Being Native American in Business:
Culture, Identity, and Authentic Leadership in Modern American Indian Enterprises

Forthcoming in <u>Leadership</u>

Daniel Stewart
Gonzaga University

Amy Klemm Verbos
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

Stephanie L. Black
University at Albany

Carolyn Birmingham
Independent Scholar

Joseph Scott Gladstone
New Mexico State University

Daniel Stewart, PhD, is a Professor of Entrepreneurship at Gonzaga University. He is an enrolled member of the Spokane Tribe of Indians.

Amy Klemm Verbos, JD, PhD, is an Assistant Professor of Business Law at the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater. She is an enrolled citizen of the Pokagon Band of Potawatomi.

Carolyn Birmingham, PhD, is an independent scholar and member of the Ojibwe Nation.

Greetings. I am Stephanie L. Black (Life Science & Entrepreneurship, Business School, University at Albany, NY). I belong to the Santee Sioux tribe.

Joseph Gladstone, PhD, is an enrolled member of the Blackfeet Tribe, a Nez Perce descendant, an Assistant Professor of Public Health Administration at New Mexico State University, and an affiliate faculty with the NMSU Indian Resource Development Program.

Being Native American in Business:
Culture, Identity, and Authentic Leadership in Modern American Indian Enterprises

Abstract

Tribally-owned American Indian enterprises provide a unique cross-cultural setting for emerging Native American business leaders. This paper examines the manner in which American Indian leaders negotiate the boundaries between their indigenous organizations and the non-indigenous communities in which they do business. Through a series of qualitative interviews, we find that American Indian business leaders fall back on a strong sense of "self", which allows them to maintain effective leadership across boundaries. This is highly consistent with theories of authentic leadership. Furthermore, we find that leaders define self through their collective identity, which is heavily influenced by tribal affiliation and tribal culture. We add to the literature on authentic leadership by showing the role that culture and collective identity have in creating leader authenticity within the indigenous community.

Keywords: Native American, leadership, authentic leadership, collective identity, American Indian, culture, international business leadership

History is replete with stories about American Indian[1] leaders; many are honored in American culture. For example, Osceola is popular in Florida for his efforts to protect his territory from colonists (Hatch, 2012). Crazy Horse is well known for his bravery in battle and

---

[1] Throughout this paper we will use a variety of terms to describe the indigenous inhabitants of North America. We do so out of respect for the variety of preferences for self-identification. Indian Country is a diverse culture scattered throughout the United States. Some indigenous Americans prefer the historical term *American Indian* while others prefer *Native American*. Native people also prefer the term *indigenous* while others are satisfied with the older *Indian*. Our own experiences reveal that this variety is distributed across individual Native people regardless of age, gender, tribal affiliation, reservation based, or urban based. We assume that some readers identify as Native, and we make every attempt to honor and respect their identifying term. Of course, for readers unfamiliar with Native cultural nuances, the most appropriate term used to classify any Native person is by that person's specific tribe, and there are far too many (>700) to list in this report, or by their word for "the people" in their own language (e.g., Anishinaabe for the Odawa and Ojibwe peoples). For a deeper philosophical understanding of these terms and their understanding by indigenous North American people, refer to Gerald Vizenor (1994).

his diligence in protecting his identity (Marshall, 2005). Geronimo is famous for using a deep knowledge of his homeland to confuse the U.S. cavalry and stave foreign settlement into his tribal territory (Debo, 1976). Sitting Bull is known for his political skill and military prowess (Utley, 2014). Chief Seattle of the Duwamish cautioned the new settlers in his homeland about the necessity of showing respect for the environment (Furtwangler, 2012). The Nez Perce leader Chief Joseph was well known for eloquently speaking in favor of racial equality and freedom for Native Americans (Gunther, 2010). One of the dominant guiding principles of his actions was tribal loyalty (Humphreys, Ingram, Kernek, 2007).

Native American leadership today has evolved to reflect contemporary challenges faced by Native people that have been confined to rural enclaves, controlled by federal government agencies, and subjected to policies aimed at destroying their cultures (Edmunds, 2004). Today, new Native American leaders have emerged; responding to these challenges and seizing opportunities to create better lives for their people.

Native Americans are geographically dispersed throughout the U.S., linguistically diverse, and culturally varied. The hundreds of tribal nations are politically distinct and separately recognized as sovereign by the federal government. Native Americans have to "build bridges across linguistic, cultural, regional, class, and even color differences" (Nagel, 1997:8) to interact in dominant U.S. culture. Native American community leaders exhibit flexibility in order to create synergies between their tribes' and the dominant U.S. culture. A push for tribal sovereignty, a tribal community's ability "to control its own political, social, economic, and religious life" (Edmunds, 2004: 6), ushered in the self-determination era. A shift in U.S. policy toward tribal sovereignty in the 1970s provided opportunities for Native economic business

development to enhance tribal economies (Grant and Taylor, 2007). This new sovereign era has led to business leaders emerging within the broader Native American community.

Business Leaders Navigating Across and Between Cultures

Corporate leadership concerns in a Native American context differs because not only does an American Indian business leader need to effectively run a company, he or she also needs to bridge the divide between two cultures – his or her Native culture and that of the dominant U.S. (business) culture.

While there are different definitions of culture, most researchers tend to accept Hofstede's definition (Myers and Tan, 2003). People share a collective character that constitutes their cultural mental programming, and shapes their values, beliefs, assumptions, expectations, perceptions and behavior (Hofstede, 1980). Thus an individual's national culture influences societal rules for behavior and the primary differences between different national cultures stem from national values (Hofstede and Hofstede, 2005).

The importance of national culture with respect to management leadership is described by Hofstede (1980), Dorfman and House (2004), and House et al. (2004). The general consensus from this research is that national cultural identity and societal demands affect how people from that culture think about leadership style and that cultural beliefs and values influence a society's definition of effective leadership. The Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) studies (House et al., 2004) are a collection of longitudinal studies in 62 countries that examine the influences of national and organizational culture on organizational leadership. The GLOBE studies highlight the differences across cultures on nine cultural values and document that national culture and leadership are interdependent organizational dimensions where culture influences leadership.

Dorfman and House (2004) argue that cultural influences on leadership influence expected leader behaviors. Research suggests that national cultures create different views on desired leadership qualities and these differences are tightly coupled to cultural characteristics rather than being universal (Dorfman et al., 2012). Consistent with Hofstede's cultural model, Redpath and Nielson (1997) found that Canadian Native cultures are very different than the dominant Canadian culture and tend to be more collectivist, tolerant, egalitarian, and adaptive. As US Native American tribes are sovereign nations within a nation and their cultures differ markedly from U.S. national culture, it is likely that differences are reflected in Native American management leadership behaviors as well.

The study of leadership often has a Western cultural bias (House and Aditya, 1997; Hofstede, 1993). Scholars have preferred to study leadership behavior from a Western perspective while focusing on organizational performance as a key driver. The management literature documents the value of leadership in the development of human capital, implementation of change, and successful performance within organizations (Deming, 1992). Management scholars have also studied leaders who follow their values, e.g. transformational leaders, who help implement change by maximizing the talents of others and being sensitive to the needs of individuals (Burns,1978), servant leaders who value helping others (Greenleaf,1977; Wilkes, 1996); and authentic leaders who follow their values (Luthans and Avolio, 2003).

We contend that USA Native American cultural values affect leadership style, especially when practiced in a Native American business context. As Redpath and Nielson (1997) observe, Canadian Native American management of a criminal justice facility reflects the core values of Native culture in managerial practices, even though the organization utilizes dominant cultural management, accounting and legal structures, systems, and procedures. Cultural differences,

5

derived from Native values and culture explain these unique management practices and unique organizational structures (Redpath and Nielson, 1997). There is a need to examine this bridge between two cultures in USA Native American tribal enterprise leadership.

There have been few empirical studies of Native American leaders, and none focus exclusively on top level Native American business executives. Julien et al. (2010) interviewed both Canadian aboriginal community and business leaders. They found distinctions in how Canadian Native Americans view leadership and behave as leaders. In particular, Canadian Native American leaders tend to be more holistic, spiritual and less profit driven; have a future-oriented, long term perspective rather than focus primarily on short term results; and work to serve the needs of the community (Julien et al., 2010). They see themselves as embedded[2] in a community and the entire community matters, not just the entity where they are a leader. In addition, business leaders are concerned with employee-employer relationships and are interested in the overall well-being of their employees (Julien et al., 2010).

This paper focuses on the effects of American Indian cultures on the collective (social) identity of leaders who work across cultural boundaries, interplay between Native American identity and leadership. Collective identity is a subjective claim of a shared common characteristic such as race or ethnicity (Ashmore et al., 2004). Because tribal businesses operate, in some respects, as multinational/multicultural companies, it is necessary for tribal business leaders to be able to bridge the divide between tribal expectations and those of the dominant, non-indigenous culture in order to be successful.

There are many research questions this raises. For example, how do these business leaders negotiate their identities as Native American people in the context of tribal enterprises? Do they bring their American Indian identities to work? If so, how do they express that identity?

---

[2] By embedded, we mean that the person considers himself or herself to be an integral part of the tribal community.

Alternatively, do they step in and out of their Native identities, being Indian at times and not being Indian at other times? Do they adopt Western notions of leadership? When is Native American culture a positive resource for their leadership? A liability? What leadership theory, if any, best explains their leadership styles? These questions led to this research.

Methods

In order better understand Native American business leadership we conducted a qualitative multiple case study. Stake (1995) argues that case studies are intrinsic, instrumental, and collective as well appropriate for unique situations. Yin (2003) contends that multiple case studies can be used to either, "(a) predict similar results or (b) predict contrasting results but for predictable reasons" (p.47). Also, case studies allow researchers to achieve high levels of conceptual validity, are advantageous in conducting field work, and in exploring causal mechanisms (George & Bennet, 2005).

We use a qualitative approach in our analysis, which is considered to be an appropriate method for conducting case study analysis (Patton, 1990; Yin, 2003). Moreover, for purposes of this study, we chose to primarily focus on Native American leaders who are responsible for managing aspects of tribally owned enterprises. These individuals were chosen due to their direct interactions with the tribe and more intimate knowledge of tribal practices. By examining various Native Americans working in tribally owned enterprises, our goal is to provide a better understanding of Native American leadership practices and enhance the data credibility (Patton, 1990; Yin, 2003).

This study took place over a one year time period from 2013 to 2014, and was conducted by researchers of Native American status. In endeavoring to locate subjects, our initial research found that non-Native business executives run many of the tribal owned enterprises. Moreover,

we were unable to find female leaders within our population, which is a limitation of this study. Nevertheless, we located and interviewed six self-identified male Native Americans who all hold top-level leadership positions in tribal enterprises. Of the participants, Two respondents currently hold leadership positions as the Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) of their respective tribes' holding companies (companies that own a portfolio of businesses); another recently left a Chief Operating Officer (COO) position to become President of a portfolio company; the fourth is a Chief Financial Officer (CFO) of such a holding company; the fifth directs business and property development for his tribe; and the sixth is the recent Chairman of the Board for his tribe's economic development company.

Pursuant to IRB policies and regulations at the respective universities of the researchers, the anonymity of the participants was protected. Moreover, the researchers determined that anonymity was appropriate given the sensitive nature of the interviews and concerns that past studies of Native Americans have been not well received by many Native Americans, who believe that they are viewed with prejudice and mistreatment by the broader society (Doble, Yarrow, Ott & Rochkind, 2007). Therefore, for the study each participant was given a pseudonym to protect his or her anonymity. For this reason, we also do not identify the specific tribes. Participants are from various parts of the United States, including the Northwest, the Plains, the Midwest, and the Southwest. This information is summarized in Table 1. Our participants range from Paul, who was raised outside of tribal culture, to Mark, whose great grandfather was a long-serving tribal chairman, and who was steeped in his tribal culture from birth.

Table 1. Participants

Pseudonym	Position	U.S. Region

Matthew	CEO	Midwest
Jordan	COO	Midwest
Paul	CFO	Plains
Justin	Property Development Director	Northwest
Mark	Board Chairman	Northwest
George	CEO	Southwest

We interviewed the leaders in person or by telephone, asking twelve open-ended questions that pertain to identity, leadership, and their careers.[3] The questions are set forth in Appendix 1. The goal of the open-ended questions is to identify the extent to which the collective identity as an American Indian ties into leadership in tribally-owned business enterprises. Researchers used a recording device and then transcribed the data. Recordings were erased immediately after transcription to protect participant identities and ensure the confidentiality of the interviews.

In the data analysis, the research team integrated a process of reflection whereby the researchers conducted a peer examination of the data to insure credibility and consistency of the findings (Krefting, 1991).

Native American Identity: Being Indian and Not Being Indian

We began by investigating the extent to which a Native American identity ties into leadership practiced by American Indians in tribally-owned business enterprises. By confining our research to those who (1) are members of a U.S. American Indian tribe, and (2) work as

---

[3] At the same time, leaders were interviewed 24 additional questions about strategy and ethics were asked, but those questions did not pertain to this analysis. The data used for this paper is separate from, and has not been included in, any other paper to be produced from the interviews.

leaders in tribally owned business ventures, we did not broach the topic of how identity is constructed. We are more focused on the psychological rather than sociological aspects of identity.

Theoretical approaches to social identity assume that an individual constructs identity through interpretive processes, and that these constructions have important implications for how individuals feel, behave and evolve (Howard, 2000). Ashmore et al. (2004) define collective identity as a psychological concept of an identity that is shared with a group of others who have some common characteristic such as gender or ethnicity, and that identity is "a *subjective* claim or acceptance by the person whose identity is at stake" (p. 81). Collective identity is the term that Ashmore et al. (2004), among others, advocate providing a better characterization than "social identity" (Tajfel and Turner, 1979; Thoits and Virshup, 1997). They ascribe the following elements to collective identity: self-categorization, evaluation (both public regard and private regard), importance (implicit and explicit), attachment and sense of interdependence, social embeddedness, behavioral involvement, and content and meaning (consisting of self-attributed characteristics, ideology, and narratives). Across our interviews with Native American business leaders, each of these elements is apparent.

Self-categorization is "identifying self as a member of, or categorizing self in terms of, a particular social grouping" (Ashmore et al., 2004: 84). All of our participants identified themselves as American Indian. It should be noted that each of the leaders interviewed has membership in a different tribe, and that of the 566 federally recognized U.S. tribes (BIA, 2015), and, as sovereign nations, each of them has established its own criteria for membership.[4] And, a

---

[4] Qualifications are usually established in tribal constitutions and have been approved by the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs. Membership requirements are based either in "blood-quantum", the degree of tribal blood, genetic descent, that an individual possess, or in simple lineage.

few of our interviewees mentioned that they are of mixed blood, but identify strongly as Native American.

The collective identity element of *evaluation* was present when we asked each participant to identify traditional American Indian values including what makes a person an Indian. The diverse answers, all positive, suggest positive private evaluations by our participants. Jordan states:

> ... traditional values would be honoring the tribe, honoring our sovereign nation, protecting the sovereignty of our tribe. Having pride in what we do, looking to seven generations, really focusing on our future and what we leave behind, and how we handle our assets and our responsibilities. Having a reverence with and a respect for that tribal government process, and the way that we do things.

Matthew referred to the importance of the tribe's Seven Grandfather Teachings and the ethical grounding that the teachings provide. The Seven Grandfather Teachings are taught to tribal members through an ancient story that is a part of the oral tradition of certain tribes and teaches human responsibilities about how to behave toward others and all of creation (Verbos and Humphries, 2014). This philosophy is shared among many tribes. Mark referenced how you treat others, including family and others in the tribe. This includes giving and not expecting something in return, along with who you are in your heart. Justin expressed that what makes a person Indian is different for each person, but that it is grounded in the community and a desire to understand and support their culture.

Congruent with the element of collective identity called *importance*,[5] we asked each participant how deeply he identifies as being Native. To Jordan, the answer was simple, "Very

---

[5] Ashmore et al. (2004) define importance as "The degree of importance of a particular group membership to the individual's overall self-concept" (p. 83).

much so, I consider myself Native in everything that I do." The question seemed to be a bit more difficult for those of mixed race and for those who were not raised in the Native culture, as they provided long answers that indicated that they live in two worlds. To Mark, the tribal side of his family *is* his family. This is in part because his white grandparents had passed early. Matthew wonders at times whether he is worthy to participate in tribal ceremonies, though others assure him that he is. Although he socializes with his tribe, he just as easily socializes with his non-Native relatives and friends. To Justin, being Native American is one of several identities, but salient in part due to his work.

> I identify myself as being Native American; I will say that being only twenty-five percent probably plays a role on identifying myself as other things as well. So I see myself as a mixture of diverse backgrounds. The Native side is probably predominantly the one I get to express in myself a lot more than others, for one because I work for the tribe.

Paul told a story about how his eyes were opened to his Native identity through his work at the holding company of another tribe. Moreover, it became a bridge when visitors came from his tribe. Then, he was invited to be on the economic development board for his tribe. Thus, through his leadership role in a tribally-owned organization, he reconnected to a dormant identity that has since become salient.

George shares how he grew up hearing tribal stories from his grandfather, a traditional man, who raised him. He then went to college utilizing a tribal scholarship before being invited by his tribe to manage the tribe's economic development, a job he accepted over a traditional management trainee position he had been offered in a dominant culture company.

The above examples demonstrate that *social embeddedness* as an element of collective identity is key for these leaders working on behalf of their respective tribes. Another example of social embeddedness is the tribal council, which is the governing body for each sovereign tribal nation, generally led by a Tribal Chair or Governor. Members are democratically elected. George, Matthew and Mark (above) served on their tribal councils and Mark was tribal chairman for 2 years, indicating a strong degree of embeddedness. Paul began his career in tribal businesses as the least embedded but, as noted above, he reconnected and is building strong ties in his own tribe through his work for a different tribe. He acknowledges that his heritage helped him to attain the CFO position, in addition to his academic background with a Master of Accountancy degree. It is clear throughout the interview that this made him curious about where he came from and about his tribe, and that he finds enjoyment in visiting his reservation and feeling connected there. It is clear that the leaders who overtly mentioned being of mixed blood felt a strong, but lesser degree, of *attachment*[6] than the leaders who did not mention whether or not they were mixed blood. This may be because they have multiple racial/cultural identities.

The leaders in our study manifest the *behavioral involvement* element of collective identity in a few different ways. We asked three questions which related to involvement. First, we asked under what circumstances the leader projects his Native American identity in his leadership. Second, we asked for the circumstances under which he does not project Native American identity. Finally, we asked what American Indian traditions[7] he practices in his leadership. Justin shares his desire to blend into his surroundings, but maintain his identity:

> I'm a blend of a lot of different things but, you can see parts of me that are rural,
>
> traditional Native American with leadership in those regards...city, urban,

[6] Attachment is defined by Ashmore et al. (2004) as "the emotional involvement felt with a group" (p. 83).
[7] Traditions are tribal practices that have been handed down across the ages such as gifting, smudging, prayers, etc.

conforming type of leadership models and traits. What I try to do is follow the

old "when in Rome" kind of ideology. I try to assimilate myself into someone

else's shoes when I'm around them but I always try to give them a context for

who I am and where I've come from, too. I don't always acquiesce to everything.

I tend to try to bring my history with me a little bit and to wear who I am on my

sleeve, as well.

To some extent, his mixed race leads him to feel "not Indian enough" when he is speaking to

members of other tribes, mentioning that he feels they might be thinking that the 'white guy'

claims to be Indian, too. Jordan expresses his Native American identity at times through such

things as using his tribal language in greetings, giving Pendleton blankets, sharing tobacco,

occasionally wearing ribbon shirts, and the like. He doesn't believe he turns off his Native

American identity with respect to his leadership, because he is proud of it. "Even in those

difficult HR meetings when you are having to make personnel decisions and when meeting with

council, you are still using that foundation to help us make those decisions."

Regarding Native American identity, Matthew responds that:

There is not a time when I feel I have to tuck that away. In fact, the more

confident, the more we work, I get the more we do as [company name], the more

we grow, the more confident I am in who we are and it just never becomes an

issue for me.

In his work week, he sets aside a time for reflection while burning sage. In addition, Matthew

states:

We bring that into our board meetings with our invocations, our prayers to the

Creator, our sharing of tobacco when we are asking to spend time with someone,

to have them maybe rest with us or speak to us and that's a critical part of what

we do. Another thing that I recently started that I thought was important…I told

[president of a major customer] that I would like to extend a tribal gift to them the

next time that we meet with them—something handmade by our tribal citizens.

Mark feels that identity shows through by participating in cultural activities and by consideration

for cultural practices when running the business. Specifically, he cites the example of giving

more bereavement leave in accordance with the local tribal custom of spending weeks (not days)

with family.

George states that, although he runs his companies as for-profit economic enterprises, his

Native American values are the basis for how he behaves as a leader. On the other hand, George

believes

...you had to go out and learn at the time what they called "the white man's way."

And you need to learn the white man's way for two reasons: One, that you can

provide yourself a good quality life, but number two, do you understand how they

do things so you can come home and be defenders for us [tribe name]. You can

protect our way of life from a lot of things that aren't right.

While he recognizes the need to honor Native American traditions, he feels that this should

happen outside of the business context. He also believes that "you have to look at tribal

principles to define what is sacred and what is not sacred" and to not exploit what is sacred to the

tribe. As a result, unlike some tribes, he does not allow tribal symbolism, sacred tribal images,

customs, ceremonies, etc. to be used in the business setting.

Because he was raised outside of the culture, Paul doesn't incorporate any Native

traditions into management practice. "I'll be honest, I have almost zero traditional knowledge. I

have more of a heart for the people than I would have in practicing traditional Native-type things."

As someone who is mixed race and looks white, Justin tries physically or verbally to let people know he is Native:

I'm proud, I'm proud of it, I'm proud of my history. Most people that know me have come to know that I am Native or have Native background...I'm not the kind of person that says I see myself as Native only. I see myself as lot of things, but I take great pride in seeing myself as being Native where I can.

Still, Justin does not integrate Native traditions into his leadership practices on any consistent basis, partly because (amongst other businesses) he runs a mainstream business franchise and has to conform to expected contractual franchise practices, some of which are not consistent with Native cultural behaviors. He accommodates some Native employee cultural needs. However, he also finds he needs to educate his Native employees about expected franchise (dominant culture) behaviors and why they need to conform.

When asked about projecting his Native identity into leadership, Mark stated that: With me, [it is] just in cultural activities...I think leaders need to be there for their people and also need to pass down traditions that were handed down to them. A real leader needs to be there in time of need. They are there for people. I think that is a cultural thing that I kind of push myself into. So, my traditions go into leadership because I think you need to be there when people need you because those people will be there for you when you need them.

Mark also incorporates hymns and prayers in his tribe's native language when helping people in need. In addition, he believes that "just speaking from your heart is the only thing that I would say probably comes across as that Native American type leadership."

Viola Cordova, of the Jicarilla Apache, describes Native philosophy as "being from a place and community, of knowing a place and respecting its boundaries" (Peters, in Cordova, 2007, p. ix). Cordova's credo reflects beliefs she attributes to many Native Americans, including the ability to adapt through changeable behavior and, foremost, a collective identity she describes as a "herd being" (2007, p. 151). Yet a herd being does not mean that there is a herd mentality. Individual identities are recognized among tribes, but these individual identities equate to high responsibilities *to the tribe* (2007). This is a value of active relationships. Individuality is not isolated, but requires participation with the world, as evidenced by these American Indian leaders who bring their collective identities, culture, and Native American values into their leadership positions.

While each respondent expresses it somewhat differently, we found that, for most leaders, indigenous identity appears to be reinforced and enhanced by working in a tribal enterprise. Except for one, they don't try to separate their cultural identity from their leadership behavior. Even the one who does (George) still believes that his Native culture and identity are the foundation of his leadership. This is consistent with the branch of identity theory that defines identity as self-meaning that is developed through roles (Stryker and Burke, 2000). In the present cases, these roles include family roles through which tribal cultural knowledge is transmitted, as well as work roles in tribal enterprises.

Native American Identity and Leadership

17

Previous studies postulate that prototypical leaders within a social group will be more trusted and recognized by followers than non-prototypical leaders (Hogg, van Knippenberg, Rast, 2012; Stewart and Martin, 2008). The social identity theory of leadership focuses on the match between individual leader traits and group traits (Hogg et al., 2012; Steffens, Haslam, Reicher, 2014; van Knippenberg, 2011). We asked about the extent to which respondents feel a typical Native American leadership style differs from mainstream leadership styles, as well as the extent to which his leadership style matches a typical Native American leadership style. Across the interviews, the majority of our participants express that Native American leaders are more informal and concerned about people and less about the bottom line than mainstream leaders. For example, Jordan states:

> You know mainstream, they have the ability to be more self-centered, more autocratic, more profit driven and shareholder driven, much more top down. Whereas with a tribe it can be much more community involvement, more collaborative.

Justin elaborates a bit from a perspective on tribal chairmen that:

> ...I think more so than just representing the people they truly care about the people. They know their decision plays a role on the future of their culture and things like that at the more micro-level than mainstream leadership styles. So from that, there's a little bit more of a personal obligation to preserve what you have going forward. That is different from mainstream leadership styles. Most native leaders have a context of history, present and future, whereas I would see a lot of mainstream leaders focusing mostly on the present and future. So having

that additional context or layer is what differentiates them from mainstream

leadership styles.

Paul states that in his experience Native leaders differ from mainstream:

I think there is more of informality with things, there is more of a relaxed nature

about things. And I have seen it be more successful than the traditional. Again, I

keep using the term cut-throat, where people are just a number and people are

just something on a financial statement. More understanding that behind the

person, there is a family, there is a person with goals and aspirations, and helping

them to become better and be successful.

Consistent with what Paul says, our respondents are concerned with their employees, both on the

job and with respect to what is happening in other roles in their lives, especially with family

responsibilities and tribal involvement. This is in contrast to the dominant cultural approach of

separating work and family roles (cf. Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985).

We thought that we might find American Indian leaders following a situational pattern in

which leaders match their behaviors with the environment in which they are operating (tribal or

non-tribal). However, our respondents' answers suggest the relationship between tribal culture

and leadership is more complex than a simple dichotomous categorization. For a social identity

theory of leadership to hold, discrete social categories must be present. For our respondents, the

boundary between indigenous and non-indigenous cultures is blurred. For example, George

states:

A lot of times we don't realize that what we're doing is really part of someone

else's culture, it's not part of our culture. But we just kind of adapted it to our

practices. In the Native American community, we have been influenced so much

by outside cultures. We have adopted a lot of foreign cultures so that sometimes

we ourselves don't know what [tribe name] cultures are, or principles are.

Justin also reiterates this difficulty:

Sometimes you don't know what your true identity is...it's tough being in

the middle sometimes.

For a few respondents, dual cultures lead to dual leadership styles. For instance, Justin

claims that he follows a "when in Rome" strategy, assimilating around others. Matthew, leader

of a holding company, states, "I think the leadership styles differ based on those who are led."

George, states that it is sometimes hard to balance tribal needs with the financial

decisions he has to make as a CEO. Thus, he keeps the two separate. He believes that you have

to run a business purely on business principles:

And I stay out of tribal politics. If I am going to involve myself in tribal politics,

I do it through a legislative process and an administrative process. I don't do it as

a tribal member and go in and try to change things, because I am a tribal

member.

He also feels that it is up to the tribal government to decide how to meet the tribe's needs; that

the company supports the tribe by writing a check that will eventually fund community needs.

This negotiated amount takes into consideration what is needed to keep the tribe's companies in

a solid financial position, as well as what is needed by the tribal council for governmental

expenses and social programs.

Perhaps as a result of operating within ambiguous cultural and organizational boundaries,

some of our respondents adopt the perspective that their leadership style is more influenced by a

strong sense of self, which, in turn, is influenced by tribal culture. As such, many of the

respondents describe a leadership philosophy that is more aligned with the theory of authentic leadership (Gardner et al., 2011), which emphasizes genuineness and a clear sense of self in leadership. Proponents of authentic leadership argue that individuals must have a clear understanding of their own values and beliefs in order to create a base from which they can lead (Eriksen, 2009). Authentic leadership has been shown to affect ethical decision making (Cianci et al., 2014), inclusivity (Cottrill et al., 2014), new venture performance (Hmieleski et al., 2012), employee commitment (Leroy, Palanski, Simons, 2012), and creativity ((Rego, Sousa, Marques, 2012). Authentic leadership also has a positive effect on the relationship between leaders and their followers, ultimately creating better performance (Wang, Sui, Luthans, 2014).

Luthans and Avolio (2003) state that authentic leaders have a good understanding of their self, are true to themselves, and possess leadership skills that instill confidence in others. Avolio et al. (2004) contend that "the more these people remain true to their core values, identities, preferences, and emotions, the more authentic they become" (2004: 802-3). Shamir and Eilam present four principles that reflect the general consensus regarding authentic leaders: "(1) they are authentic and do not fake their leadership; (2) authentic leaders do not take a leadership role or engage in activities for status, honor, or personal rewards; (3) these leaders are not copies; (4) authentic leaders are leaders whose actions are based on their values and convictions" (2005: 396-398). Authentic leadership is considered to be an eudaimonic activity, meaning "being true to one's true self" (Shamir and Eilam, 2005: 397). The state of eudaimonia occurs when individual's lives are congruent with their core values (Ilies, Morgeson, Nahrgang, 2005). Thus, authentic leaders are interested in "being all that they can be but also in making a difference" (Shamir and Eilam, 2005: 397). These individuals also exhibit a tendency to use their skills to help others. Their leadership abilities help mold others into leaders as well by motivating,

engaging, and developing commitment and satisfaction from others (Kark and Shamir, 2002). Authentic leadership, then, cannot be separated from the embedded social and organizational context (Shaw, 2010; Algera and Lips-Wiersma, 2012; Nyberg and Sveningsson, 2014).

In the case of some of our respondents, authenticity seems to be the means through which they negotiate across cultural boundaries. For instance, although all of our respondents acknowledge cultural differences between indigenous and non-indigenous communities, some leaders point out the desire to stay true to their individual values. George states:

> As a person I stay true to the principles. So, I don't trade principles based on what environment I'm in. My principles are the same in the business world as they are in my [tribe's] world.

Mark describes his leadership in terms of stability, unwavering across audiences:

> A good leader is someone who is there to lead and not care what people think. In general, I don't think there is a difference between a non-tribal leader and a tribal leader. I think they have the same qualities.

When asked if he assumes a different leadership style when meeting with others who are not members of the American Indian community, Mark replied,

> No, I don't think so. I haven't experienced it. I think that's one of the things from what I try to do, to just be who I am to everybody whether I'm meeting with you or a Congressman or a Senator. It doesn't matter. What you see is what you get at all times, basically.

Thus, for Mark and George, leadership behaviors are a direct reflection of their personal values, regardless of the situation. Their perspective on leadership echoes March and Weil (2005), who claim that leadership is a commitment to an identity rather than a particular

outcome, such as profits. According to March and Weil, the traditional economic assumption that leaders make choices solely to maximize economic returns is misguided. Instead, leaders are motivated to enact behaviors that are consistent with their identity. In other words, leaders act in accordance with the roles that are presumed to accompany their identity. Thus, the guiding behavioral question becomes, "what does a person such as myself do in a situation like this?"

Several respondents indicate that tribal politics complicate running their businesses and, as such, are not always a positive influence. For example, some tribes expect companies to provide employment for tribal members regardless of skills. George comments that there could be backlash if he disciplines a tribal member who is related to a powerful tribal leader, and that tribal leaders sometimes want him to fire certain employees due to non-work related disputes. Jordan also comments:

> Tribes, I suppose, tend to be very politically charged and that can be detrimental and have a negative impact on business, morale, job security, and confidence. Government moves slowly, and business moves at a quick pace, and you have got to be able to make decisions and keep things going. So, sometimes it can hold business back, and that can have a potential negative impact. Definitely.

Both Matthew and George try to shield their companies from tribal politics and do not want to become involved in tribal politics. Matthew sums it up stating:

> When we are at our best is when we are closest to our values; when we adhere to them in our leadership and in activities and our behaviors...I think leadership that adheres to those values it is awesome. It is that simple. I won't get into tribal politics and, by the way, I tell my staff as well as myself, "Do not get into tribal

politics"...We want to be part of a peaceful, positive movement within our tribe to

advance it.

As a result of the tension between tribal politics and business, there are times when some of our

respondents feel a conflict between what they need to do as a business leader and what is

expected from their tribe. In this respect, the dilemma they find themselves in as a result of the

interdependence between the tribe and their business is one that leaders in dominant culture

corporations do not have to deal with. It complicates the business executive role. They balance

decisions based on what is best for the business with what is best for the tribe, and there isn't

always an easy resolution. The flip side of this, and consistent with Julien et al. (2010), is that

our respondents also struggle at times to be true to their tribal culture, values, and beliefs and at

the same time effectively operate in the dominant culture's business environment.

When asked how they would compare their leadership style to a typical Native American

leadership style our respondents mostly see themselves as prototypical Native American leaders,

or they see themselves as business leaders who are strongly influenced by their tribal cultural

values. Jordan believes that he is:

> fairly typical of what I've seen in Indian Country. There is that openness, that
>
> accountability. There's sharing. There's encouragement for growth and learning,
>
> for giving back, more really focusing on future generations and what kind of
>
> legacy we will leave behind.

Justin also talks about how his leadership style reflects traditional Native American concerns,

including having a strong focus on future generations:

> So, having the foresight to be able to continue moving forward in a seven
>
> generational model to make sure that the past gets preserved going forward, too,

would be the difference there [between Native and non-Native leaders], rather than the corporate profiteer trying to figure out how to make money.

George has a focus on future generations, especially developing future generations of leaders. Paul also has a more traditional, dominant culture focus as a leader and believes he has "less tribal attributes," which he attributes to not growing up in his tribe's culture. He sees himself as a "work in progress," learning and incorporating Native American culture into his leadership style. Both Matthew and Mark think that leadership styles vary between individuals, but are affected by being Native American. Mark attributes any differences to what he believes is a general personality trait of Native Americans. He states:

It takes a special person to be a leader wherever you are, and I think that everybody varies on their styles. From what I've experienced, I think Native leaders are more laid back, but that's more of a personality trait of Indian people than it is of leadership.

Consistent with authentic leadership, all of these business leaders bring who they are to their leadership positions. Who they are is affected by their tribal affiliation, tribal culture and tribal values. While they may vary in the importance they ascribe to the dominant cultural focus on "profit as a primary goal," profitability is critically important, since their tribes rely on the profits their companies bring in. All believe that their Native American culture and cultural values affect who they are as leaders, whether it serves as an underlying moral compass or more directly in bringing into their leadership style traditional Native approaches.

Discussion

Our results are consistent with and extend the existing research about Native American leaders. As indicated by Lawler and Ashman (2012), research in authentic leadership encourages

us to evaluate the value systems within which we operate. The value systems of Native American leaders are often reflective of their indigenous heritage and differ from the dominant culture. For example, Julien et al. (2010) found that, for Canadian Indigenous community and business leaders, leadership was about "meeting the needs of the entire community and about connecting community to the past. It is also about leading a life filled with purpose...Moreover, it's learning about your clan, learning about your responsibilities in the community (p.119)." We had similar findings when looking at Native American business leaders. For example, Jordan states:

> There's sharing, there's encouragement for growth and learning, for giving back, more really focusing on future generations, and what kind of legacy we will leave behind. So with all those things in mind, for me personally and what I have seen in our orientation, that is how we run the organization.

Our respondents clearly state that they perceive cultural differences between Native American and mainstream leadership. As culturally "different" from the dominant culture, they discuss how their leadership is influenced by their tribal culture and how there are dual influences - Native culture and dominant culture - on their behavior as a leader and on how they run their companies. They cannot behave as if they are only accountable to the tribe. They also have to bridge the boundaries between their tribe and external constituents (i.e. buyers, suppliers, partners) in the surrounding dominant culture.

Also consistent with Julien, et al. (2010), our respondents sometimes struggle to be true to their tribal values and identity while effectively running their business within the constraints of both tribal and dominant cultural demands. While operating in both cultures simultaneously, with both sets of cultural norms, rules, and laws in place at the same time, they have to navigate across both cultures while staying true to their tribal values. This can produce identity struggles

for these leaders as they span contradictory discourses (Nyberg and Sveningsson, 2014). They are not operating in a purely "domestic" company nor are they operating in a purely "international/multinational" company. They are, in a sense, leading in a hybrid environment, which puts more demands on leaders by mixing elements of indigenous and mainstream cultures. And it is vitally important work. George comments that

> ...we're basically the lifeblood of the tribe when it comes to economic resources. So we can't fail. We can't. There are too many people depending on us. I would say right now if we were to close our doors probably about 50% of the tribal employees that work for the [tribal] government would have to be laid off.

With respect to their leadership style, our findings are highly consistent with Avolio et al.'s (2004) and Shamir and Eilam's (2005) conceptualization of authentic leadership. Our respondents repeatedly speak of how their values and culture are the driving force behind their actions. Several claim that they are not doing this for status or personal wealth. Instead, the needs of their tribe are the primary motivating force. Thus, as authentic leaders, they remain "true to their core values, identities, preferences, and emotions" (Avolio et al., 2004: 802). Our leaders credit their Native American cultural heritage as a primary influence behind their identity and the values by which they live, lead, and manage.

Contributions and Implications

We present a portrait of modern Native American business leaders as authentic leaders, whose authenticity reflects their American Indian identity. This paper adds to the literature on authentic leadership by showing the role that culture and collective identity have in creating leader authenticity within the indigenous community. We sought to identify and describe a Native American identity and present examples connecting Native identity with leadership

values through qualitative interview data. Our interview analyses reveal how modern Native American business leaders operate simultaneously within two sets of cultural influences and rules. Native corporations require leaders to figure out how to operate in both in their home culture and in the dominant mainstream culture at the same time, often within the *same* physical location. This hybrid arrangement is likely to result in dilemmas, conflicts, and demands on the company's leadership that are not experienced to this degree in other contexts.

The challenges that Native American leaders face in economic development is similar to that of some new multinational enterprises (MNEs) in the global economy, although the boundaries in this case are mainly cultural rather than geopolitical. These new organizations are not conventional and resource rich multinational enterprises in terms of origins, growth patterns, and organizational structures and strategies (Matthews and Zander, 2007). The new Native American entities, much like emerging MNEs, are faced with an entrepreneurial process that extends across boundaries to (1) discover new opportunities; (2) deploy resources in the exploitation of these opportunities; and (2) engage with competitors (Matthews & Zander, 2007). Native leaders assimilate knowledge from outside entities and are flexible and adaptable in order to become more effective across boundaries (cf. Lane et al., 2001; Contractor et al., 2007). Native American organizations expanding their businesses off tribal lands face acculturation issues as indigenous firms and outside entities learn about each other's value systems.

Implications for Practice

Understanding the relationship between business leadership and indigenous culture is important. First, we believe that economic development within Indian Country requires tribal leaders who have the ability to recognize a dormant history of tribal economic freedom and who value what tribal members in private, for-profit business contribute to tribal economies. Second,

implementing tribal economic policies into the private sector requires a political and legal environment that facilitates rather than impedes citizen entrepreneurship (Cornell et al., 2008). Third, and most important for bringing these ideals together, management education for Native students and tribal communities needs to integrate current leadership and business research with Native American worldviews. Integrating Native American philosophies with leadership and business education benefits more than Native people, these indigenous perspectives provide insights useful for Western management education in general (Verbos, Gladstone, Kennedy, 2011; Verbos and Humphries, 2014). Fourth, in order to develop more economic independence and sustainability, tribal leaders must develop leadership strategies to work with outside business entities to develop new businesses, obtain capital funding, create jobs for other tribal members, and to develop long range business plans that align with tribal cultural values, but still encourage economic development. This is especially vital if modern American Indian commerce expands away from reservation locations and into mainstream communities (Pascal and Stewart, 2008).

Implications for Research

Our findings show that Native American business leaders manage organizations from communities that can be considered "nations within a nation." Yet, these organizations require leaders who need to operate, on a fundamental level, as if this were not the case. As such, our results could also link authentic leadership with international business leadership. While there are differences in how individual Native American business leaders handle decisions, their underlying approach is both consistent with authentic leadership and reflects their cultural embeddedness in tribal culture. Further research could further explore these linkages and connections.

This paper also adds to a newly emerging stream of literature examining the role of indigenous culture in American Indian business. In response to conjecture that indigenous culture impedes business performance, Stewart and Schwartz (2007) surveyed Native American business leaders and found that they do not feel as though their tribal culture impedes the growth or success of their firms. In fact, many businesses use culture as the basis of their business strategy. Many firms utilize a "culture-of-origin" strategy, which explicitly exploits culture through the purposeful marketing and branding of goods and services as "indigenous goods" (Stewart, Gladstone, and Verbos 2014). This study complements and extends these works by identifying the role that indigenous identity plays in the leadership of the Native American businesses.

Finally, we would like to note that Native American business leadership is not a new-age philosophy. Rather, it is one that has existed in varying forms for millennia that must demonstrate its value within the dominant Western-oriented business philosophy. Brown and Brown (2003) and Fixico (2003) discuss challenges with bringing Native philosophy into the Western-based academic mainstream. Native perspectives fill a void in mainstream academia. The scant literature today about Native American economic development and leadership practices often fails to deeply explore a thematic concern about the ways in which people from different societies organize and connect to their world. By analyzing leadership from the American Indian perspective, we place indigenous thought as a credible and equal frame of reference as mainstream thought for understanding business culture and leadership, which may help Native American and indigenous studies scholars understand and appreciate the contributions of business leaders in tribal economic development.

Future research could include surveys of both Native and non-Native employees of tribal enterprises to determine the extent to which collective identity affects the relationship between followers and leaders (Hogg et al., 2012; Steffens et al., 2014; van Knippenberg, 2011), the extent to which non-leader employees experience a Native American leadership style, and how having Native American leaders rather than non-Native American leaders of Native American enterprises affects organizational identification, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and intentions to quit. Moreover, research should be expanded to try and capture female Native American leaders. In this study we were not able to identify any female leaders, which is a limitation in the study. However, by capturing a more diverse population, more generalities can be drawn from the results.

Additional research could examine the extent to which Native American cultural values are or are not reflected in the GLOBE cross-cultural dimensions (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, Gupta, 2004) and the implications that this may have for managerial practices within organizations that seek to employ American Indians. Although, firms recognize the importance of cross-cultural differences and cultural specific policies and/or practices, research has not fully addressed the relationship between facets of national culture and specific human resources practices (Hendry, 1992). However, research by Newman and Nollen (1996) shows that cultural sensitivity and the willingness to adapt to cultural differences can be financially beneficial to organizations.

Conclusion

American Indians, the indigenous people of the United States, operate as sovereign nations within a nation. Within this context, tribal enterprises have become the tool of economic development for indigenous nations to provide sustainable growth opportunities. As a result, a

new type of boundary-spanning Native American business leadership has emerged. Negotiating the boundaries between the culture of the tribe and the culture of mainstream business while maintaining personal authenticity is a challenge faced and met by these leaders.

Tribal business leaders have been influenced by their traditional culture. Yet, they desire to set modern standards of performance within their industries, create productivity, and generate employment--goals which are influenced by their tribal heritage. These leaders bring their people together around common objectives and establish goals to be accomplished that will enable tribal members to live better lives and, more importantly, sustain the tribe economically. Native American leaders have been faced with the challenge of providing economic resources and training necessary to allow their people become "nationally" competitive while protecting their unique Indian way of life (Edmunds, 2004).

In order to accomplish economic independence and true indigenous sovereignty, American Indian tribes must encourage and train American Indian business leaders to run economically viable companies that integrate with the mainstream economy. This requires leaders who can function with equal effectiveness both within their tribal organizations and across boundaries within the dominant culture. The tribal leaders we interviewed have displayed this ability to successfully accommodate both cultures, and have solved this problem in different ways, allowing them become a successful leaders within their Native American communities and within the businesses that they lead.

References

Algera PM and Lips-Wiersma M (2012) Radical authentic leadership: co-creating the conditions under which all members of the organization can be authentic. *The Leadership Quarterly* 23: 118–131.

Ashmore RD, Deaux K and McLaughlin-Volpe T (2004) An organizing framework for collective identity: articulation and significance of multidimensionality. *Psychological Bulletin* 130(1): 80-114.

Avolio B, Gardner WL, Walumbwa FO et al (2004) Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviours. *The Leadership Quarterly* 15(6): 801–823.

BIA (2015) http://www.bia.gov/

Brown KG and Brown MP (2003) Access in theory and practice: American Indians in philosophy history. *American Indian Quarterly* 27(1 & 2): 113-120.

Burns JM (1978) *Leadership*. New York: Wiley.

Cianci AM, Hannah ST and Roberts RP et al (2014) The effects of authentic leadership on followers' ethical decision-making in the face of temptation: An experimental study. *Leadership Quarterly* 25(3): 581-594.

Contractor FJ, Kumar V and Kundu SK (2007) Nature of the relationship between international expansion and performance: The case of emerging market firms. *Journal of World Business* 42(4): 401-417.

Cordova, VF (2007) *How it is: The Native American philosophy of V.F. Cordova* Moore KD, Peters K, Jojola T et al (eds). Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Cornell S, Jorgensen M and Record IW et al (2008) Citizen entrepreneurship: An underutilized development resource. In: Jorgensen, M (ed) *Rebuilding Native nations: Strategies for governance and development.* Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, pp. 197-222.

Cottrill K, Lopez PD and Hoffman CC (2014) How authentic leadership and inclusion benefit organizations. *Equality, Diversity & Inclusion* 33(3): 275-292.

Debo A (1976) *Geronimo: The man, his time, his place*. Norman: The University of Oklahoma Press.

Deming WE (1992) *Out of the crisis*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Center for Advanced Engineering Study.

Doble, J, and Yarrow, AL (2007). Walking a mile: A first step toward mutual understanding. *Public Agenda. Retrieved February*, *6*, 2010.

Dorfman PW and House RJ (2004) Cultural influences on organizational leadership: Literature review, theoretical rationale, and GLOBE project goals. In: Dorfman PW, Javidan, M and Hanges PJ et al (2012) GLOBE: A twenty year journey into the intriguing world of culture and leadership. *Journal of World Business* 47(4): 504-518.

Dorfman P, Javidan M, Hanges P et al. (2012) GLOBE: A twenty year journey into the intriguing world of culture and leadership. *Journal of World Business*, 47(4): 504-518.

Edmunds RD (ed) (2004) *The new warriors: Native American leaders since 1900*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Eriksen M. (2009). Authentic leadership. *Journal of Management Education, 33*(6), 747-771.

Fixico DL (2003) *The American Indian mind in a linear world: American Indian studies and traditional knowledge*. New York: Routledge.

Furtwangler A (2012) *Answering Chief Seattle*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Gardner WL, Cogliser CC and Davis KM et al (2011) Authentic leadership: A review of the literature and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly* 22(6): 1120-1145.

George, AL, and Bennett, A (2005) *Case studies and theory development in the social sciences*. MIT Press.

Grant K and Taylor J (2007) Managing the boundary between business and politics: Strategies for improving the chances for success in tribally owned enterprises. In: Jorgenson, M (ed) *Rebuilding Native nations: Strategies for governance and development.* Tuscon: The University of Arizona Press, pp. 175-196.

Greenhaus JH and Beutell NJ (1985) Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review* 10(1): 76-88.

Greenleaf RK (1977) *Servant leadership: A journey into the leadership of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.

Gunther V (2010) *Chief Joseph: A biography*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO LLC.

Hendry C (1992) Human resource management in the international firm. Paper presented to the *VET Forum Conference on Multinational Companies and Human Resources: A Moveable Feast?* University of Warwick, June 22-24.

Hmieleski KM, Cole MS and Baron RA (2012) Shared authentic leadership and new venture performance. *Journal of Management 38*(5): 1476-1499.

Hofstede G (1980) *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values.* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Hofstede G (1993) Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Executive 7*(1), 81-94.

Hofstede G and Hofstede GJ (2005) *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hogg MA, van Knippenberg D and Rast DE III (2012) The social identity theory of leadership: Theoretical origins, research findings, and conceptual developments. *European Review of Social Psychology* 23: 258-304.

House RJ and Aditya R (1997) The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management* 23(3), 409−473.

House RJ, Hanges PJ and Javidan M (eds) (2004) *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Howard J (2000) Social psychology of identities. *Annual Review of Sociology* 26: 367-393.

Humphreys J, Ingram K and Kernek C (2007) The Nez Perce leadership council: A historical examination of post-industrial leadership. *Journal of Management History* 13(2): 135-152.

Ilies R, Morgeson FP and Nahrgang JD (2005) Authentic leadership and eudaemonic well-being: Understanding leader–follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly* 16(3), 373-394.

Julien M, Wright B and Zinni DM (2010) Stories from the circle: Leadership lessons learned from aboriginal leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly* 21:114-126.

Kark R and Shamir B (2002). Opening people to possibilities: A Heideggerian Approach to leadership. *Philosophy of Management* 5(1): 25-44.

Krefting L (1991) Rigor in qualitative research: The assessment of trustworthiness. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy* 45: 214-222.

Lane PJ, Salk JE and Lyles MA (2001) Absorptive capacity, learning, and performance in international joint ventures. *Strategic Management Journal* 22(12): 1139-1161.

Lawler J and Ashman I (2012) Theorizing leadership authenticity: A Sartrean perspective. Leadership 8(4): 327-344.

Leroy H, Palanski M and Simons T (2012) Authentic leadership and behavioral integrity as drivers of follower commitment and performance. *Journal of Business Ethics 107*(3): 255-264.

Luthans F and Avolio BJ (2003) Authentic leadership: A positive development approach. In Cameron KS, Dutton JE and Quinn RE (eds) *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline* (pp. 241–261). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

March JF and Weil T (2005) *On Leadership.* Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Marshall JM (2005) *The journey of Crazy Horse.* New York: Penguin Group.

Matthews JA and Zander I (2007) The international entrepreneurial dynamics of accelerated internationalisation. *Journal of International Business Studies* 38(3): 387-403.

Myers MD and Tan B (2003) Beyond models of national culture in information systems research. *Advanced Topics in Global Information Management* 10(1): 14-29.

Nagel J (1997) *American Indian ethnic renewal: Red power and the resurgence of identity and culture.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Newman KL and Nollen SD (1996) Culture and congruence: The fit between management practices and national culture. *Journal of International Business Studies* 27(4): 753-78.

Nyberg D and Sveningsson S (2014). Paradoxes of authentic leadership: Leader identity struggles. *Leadership* 10(4): 437-455.

Pascal, VJ and D Stewart (2008) "The Effects of Geographic Location and Economic Cluster Development on Native American Entrepreneurship." *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation* 9:121-131.

Patton M (1990) *Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed).* Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Redpath L and Nielsen MO (1997) A comparison of Native culture, non-Native culture and new management ideology. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences* 14(3), 327-339.

Rego A, Sousa F and Marques, C et al (2012) Authentic leadership promoting employees' psychological capital and creativity. *Journal of Business Research* 65(3): 429-437.

Shamir B and Eilam G (2005) "What's your story?" A life-stories approach to authentic leadership development. *The Leadership Quarterly* 16(3), 395-417.

Shaw J (2010) Papering the cracks with discourse: the narrative identity of the authentic leader. *Leadership* 6(1): 89–108.

Stake RE (1995) *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Steffens NK, Haslam SA and Reicher SD (2014) Up close and personal: Evidence that shared social identity is a basis for the 'special' relationship that binds followers to leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly* 25: 296-314.

Stewart D, Gladstone JG and Verbos AK et al. (2014) Native American cultural capital and business strategy: The culture of origin effect. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 38(4): 103-114.

Stewart D and Martin R (2008) The Social Context of Servant-Leadership Assessments. *International Journal of Servant Leadership*. 4(1):321-345.

Stewart, D and Schwartz RG (2007) Native American Business Strategy: A Survey of Northwest US Firms. *International Journal of Business Performance Management*. 9(3): 259-277.

Stryker S and Burke PJ (2000) The past, present, and future of an identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 63(4): 284-297.

Tajfel H and Turner JC (1979) An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In: Austin WG and Worchel S (eds) *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Monterey: Brooks-Cole, pp. 33-47.

Thoits PA and Virshup LK (1997) Me's and We's: Forms and functions of social identities. In: Ashmore, RD and Jussim L (eds) *Self and identity: Fundamental issues*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 106-133.

Triandis HC (1995) *Individualism and collectivism.* Boulder:Westview Press.

Utley RM (2014) *Sitting Bull: The life and times of an American Patriot.* New York: Henry Hold and Company LLC.

van Knippenberg D (2011) Embodying who we are: Leader group prototypicality and leadership effectiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly* 22: 1078-1091.

Verbos AK, Gladstone JS and Kennedy DM (2011) Native American values and management education: Envisioning an inclusive virtuous circle. *Journal of Management Education* 35(1): 10-26.

Verbos AK and Humphries MT (2014) A Native American Relational Ethic: An Indigenous Perspective on Teaching Human Responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics* 123(1): 1-9.

Vizenor, G. (1994). Manifest Manners. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Wang H, Sui Y and Luthans F et al (2014) Impact of authentic leadership on performance: Role of followers' positive psychological capital and relational processes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 35(1): 5-21.

Wilkes GC (1996) *Jesus on leadership, becoming a servant leader.* Nashville: LifeWay Press.

Yin RK (2003) *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Appendix 1
Interview Questions

1. What is your definition of traditional values (i.e., what makes a person an Indian)?
2. When is American Indian culture a positive resource for leadership?
3. When is it not a positive resource for leadership?
4. How does a typical Native American leadership style differ from 'mainstream' leadership styles?
5. How would you compare your leadership style to a typical Native American leadership style
6. Under what circumstances do you project your Native American identity in your leadership (e.g., clothing, language, etc.)?
7. Under what circumstances do you not project your Native American identity in your leadership?
8. Do you incorporate Native American traditions into your leadership practices (e.g., bringing tobacco)?
9. What is your educational background?
10. How did you become involved in the tribal enterprises? Why?
11. Please list your professional career over the last 10 years including approximate years in each position.
12. How deeply do you identify yourself as Native?