, and Juliane Reinecke. 2021. “Researching for Desirable Futures: From Real Utopias to Imagining Alternatives.” *Journal of Management Studies*. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12709.

Hamann, Ralph, John Luiz, Kutlwano Ramaboa, Farzad Khan, Xolisa Dhlamini, and Warren Nilsson. 2020. “Neither Colony Nor Enclave: Calling for Dialogical Contextualism in Management and Organization Studies.” *Organization Theory* 1 (1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2631787719879705.

Harima, Aki. 2022. “Theorizing Disembedding and Re-Embedding: Resource Mobilization in Refugee Entrepreneurship.” *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 34 (3–4): 269–293. https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2022.2047799.

Hart, Michael. 2010. “Indigenous Worldviews, Knowledge, and Research: The Development of an Indigenous Research Paradigm.” *Journal of Indigenous Voices in Social Work*.

Hedlund-de Witt, Annick. 2012. “Exploring Worldviews and Their Relationships to Sustainable Lifestyles: Towards a New Conceptual and Methodological Approach.” *Ecological Economics* 84: 74–83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2012.09.009.

Hedlund-de Witt, Annick. 2014. “Rethinking Sustainable Development: Considering How Different Worldviews Envision ‘Development’ and ‘Quality of Life’” 2012 (2012): 8310–8328. https://doi.org/10.3390/su6118310.

Hernes, Tor, and Tore Bakken. 2003. “Implications of Self-Reference: Niklas Luhmann’s Autopoiesis and Organization Theory.” *Organization Studies* 24 (9): 1511–1535.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840603249007.

Hindle, Kevin, and Peter Moroz. 2010. “Indigenous Entrepreneurship as a Research Field: Developing a Definitional Framework from the Emerging Canon.” *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal* 6 (4): 357–385. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-009-0111-x.

Hlady-Rispal, Martine, Alain Fayolle, and William Gartner. 2021. “In Search of Creative Qualitative Methods to Capture Current Entrepreneurship Research Challenges.” *Journal of Small Business Management* 59 (5): 887–912. https://doi.org/10.1080/00472778.2020.1865541.

Hosking, Dian. 2004. *Relational Constructionism and Entrepreneurship: Some Key Notes*. *Narrative and Discursive Approaches in Entrepreneurship*.

Hosking, Dian. 2011. “Telling Tales of Relations: Appreciating Relational Constructionism.” *Organization Studies* 32 (1): 47–65. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840610394296.

INE (Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas). 2018. https://www.censo2017.cl/descargas/home/sintesis-de-resultados-censo2017.pdf.

Jack, Gavin, Jagjit Plahe, and Sarah Wright. 2022. “Development as Freedom? Insights from a Farmer-Led Sustainable Agriculture Non-Governmental Organisation in the Philippines.” *Human Relations* 75 (10): 1875–1902. https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267221090779.

Johnson, Phil, and Joanne Duberley. 2003. “Reflexivity in Management Research.” *Journal of Management Studies* 40 (5): 1279–1303. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6486.00380.

Jones, Robert, James Latham, and Michela Betta. 2008. “Narrative Construction of the Social Entrepreneurial Identity.” *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research* 14 (5): 330–345. https://doi.org/10.1108/13552550810897687.

Kelly, Dara, and Amber Nicholson. 2022. “Ancestral Leadership: Place-Based Intergenerational Leadership.” *Leadership* 18 (1): 140–161. https://doi.org/10.1177/17427150211024038.

Klag, Malvina, and Ann Langley. 2020. “When Everything Interacts with Everything Else: Intervening in Messes.” *Academy of Management Perspectives*.

Korsgaard, Steffen, Caroline Wigren-Kristoferson, Ethel Brundin, Karin Hellerstedt, Gry Alsos, and Jorunn Grande. 2022. “Entrepreneurship and Embeddedness: Process, Context and Theoretical Foundations.” *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 00 (00): 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2022.2055152.

Larsen, Jenny, Thomas Lauvås, and Roger Sørheim. 2022. “In the Same Boat? The Dynamics of Embedded Firms in Peripheral Regions.” *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 34 (3–4): 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2022.2055151.

Lévesque, Moren, and Ute Stephan. 2020. “It’s Time We Talk About Time in Entrepreneurship.” *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 44 (2): 163–184. https://doi.org/10.1177/1042258719839711.

Macpherson, Wayne, Alexei Tretiakov, Jason Mika, and Christian Felzensztein. 2021. “Indigenous Entrepreneurship: Insights from Chile and New Zealand.” *Journal of Business Research* 127 (2020): 77–84. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.01.013.

Maher, Rajiv, Nicolás Pedemonte-Rojas, Diego Gálvez, and Subhabrata Banerjee. 2023. “The Role of Multistakeholder Initiatives in the Radicalization of Resistance: The Forestry Stewardship Council and the Mapuche Conflict in Chile.” *Journal of Management Studies*. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.13015.

McMullen, Jeffery, Katrina Ingram, and Joel Adams. 2020. “What Makes an Entrepreneurship Study Entrepreneurial? Toward A Unified Theory of Entrepreneurial

Agency." *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1042258720922460.

Morales, Andrés, Sara Calvo, José Guaita, and José Martín. 2021. "Hybrid Forms of Business: Understanding the Development of Indigenous Social Entrepreneurship Practices." *Journal of Business Research* 124 (2020): 212–222. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.11.060.

Müller, Sabine, and Steffen Korsgaard. 2018. "Resources and Bridging: The Role of Spatial Context in Rural Entrepreneurship." *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 30 (1–2): 224–255. https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2017.1402092.

Muñoz, Pablo, and Jonathan Kimmitt. 2018. "Entrepreneurship and the Rest: The Missing Debate." *Journal of Business Venturing Insights* 9 (3): 100–106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2018.03.003.

Muñoz, Pablo, and Jonathan Kimmitt. 2019. "Rural Entrepreneurship in Place: An Integrated Framework." *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 31 (9–10): 842–873. https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2019.1609593.

Muñoz, Pablo, Jonathan Kimmitt, and Ben Spigel. 2023. "Trans-Contextual Work: Doing Entrepreneurial Contexts in the Periphery." *Small Business Economics*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-023-00772-4.

Murphy, Matthew, Wade Danis, Johnny Mack, and Judith Sayers. 2020. "From Principles to Action: Community-Based Entrepreneurship in the Toquaht Nation." *Journal of Business Venturing* 35 (6). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2020.106051.

Newbert, Scott, Romi Kher, and Shu Yang. 2022. "Now That's Interesting and Important! Moving beyond Averages to Increase the Inferential Value of Empirical Findings in Entrepreneurship Research." *Journal of Business Venturing* 37 (2).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2021.106185.

Nowak, Vicky, and Paola Raffaelli. 2022. “The Interconnected Influences of Institutional and Social Embeddedness on Processes of Social Innovation: A Polanyian Perspective.” *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 34 (3–4): 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2022.2049376.

Padilla-Meléndez, Antonio, Juan Plaza-angulo, Ana Del-Aguila-Obra, and Antonio Ciruela. 2022. “Indigenous Entrepreneurship. Current Issues and Future Lines Indigenous Entrepreneurship. Current Issues and Future Lines.” *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 00 (00): 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2021.2011962.

Parathian, Hannah. 2019. “Understanding Cosmopolitan Communities in Protected Areas: A Case Study from the Colombian Amazon.” *Conservation and Society* 17 (1): 26–37. https://doi.org/10.4103/cs.cs_18_49.

Parhankangas, Annaleena, and Rick Colbourne. 2022. “Indigenous Entrepreneurship and Venture Creation : A Typology of Indigenous Crowdfunding Campaigns” 0 (0): 1–43. https://doi.org/10.1177/10422587221096907.

Peredo, Ana. 2023. “The Unsettling Potential of Indigenous Organizing.” *Organization* 30 (6): 1211–1221. https://doi.org/10.1177/13505084231189263.

Peredo, Ana, and Murdith McLean. 2013. “Indigenous Development and the Cultural Captivity of Entrepreneurship.” *Business and Society* 52 (4): 592–620. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650309356201.

Persaud, Anthony, Harry Nelson, and Terre Satterfield. 2021. “Reconciling Institutional Logics Within First Nations Forestry-Based Social Enterprises.” *Organization and Environment*. https://doi.org/10.1177/10860266211042659.

Pidduck, Robert, and Daniel Clark. 2021. “Transitional Entrepreneurship: Elevating

Research into Marginalized Entrepreneurs." *Journal of Small Business Management* 59 (6): 1081–1096. https://doi.org/10.1080/00472778.2021.1928149.

Pio, Edwina, and Sandra Waddock. 2021. "Invoking Indigenous Wisdom for Management Learning." *Management Learning* 52 (3): 328–346. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507620963956.

Plakoyiannaki, Emmanuella, Tian Wei, and Shameen Prashantham. 2019. "Rethinking Qualitative Scholarship in Emerging Markets: Researching, Theorizing, and Reporting." *Management and Organization Review* 15 (2): 217–234. https://doi.org/10.1017/mor.2019.27.

Radu-Lefebvre, Miruna, Vincent Lefebvre, Eliana Crosina, and Ulla Hytti. 2021. "Entrepreneurial Identity: A Review and Research Agenda." *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 45 (6): 1550–1590. https://doi.org/10.1177/10422587211013795.

Ramírez-Cendrero, Juan, Santiago García, and Alejandro Santillán. 2017. "Sumak Kawsay in Ecuador: The Role of Communitarian Economy and the Experience of the Rural Communities in Sarayaku (Ecuadorian Amazonia)." *Journal of Rural Studies* 53 (6): 111–121. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2017.05.018.

Redhead, George, and Zografia Bika. 2022. "'Adopting Place': How an Entrepreneurial Sense of Belonging Can Help Revitalise Communities." *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 34 (3–4): 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2022.2049375.

Salmon, Emily, Juan Chavez, and Matthew Murphy. 2021. "New Perspectives and Critical Insights from Indigenous Peoples' Research: A Systematic Review of Indigenous Management and Organization Literature." *Academy of Management Annals*.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2012. "Public Sphere and Epistemologies of the South." *Africa Development* 37 (1): 43–67.

Scheyvens, Regina, Anna Carr, Apisalome Movono, Emma Hughes, Freya Higgins-Desbiolles, and Jason Mika. 2021. “Indigenous Tourism and the Sustainable Development Goals.” *Annals of Tourism Research* 90. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2021.103260.

Schneider, Bettina, and Bob Kayseas. 2018. “Indigenous Qualitative Research.” In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Business and Management Research Methods: History and Traditions*, 154–172. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Sharma, Garima, Angela Greco, Sylvia Grewatsch, and Pratima Bansal. 2022. “Cocreating Forward: How Researchers and Managers Can Address Problems Together.” *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 21 (3): 350–368. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2021.0233.

Shepherd, Dean, Karl Wennberg, Roy Suddaby, and Johan Wiklund. 2019. “What Are We Explaining? A Review and Agenda on Initiating, Engaging, Performing, and Contextualizing Entrepreneurship.” *Journal of Management* 45 (1): 159–196. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318799443.

Shirokova, Galina, Tatiana Beliaeva, and Tatiana Manolova. 2022. “The Role of Context for Theory Development: Evidence From Entrepreneurship Research on Russia.” *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*. https://doi.org/10.1177/10422587221138226.

Smith, Linda. 2020. *Decolonizing Methodologies*. *Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Stewart, Daniel, Amy Verbos, Carolyn Birmingham, Stephanie Black, and Joseph Gladstone. 2017. “Being Native American in Business: Culture, Identity, and Authentic Leadership in Modern American Indian Enterprises.” *Leadership* 13 (5): 549–570. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715016634182.

Steyaert, Chris. 2007. "'Entrepreneuring' as a Conceptual Attractor? A Review of Process Theories in 20 Years of Entrepreneurship Studies." *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 19 (6): 453–477. https://doi.org/10.1080/08985620701671759.

Tatli, Ahu, Joana Vassilopoulou, Mustafa Özbilgin, Cynthia Forson, and Natasha Slutskaya. 2014. "A Bourdieuan Relational Perspective for Entrepreneurship Research." *Journal of Small Business Management* 52 (4): 615–632. https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12122.

Tynan, Lauren. 2021. "What Is Relationality? Indigenous Knowledges, Practices and Responsibilities with Kin." *Cultural Geographies* 28 (4): 597–610. https://doi.org/10.1177/14744740211029287.

Valentinov, Vladislav, Steffen Roth, and Matthias Will. 2019. "Stakeholder Theory: A Luhmannian Perspective." *Administration and Society* 51 (5): 826–849. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399718789076.

Van Burg, Elco, Joep Cornelissen, Wouter Stam, and Sarah Jack. 2022. "Advancing Qualitative Entrepreneurship Research: Leveraging Methodological Plurality for Achieving Scholarly Impact." *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 46 (1): 3–20. https://doi.org/10.1177/1042258720943051.

Vanhulst, Julien, and Adrian Beling. 2014. "Buen Vivir: Emergent Discourse within or beyond Sustainable Development?" *Ecological Economics* 101: 54–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2014.02.017.

Vedula, Siddharth, Claudia Doblinger, Desirée Pacheco, Jeffrey York, Sophie Bacq, Michael Russo, and Thomas Dean. 2022. "Entrepreneurship for the Public Good: A Review, Critique, and Path Forward for Social and Environmental Entrepreneurship Research." *Academy of Management Annals* 16 (1): 391–425. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2019.0143.

Villalba-Eguiluz, Unai, and Iker Etxano. 2017. “Buen Vivir vs Development (II): The Limits of (Neo-)Extractivism.” *Ecological Economics* 138: 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2017.03.010.

Wagenschwanz, Anna. 2021. “The Identity of Entrepreneurs: Providing Conceptual Clarity and Future Directions.” *International Journal of Management Reviews* 23 (1): 64–84. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12241.

Welter, Friederike. 2011. “Contextualizing Entrepreneurship—Conceptual Challenges and Ways Forward.” *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 35 (1): 165–184. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2010.00427.x.

Welter, Friederike, and Ted Baker. 2021. “Moving Contexts Onto New Roads: Clues From Other Disciplines.” *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 45 (5): 1154–1175. https://doi.org/10.1177/1042258720930996.

Welter, Friederike, Ted Baker, and Katharine Wirsching. 2019. “Three Waves and Counting: The Rising Tide of Contextualization in Entrepreneurship Research.” *Small Business Economics* 52 (2): 319–330. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-018-0094-5.

Wigren-Kristoferson, Caroline, Ethel Brundin, Karin Hellerstedt, Anna Stevenson, and Maria Aggestam. 2022. “Rethinking Embeddedness: A Review and Research Agenda.” *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 34 (1–2): 32–56. https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2021.2021298.

Wilson, Shawn. 2008. *Research Is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Woods, Christine, Kiri Dell, and Brigid Carroll. 2021. “Decolonizing the Business School: Reconstructing the Entrepreneurship Classroom Through Indigenous Pedagogy and Learning.” *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 21 (1): 82–100.

https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2020.0366.

Wright, April, Gemma Irving, Asma Zafar, and Trish Reay. 2022. “The Role of Space and Place in Organizational and Institutional Change: A Systematic Review of the Literature.” *Journal of Management Studies*. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12868.