

running head: The Difference Culture Makes: The Competitive Advantage of Reciprocal,
Non-Monetary Exchange

**The Difference Culture Makes: The Competitive Advantage of Reciprocal,
Non-Monetary Exchange**

Ana María Peredo

Centre for Co-operative and Community-Based Economy, and

The Faculty of Business

University of Victoria

Published chapter in Mook L, Quarter J and Ryan S (eds) *Businesses with a Difference: Balancing the Social and Economic*. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 87-110.

**The Difference Culture Makes: The Competitive Advantage of Reciprocal,
Non-Monetary Exchange**

Abstract

Increasingly, the relationship of business to the communities in which it operates is the focus of attention among management scholars. In this paper I wish to go beyond the view that communities should be seen as stakeholders and/or as the target of corporate social responsibility. I will argue that certain cultural endowments in certain communities may in fact contribute a sustained advantage to enterprises embedded in those communities. I will focus on a concentrated form of this embeddedness: ‘Community-Based Enterprises’: ventures in which communities act collectively as both entrepreneur and enterprise. An outline of the conditions in which they typically arise, the features they characteristically display—especially their blend of social and economic goals—and their participation in the global economy, offer fertile suggestions as to the way that their cultural endowments contribute a rich supply of non-monetary resources to their operations. These resources can constitute an important and sustained competitive advantage. The article recognises important challenges faced by these remarkable ventures, before drawing some provisional conclusions and suggestions for further enquiry.

What is happening in Canaca?

In early 1988, as a newly-minted graduate student, I began my first fieldwork in an isolated community called Canaca, in the southern province of Puno, in my native country of Peru. I was there to study how a recently-introduced program of agricultural loans to communities was working out on the ground. Canaca, a community at 4,500 metres above sea level, was the first recipient of such a loan. Villagers' houses were scattered through thick, brown hills, and the ever-present dogs of excitable temperament made them hard to approach. I knew it was harvest season, so I did not take anything to eat. When I became hungry, I approached people I encountered returning from their harvesting and asked if they could sell me something. They were invariably polite, but just as invariably replied, 'I am sorry. I do not have anything. Maybe the next person has.' The next person never did. It appeared no one could sell me anything, even if I offered a high price for their products. I knew food was being harvested. I was baffled by this apparent breakdown of the system of supply and demand.

A month later my relationship to the villagers had become quite different. I was now working with them in the fields in the potato harvest; and their response to my nutritional needs had also undergone a fundamental change. I was regularly and generously supplied with *chuno* (dried potato) and cheese, though no one would accept any cash in exchange. I realised that I was being introduced to a vital concept in understanding how Andean rural people survive. I called it 'the Andean Insurance', in which resources are circulated in keeping with deep and diverse cultural traditions of reciprocity. My expectation that the production and distribution of necessities would be governed by some version of market forces was simply an alien import.

Initial research on credit evolved into research on social networks and rituals, as I came to understand that the credit resources I had come to study had become entangled with the social and cultural life of the community and its web of reciprocal obligations and exchanges. Loans had become ‘diverted’ into looking after responsibilities that came from community membership, such as ‘first haircut’ ceremonies, or weddings, or funerals, or other events that involved the transfer of benefits to others in the community. From the perspective of financial or government institutions, the program had failed. People were not taking capitalistic advantage of their loans.

Field work often presents the researcher with phenomena that are deeply puzzling, given an outsider’s point of view. It was years later, many of them spent in remote communities in the Andes, that I felt I began to understand the full potential of that network of reciprocity as the basis for the creation, and maintenance, of ‘community- based enterprises’ (CBE’s) functioning in this community as well as in many other impoverished communities. Recognising this kind of provisioning activity, deeply rooted in traditions of reciprocity, solidarity and collective undertakings, forced me to abandon my simplistic assumptions about the ways that economies could work, and the ways that what we call business venturing could fit into them.

In what follows, I will focus on CBEs as a concentrated example of a more general force in many business operations: the contribution of culturally-derived, reciprocal and non-monetary exchanges to sustained competitive advantage. As part of this, I will argue that an essential element in this contribution is the way in which these forms of enterprise include social aims, often predominantly, in their goal structure. I begin by defining more precisely what I take CBEs to be. I continue by outlining what appear to be the conditions in which they arise and their characteristic features, and mention some of the many examples of this form of enterprise that

exist around the world. I then discuss the way in which CBEs participate in the globalising economy, including an account of their operations that takes account of theoretical constructs such as embeddedness, gift economies and social capital. There are significant challenges to this kind of enterprise, as recognised the next section of the chapter. I make no attempt to predict the outcome of these challenges. Some summary conclusions and suggestions for the way we should proceed in this research conclude the chapter.

What is a ‘Community-Based Enterprise’

The theoretical notion of ‘Community-Based Enterprise’ grows out of experiences I had in a number of Andean communities, shaped by an interdisciplinary literature concerning such topics as economic anthropology, network theory and entrepreneurship. Once formed, the idea clearly applied to many phenomena beyond those that gave rise to it.

I mean by a ‘Community-Based Enterprise’ (‘CBE’) a community acting corporately as both entrepreneur and enterprise in pursuit of the common good. ‘Entrepreneurship’ itself is a keenly contested concept, even or especially among students of the subject (Venkataraman, 1997).

Let us suppose that entrepreneurship is the linking of an inadequately-met need or want with an under-used source of supply. The way in which this link may be forged varies enormously according to circumstances, and it is plausible to argue that much debate about the nature of entrepreneurship stems from an understandable variety in what it is that a scholar focuses on as the mechanisms of that link. One might draw attention to

an alertness to profit opportunities (Kirzner); the exploitation of a new technological possibility (Schumpeter); a bet, gamble, or chance on some new idea (Brenner); the exercise of control over means of production (McClelland); a

management discipline (Drucker); the creation and ownership a small business or new business (Drucker; Reynolds, Hay & Camp); a purposeful task or practice (Drucker); and the acceptance of risk and/or uncertainty in the pursuit of profit opportunities (Cantillon) (Brenkert, 2002, p. 9).

No doubt there are more. For our purposes, it will be sufficient to say that the community acts as an entrepreneur when its members, acting as planners, owners, managers, and employees, collaboratively create or identify an opportunity to bring together some need or want with some way of supplying it, and organise themselves in order to respond to that opportunity.

‘Enterprise’ is a less contentious concept, though there is a degree of ambiguity about it. Generally, ‘enterprise’ may be understood as ‘an undertaking, especially a bold or difficult one’ (Barber, 1998, p. 466). More narrowly, it may simply be taken to refer to ‘a business’ (Barber, 1998, p. 466). For our purposes, it is best to mingle these two senses, while broadening the sense of ‘business’ to include activities that are not confined to profit-making for some individual or collective. I will say that a community acts as an enterprise when its members work together to jointly produce and exchange goods and/or services using its existing social structure as a means of organizing those activities. In sum, then, CBE represents both the entrepreneurial process of venture creation and the venture created through that process.

What first of all delineates the communities in this discussion is geographical location, perhaps combined with culture and/or ethnicity and/or other shared relational characteristic(s) (Molinary, Ahern & Hendryx, 1998). This distinguishes them from ‘communities’ that are

formed on the basis of shared goals or participation in some productive activity. The communities in CBEs pre-exist their life as a CBE.

The idea that members act ‘together’, ‘corporately’ or ‘collaboratively’ must allow for some differences in involvement. Some members may be more active than others, but most or all will have some role in developing and implementing the entrepreneurial initiative. Governance is ‘corporate’ in the sense that most if not all members will take some part in overseeing the enterprise’s activities. Some members of the community will also be directly involved in carrying out the work of the enterprise. But fundamentally it is understood that community members will be more or less united in their commitment to their collective undertaking.

An essential feature of these undertakings is that while they must return some profit in order to be sustainable, profit is typically seen strictly as means to achieving some other community goals, such as health or educational services. A lower level of profitability may well be accepted if that is the price for achieving other community purposes, such as wider employment. In CBEs, therefore, profitability is generally a means to serving other community objectives.

CBEs are not the same as organisations that may be set up by government to operate in the interests of some community, or operations that may be put in place by some sub-group to provide community benefits. However important enterprises like these may be, their dynamic is quite different from CBEs, which are owned, managed, and governed by community members themselves, and not by others on their behalf. CBEs are also distinct from co-operatives, though they may in some cases be close relatives. The membership of a co-operative is a voluntary association of people who may or may not share community membership but decide to band together in co-operative pursuit of some goal. As mentioned above, CBEs begin in shared

community, and work from there to a collective undertaking. In certain circumstances, there may be co-operatives that are so linked with communities that they are hard to distinguish from CBEs, but that need not worry us. 'The world is not perfectly tidy with respect to what is and what is not a CBE' (Peredo & Chrisman, 2006, p. 316), and that is not a bad thing.

What Gives Rise to Community-Based Enterprises?

It appears that what favours the emergence of CBEs is a fertile combination of at least five community characteristics: (1) some condition or event of stressful disequilibrium, (2) cultural traditions of reciprocity and generous deposits of social capital, (3) previous experience of collective, concerted action, (4) a repertoire of skills in the community, either traditional or acquired more recently, and (5) an appropriate size. Each of these deserves a brief expansion.

First, CBEs are typically rooted in the attempts of a community to respond to serious economic and/or social stresses. These stresses may be quite material, such as a gathering crisis in food production or economic circumstances; or they may be more social and even political, such as the alienation of a community from mainstream society or political life. They may in turn be brought on by critical or accumulated environmental forces, such as drought or flood, soil erosion or climate change. Or they may result from armed conflict, social marginalisation or political oppression. These factors are often, but not always, a reflection of macro conditions, such as large-scale environmental changes, national economic crisis or shifts in political ideology. At the community level, the stressing factors are often multiple and inter-related. The main point is that a major factor in the emergence of CBEs appears to be an experience of disequilibrium that threatens its sense of survival in an acceptable state. There is a resulting drive to find new resources and/or new social arrangements that will help relieve the stress.

Second, a factor that seems to focus this drive to gain or regain an acceptable way of life is a cultural deposit of co-operative social organization. In the Andean highlands, the site of our paradigmatic CBEs, traditions of cooperative interaction are vital instruments of survival in an environment where the agricultural production that forms the backbone of the economy is risky and uncertain, and government safety-nets are non-existent. The ancient traditions of *ayni* (reciprocal work among two families), *minga* (among a group of families) and *faena* (involving activities for the benefit of the entire community) (Alberti & Mayer, 1974; de la Cadena, 1989) represent ingrained patterns of interdependence and reciprocity that are fertile ground for the emergence of CBEs.

Third, and related to these traditions, it appears that CBEs arise in part out of an experience of collective action (Helmsing, 2002). The communities in which CBEs emerge have frequently had past involvement in combined political action, e.g. demanding access to basic services from the government, contesting government reforms, or protesting against such conditions as counterinsurgency or large-scale landownership. The experience of these activities may be expected to result in the development of collective tacit knowledge related to marshalling and organising collective energy to pursue community goals (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998; Spender, 1994). It is easy to see how communities may draw on this resource and channel their motivation for community activism toward enterprise creation.

A fourth and crucial factor in CBE development is the existence of an endowment of skills that can be exploited in enterprising activity. As with any entrepreneurial venture, the start-up and success of a CBE require that the community possess, or have access to, sufficient resources to launch the enterprise (Chrisman, Bauerschmidt, & Hofer, 1998; Gartner, 1985; Katz & Gartner, 1988). The repository of skills and experience in the community is available as a

resource that can be used in developing a CBE. Some of those skills are collective ancestral knowledge, assembled over generations of engagement in endeavours such as textiles, pottery, forestry and agriculture. Others have been developed more recently when community members are employed in industries such as mining or manufacturing, either when those industries enter the community or when members find employment outside. The collection of these skills and experience provide the raw material out of which CBEs may be constructed.

Finally, size is a factor. As with any entrepreneurial startup (Chrisman, Bauerschmidt, & Hofer, 1998), CBEs require a certain level of resource endowment (including skills, capital and extended social networks) to support their launch and potential for success. Especially in relatively poor communities, the *per capita* endowment of these resources is not great; so up to a certain point, increase in size increases the likelihood of launch and the potential for success. At the same time, many of the factors mentioned above depend on the functioning of developed social networks and the exploitation of ‘social capital’. As networks increase in size, networks become more fragmented, and the contacts on which they depend become less frequent. Kranton (1996) argues persuasively that reciprocal nonmarket exchanges are more likely and provide greater benefits in smaller markets owing to the likelihood of frequent future contacts. In general, the frequency and quality of contacts is a potent factor in establishing and maintaining the networks that undergird CBEs. So, beyond the levels that increase available resources, as communities grow larger they reduce the support for factors that encourage the formation of CBEs. The outcome is that there is a certain moderate size range—large enough to supply requisite resources, but small enough to encourage and maintain social networks—that is correlated with the emergence and maintenance of CBEs. There are many external factors that influence what the viable range will be, but there is a rough-and-ready range within it falls.

This is a sketch of factors that appear to be connected with the emergence of CBEs.

There is no suggestion that each of them is necessary, though some invite that possibility; nor is it proposed that they are jointly sufficient. All I am suggesting is that these are events or conditions that are highly relevant to the emergence of CBEs as defined above. However complete or accurate the list may be, however, it offers only a preliminary idea of what CBEs are like in operation. Let me fill out that picture a bit.

What Are CBEs Like?

One fundamental feature of CBEs is their commitment to a configuration of goals in which profit-making is seen as a means to other ends. Communities forming CBEs typically emphasize the need to achieve social, economic, environmental, and cultural goals simultaneously, and the reasons for this are not hard to see. To begin with, these are often poor or disadvantaged communities with little or no access to the social and economic resources of government or large industry that could help break the spiral of their disadvantage. Frequently, they must find ways of providing or supplementing a variety of things: their own health and educational services; seed resources for small, family-sized enterprises that form a web of local production; infrastructure such as roads and agricultural implements; the means of addressing soil degradation or other environmental challenges; the preservation of traditional arts or crafts that define their culture and way of life; local employment opportunities for young people; and more. Any or all these and more may present themselves as urgently requiring attention, and they typically are combined in a complex and dynamic way. Different sectors of the community will find themselves with different priorities in the cluster of needs that are evident, so maintaining a variety of goals and a flexible balance among them is to be expected in the operation of the CBE. This balancing act means that CBE goals tend to be holistic and multifaceted, taking into account

the particular cluster of economic, cultural, social and environmental needs that a community faces. Like any entrepreneurial undertaking, CBEs are aimed at economic gain. But that gain is meant to support the array of social, cultural and material goals that the community has identified as requiring its collective action.

Second, the kind of economic activities (sometimes there is a variety) adopted by CBEs generally draws on that repertoire of skills and experience acquired by local people before the creation of the CBE. As indicated above, the presence of this repertoire is an important factor in fostering the creation of CBEs. Not surprisingly, then, the undertakings of CBEs are characteristically formed out of that repertoire, whether it based on collective ancestral knowledge such as crafts or agriculture, or arises out of recent experience in industries of one kind or another. In general, the skills and resources acquired before undertaking a venture are important factors that both improve the chances of venture success (Bygrave & Minniti, 2000; Harvey & Evans, 1995), and provide a framework for seeking opportunity (Ardichvili, 2003). Given that the community in this case is the entrepreneur, the creation and performance of a CBE is a function of the community's ability to combine and adapt in an innovative way its variety of ancestral and new skills, experiences, cooperative practices, and values. CBE undertakings are characteristically an inventive combining of the experience and aptitudes available in the community in relation to the needs and opportunities around them. Indeed that stock of experience and aptitudes helps the entrepreneurial community identify what opportunities there are.

Third, the governance structure of CBEs has a characteristic form that emerges from the cultural traditions of cooperation and reciprocity noted above. Members of CBEs typically see their ventures as a naturally evolved social and economic form, adapted to the realities and

pressures of the market economy while integrating their own cultural traditions (Anderson, 2002; Peredo, 2001). Ancestral traditions of community management and decision-making are frequently revitalized to play an important part in the communal life into which the enterprise is woven. In general, the governance structure of a CBE can be expected to be consistent with the structure of decision-making in its community, typically involving communal assemblies of stakeholders. Indeed traditional communal assemblies—the governance form for the community itself—are frequently the same body that governs the community enterprise. These bodies are collective in two related senses: (a) All community members (called ‘commoners’ in the Andean communities that began this story) are members of the assembly/governing body and are expected to take their responsibilities of membership seriously. And (b), the decision-making process is highly democratic, with all members having a right, in fact a responsibility, to speak to decisions under consideration, and to vote in determining the resolution. There are several advantages in this arrangement. Community assemblies provide a vital mechanism for achieving that dynamic balance of goals referred to earlier, and in the course of that, dealing with power imbalances and conflict. Collective governance enhances members’ sense of ownership (Bendick & Egan, 1995; Hadi, 2001; Hodson, 2002), in contrast with ‘development’ projects that import solutions and resources or manage them on the community’s behalf. Community-based decision-making, with its pooling of experience and expertise, has been shown to improve planning perspective, including anticipation of ecological outcomes (King, 1995), which is crucial in these settings. It also provides a well-accepted and effective means of maintaining accountability in those executing the enterprise. Further, it is important to recognise that while cultural tradition can become the launching pad for new enterprise, there is frequently a significant reciprocal action: the presence of collective enterprise can strengthen or create local social and cultural

systems. The active involvement of local members not only reflects the sense of community that exists, but reinforces and recreates it (Bowen, Martin, Mancini, & Nelson, 2000).

Where do you find CBEs?

This story began in communities in the Peruvian sierra, and branched out from there to communities up and down the Andean backbone of Latin America. But as the concept of CBE took shape, I began to recognise that CBEs and their close relatives are to be found in communities around the world. These community-based ventures, where community is both collective entrepreneur and enterprise, display variations on the relation to a set of favourable conditions and characteristic features outlined above; and they exist on almost every continent.

Still in Peru, the self-managed community enterprise of Llapampa and the Community of Chaquicocha Trade Fair are paradigmatic cases of CBE (Peredo, 2003). Moving along the Andes, the Communal Enterprises of Salinacocha in Ecuador (Peredo, 2001) continue the pattern. The Walkerswood Community in Jamaica launched a community-constituted venture in the 1970s producing traditional cooking sauces, spices, seasonings, preserves and canned vegetables for world-wide sales and using the proceeds to supply local water, schooling and employment (Lean, 1995). The Nuevo San Juan Community Forest is community-based organization established in the early 1980s with the aim of promoting development through the use and management of forest and non-forest resources (Quintero, 2006). The database of the UNDP's 'Equatorial Initiative' contains numerous examples of communities organising around traditional forms and expertise to initiate collective ventures based on environmentally respectful production aimed at enhancing community well-being (Berkes & Adhikari, 2006; Equator Initiative, 2009). The indigenous population of Bali sustains itself while maintaining its distinctive culture through an inventive form of CBE that depends on a dual monetary system,

one part entirely non-cash and built out of ancient traditions of cooperation and reciprocity (Lietaer & De Meulenaere, 2003). The declining town of Amagase, Japan, decided as a community in the late 1970s to switch from uncompetitive rice production to cooperative floriculture, using its hot springs as a low-cost source of energy (OECD, 1995a). Community forest projects in Gambia feature an element of government initiative, but build in the CBE manner on existing cooperative traditions to build community-based ventures built on tradition connections with the forest (Dampha & Camera, 2005). The village of Ralegan Siddhi in India marshalled its community traditions and resources to work collectively on projects that turned them from abject poverty and endemic water shortages to abundant water supplies, improved services in education and health and cooperative agricultural production that fuels development (Hazare, 1997). The famous and highly successful Mondragon Corporation Cooperative in Spain bears all the marks of a complex CBE (Greenwood, 1992; Morrison, 1997). Even relatively prosperous parts of the world produce CBEs. MacLeod (1986) has documented the ways in which communities in maritime Canada, acting collectively, have advanced their well-being through communal ventures building on a co-operative culture and a shared store of skills. Elliot Lake in Canada, a community suffering from the collapse of its uranium mine, constituted itself in 1987 as a community corporation aimed at community betterment through the establishment of 'Retirement Living in Elliot Lake' (OECD, 1995b).

It is safe to assume that this is the tip of a very large iceberg. The phenomenon of communities building on their traditions to act corporately in pursuing community well-being is not an isolated event. It is widespread, and in many cases it has impressive results at least in the short run. But how can we understand their participation in the complex, globalising economies in which they are increasingly immersed? Can we expect them to survive, let alone prosper, in

that environment? And can we hope that in that process they have any hope of maintaining and building the traditions and ways of living that are precious to them?

CBEs in the Global Economy

In what follows, I will argue that CBEs possess certain features that may, given other factors in the business and economic climate, equip them to survive, perhaps even prosper as they wish to prosper, in this heated environment. In order to suggest this, I will appeal to arguments based on theoretical constructs that I believe contribute to my case. An important result of that appeal is that organisational forms that are not necessarily CBEs, but share some significant features with them, may well have the resources for a particular kind of competitive advantage. In short, I will conclude that resources in the form of traditions of reciprocal, non-monetary exchange often confer an advantage on CBEs and relevantly similar competitors in the global market-place.

In the globalising economy, participants are exposed to intense price competition, and the ways most frequently adopted to compete in that environment are (a) to increase firm size, so as to take advantage of various kinds of scale, (b) to keep firms mobile, so that they may take advantage of shifts in factor costs, especially labour, and (c) to fragment production, to take advantage of differential deposits of production factors in different locations. These strategies together entail delocalising enterprises. They tend to lower prices and intensify competition. But they also disconnect ventures from a particular place and community.

‘Sustained Competitive Advantage (SCA). What we are considering is whether, in this environment, CBEs might be said to have any potential advantage that would allow them to acquire and maintain a share of the markets they enter that provides them with the return they aim at. The business term for this is ‘sustained competitive advantage’ (SCA), classically

explicated by Barney (1991). 'A firm is said to have a *sustained competitive advantage*', Barney stipulates,

when it is implementing a value creating strategy not simultaneously being implemented by any current or potential competitors *and* when these other firms are unable to duplicate the benefits of this strategy (1991, p. 102 Italics in original.)

Barney underlines two elements in this definition. First, it refers not only to existing competitors but to potential rivals. Second, the kind of sustainability referred to is not for some temporal period but represents a kind of equilibrium position where the advantage persists beyond the closure of attempts to replicate it. Not that SCA will last forever. It may be overcome by other changes in economic or other relevant factors in the business environment. It is just that it is not lost by other ventures duplicating it.

It is worth emphasising that this advantage need not be such that it enables an enterprise to eliminate all competitors. For our purposes, a venture possesses an SCA if its advantage enables it to achieve and maintain a market share that it finds satisfactory. An SCA need only be *sufficient* for the enterprise's purposes, however grand or limited those might be. An SCA is therefore relative to the aspirations of a particular venture.

It seems true almost by definition that the basis for developing an SCA are an enterprise's resources of various kinds. 'Resources' may be identified and categorised in a variety of ways (Hoffman, 2000), but Barney (1991, p. 101) provides a useful and concise classification into three categories: physical, human, and organisational capital. Physical resources include technology, plant and equipment, geographical location and access to raw materials. Human resources comprise the training, skills, personal capacities and relationships of individuals in the

enterprise. Organisational resources encompass the myriad aspects of organisational structure: methods of planning and execution, monitoring, and informal relations both among groups in the enterprise and between the enterprise and people in its environment. These are the potential sources of an SCA.

It seems clear that if any of these kinds of resources are to be the raw material of an SCA, they must not be accessible to competing enterprises (they are ‘heterogenous’), and not easily acquired by any venture that wants to lay hands on them (they are relatively ‘immobile’) (Barney, 1991). This entails that whatever the sources of an SCA are, they are not the sort of thing that may be purchased on an open market. If they were, any competitor with the purchase price could duplicate the advantage and it could not be sustained.

Barney (1991) has argued, convincingly, that a resource must possess four characteristics in order to be a potential source of SCA. To begin with, it must be ‘valuable’, or useful, in the sense that it takes advantage of some opening, or at least counteracts some hazard, in the business environment of the venture. Further, it must be ‘rare’ in the sense that few if any competitors have access to that resource, or at least to the same extent or quantity of that resource. Further still—and this turns out to be crucial—the resource must be difficult to replicate, ‘imperfectly imitable’. What might make resources ‘imperfectly imitable’?

The answer, according to Barney (1991, pp. 107-111), is some combination of at least two factors strikingly relevant to the forms of enterprise at the centre of our enquiry. Unique historical circumstances are one potent source of inimitability. The particular historical path followed by an enterprise may furnish ways of acquiring and exploiting resources that are simply not available to others with a different history. Second, ‘social complexity’—the degree of intricacy and density that exist at all levels of an enterprise, may be a resource that rivals cannot

replicate. Relations among those involved in the historical development, direction, management or conduct of the enterprise, or the relationship of the enterprise to its business, social, cultural and political surroundings, may be and frequently are sufficiently complicated that attempting to reproduce them is almost futile. Even if competitors knew what it was about the enterprise's 'culture', its relationship to its community of suppliers consumers and so on, that gives it an advantage, in many cases it is not at all clear how that connection could be replicated.

Finally, the resource must not lend itself to 'substitutionability'; i.e. it must not be possible to replace the resource with some other that is not rare and can be used to implement the same strategy. Obviously, if a competitor may replace a valuable resource with some other that is readily accessible, that resource cannot generate an SCA.

I will argue that the circumstances and backgrounds of CBEs provide them with a rich source of potential SCA. In a nutshell, CBEs are typically supported and enabled by a deeply and tightly woven web of reciprocal exchanges that is extremely valuable, rare and hard to replicate.

Non-Monetary Exchanges and CBEs. Consider the example of Llapampa, a community in the Andean highlands of Peru. The region has been occupied for more than a millennium by a people known as *wankas*. Today's community members are fiercely proud of their lineage and of having both resisted and survived centuries of attempted domination by Incas and Spaniards. These are the people who, in 1975 launched and today operate the Self-Managed Community Enterprise (SMCE), a CBE under whose umbrella a range of productive activities are conducted, ranging from agriculture through tourism to marble quarrying and silica mining. The history of SMCE's foundation and the methods of its governance illustrate the account given above of favouring circumstances in history and tradition, and characteristic forms of complex goal structure and democratic governance. The mining operation is the most profitable, but the

agricultural and other operations have played their part in providing the community with a level of social, medical and educational services, as well as an infrastructure of roads and public buildings, that are quite remarkable in the area. At the very heart of this network of activity is the tradition of *faena*: unpaid work contributed by all community members to community projects as a matter of regular obligation. *Faenas* built the school and the health centre, they are fundamental to the agricultural operations and their role in reducing costs has been essential to the productivity of the SMCE.

It is important to recognise that *faena* is a part of a complex network of reciprocal exchanges that undergirds life in these communities. These are grounded in an understanding of mutual responsibilities that exist between pairs of families, groups of families, and families and community at large. These reflect a general sense of interdependence and reciprocity that is the basis of countless transfers of things needed or services required without any notion of a financial basis for exchange. There is a comparatively strong sense of ‘community-orientation’, in which members experience their membership as resembling the life of parts of an organism; they tend to feel their status and well-being is a function of the reciprocated contributions they make to their community (Peredo & Chrisman, 2006, p. 313). With this goes a sense that members have a right to certain societal benefits, such as health, education and safety. Individual rights, even to such things as private property and private use of time, are to some extent subordinated to this. This brings with it the impression that the community is not only a provider of benefits but itself has needs, and is a party to these reciprocal, non-monetary exchanges of valuable goods and services. The practice of *faena* is continuous with the pattern of community involvement with their enterprise, including their active participation in governance.

Economic systems based on reciprocity and redistribution are not archaic and they are not rare. This elaborate arrangement of reciprocal exchanges regulates the mobility of labour, work and services in many communities worldwide. They are currently prominent in the economic life of not only the Aymara and Quechua people of South America, but also among the peoples of Papua New Guinea, the communities of Tristan de Cunha in South Africa, the Lio and Maneo of Eastern Indonesia, the Guarani of the Amazon in South America, the Salish and other first nations people of North America, the Inuit of Rankin Inlet, the indigenous people of Bali, and many others. The point is that these networks of non-monetary contribution and exchange are a resource with potential basis for sustained competitive advantage that many CBEs have already seized upon, and other communities would do well to consider.

Non-monetary forms of contribution are a resource, and there can be no doubt they are ‘valuable’ in the sense outlined above in explicating the concept of SCA. They are a powerful instrument in opening up and exploiting opportunities that communities identify in considering how to provision and sustain themselves.

Though these arrangements are not rare, in the sense that they are found throughout the world, they *are* ‘rare’ in the sense that the competition CBEs face as they are confronted by the globalising economy seldom if ever have access to the same resource, nor can they easily imitate or replace it. To see how ‘rare’ it is, let us employ the conceptual lenses of ‘social capital’, ‘embeddedness’ and ‘the gift economy’.

The rareness of reciprocal, non-monetary exchange. It is well-recognised that what is called ‘social capital’ is an extremely valuable resource in enterprise activity (C. B. Flora & Flora, 1993; J. L. Flora, 1998; J. L. Flora, Sharp, Flora, & Newlon, 1997). Among those who made the concept popular, Pierre Bourdieu defined social capital as ‘the aggregate of the actual

or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalised relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition' (Bourdieu, 1983, p. 249). Scholars found this a fertile way of identifying a resource, providing the avenues and lubricants of interaction, available to those who wished to engage in transactions of various kinds. Interestingly for our purposes, J. L. Flora (1998) expands this notion to include what he calls equality, inclusion and a sense of agency, to constitute 'entrepreneurial social infrastructure': a powerful resource for competitive advantage. There can be no doubt that these added features are among those that typically characterise the communities described here. Social capital, then, especially when it is understood as 'entrepreneurial social infrastructure', is a resource; and CBE communities possess it in abundance.

But seeing it simply as a resource fails to recognise the deep deposits underlying and feeding it that make it rare and inimitable. It was noted above that unique historical origins are a way of furnishing resources that cannot be accessed, and cannot be imitated, by those without that history. The 'social capital', or 'entrepreneurial social infrastructure' we are speaking of here is generally the outcome of generations of communal experience laid down in dynamic cultural traditions. One way of underlining the profundity of that accumulation is to add in the concepts of 'embeddedness' and 'the gift economy'.

One important use of the concept of 'embeddedness' is as a tool to understanding the way that economic transactions are affected by the location of transacting individuals and organizations in networks of personal relationships. Granovetter (1985) highlighted the degree to which economic transactions are, contrary to standard economic analysis, shaped not just by impersonal calculations of personal benefit but also by immersion in networks of personal relationship. Granovetter's work has been hugely influential in bringing attention to the way that

these transactions are the outcome, in part, of the pushes and pulls created by the connections created in our social interaction with others in our communities of significant contact.

A related but deeper sense of ‘embeddedness’ (Krippner & Alvarez, 2007) was advanced earlier by Karl Polanyi (1977, 2001 [1944]), whose thesis was that ‘economy’ is a broad term that includes various ways of providing for the needs of societies, and that exchanges are governed by a variety of prevailing institutions in the society. Markets are recent as a governing institution, Polanyi argued, but alternative institutions of reciprocity and redistribution are long-lived and deeply-rooted. From the viewpoint of an economic historian, Polanyi argued, transactions were generally undertaken in the context of a web of reciprocal obligations and understandings, and/or acceptance of redistributive rights of community authority. They were not determined by market prices or expectations of individual gain, but by notions of community benefit and one’s place in realising that.

It is arguable that Polanyi’s view represents many of the communities engaging in CBE. They are, in this view, not fossils, or historical oddities, but fully viable alternatives as to ways of conducting an economy. In practice, they constitute the marshalling of resources from an alternative economy as it engages with the forces of a market economy in the process of globalisation.

My argument is that these roots of the resource we are discussing, non-monetary exchange, run very deep. Their history and their depth is fundamental in rendering them rare and inimitable. The rivals of CBEs in the globalising economy are not other CBEs. CBEs are, by their nature, relatively small, local and specific in their operations and their call on resources. What impinges on them in the globalising economy are enterprises that are enlarging, de-localising and broadening in their scope. In that context, the resource of CBEs in non-monetary

exchange, deeply understood, will not constitute a sustained competitive advantage no matter what other market conditions are. But it is, potentially, powerful source of sustained competitive advantage in certain identifiable circumstances. In that role, CBEs are a counter-example to the standard views or what is needed for 'business success'. And in their resort to the potential of sustained competitive advantage in traditions of reciprocal exchange, they point to the promise that other forms of enterprise that are not exactly CBEs may build upon.

Challenges in the Globalising Environment. I have been arguing the CBEs typically have access to a resource with high potential for conferring a sustained competitive advantage on CBE in their attempts to survive in the globalising environment. As noted above, however, a sustained competitive advantage is not guaranteed to last forever. It is worth noting some of the challenges that CBEs and similar ventures face in their contact with an evolving market scene.

To begin with, increased emphasis on cash crops and/or migration, especially as a result of increasingly export-orientated national economies, characterise the realities of many villages in poor countries. Both have disruptive effects on the fabric of reciprocal exchanges as agriculture become more intensely monetarised. For example, many households headed by women as a result of outward migration by males in search of employment find it difficult to engage in non-monetary exchange of labour on behalf of their reduced households. Major emphasis on cash crops led to increase of wage labour. One Quechua women, in talking to me about her changing circumstance, referred to cash as 'the devil' entering in their lives. Similar patterns are found throughout Latin America, Asia, Africa. Netting, Stone, and Stone's study (1989) in Africa, documents the way in which patterns of abandoning traditional reciprocal cooperative behaviour leads to inequality and poverty among the Kofyar peoples. Their detailed investigation led them to contest the assumption that rural wage labour is cheaper than co-

operative labour. However, labour scarcity gives young men an incentive to make demands and break customs concerning reciprocal work, thus depleting the store of social capital that provides potential competitive advantage.

Not only relationship within communities has been transformed and weakened but relationship among communities as well. Historical records demonstrate local trade systems among communities based on reciprocal relations. However many of those been broken in the struggle for accessing cash and by large migrations into shantytown in the outskirts of large cities.

Second, cultures do not remain static. They evolve and adapt to changing circumstances, and CBEs are one example of that evolution. One change in evidence in many communities, however, is that younger members, especially those educated at universities outside the community, frequently return having acquired outlooks in some tension with the cultural traditions on which the CBEs rest. It is remarkable to observe the young people, particularly those studying business or economics, openly questioning the prominence of social and cultural goals in the structure of the enterprise, and the traditional management by community. At the conclusion of a general meeting in one community, I had the opportunity to meet with a number of students and hear their ideas. Their approach was reflected in the comments of various like-minded young management students from the community: 'We need to become professionals and we should not and cannot carry with social expenses in this community', said one. Another: 'We have to run this as a private business.' Yet another: 'yes, we have to privatise, maybe through commoners' groups that can buy shares, and enter into joint ventures with other companies....To do things right means: community is one thing, enterprise another.' Or: 'We have to hire a manager here.'

No doubt there is a need for increased management skills in the communities, but it seems that management education, perhaps among other things, has the effect of cultural attenuation and disconnecting younger members from the values and cultural traditions of their communities.

Third, 'development' initiatives undertaken by nations or regions in which CBEs are located frequently ignore culture as a resources and fail to appreciate cultural and economic diversity. Writing of one tribal group in Nigeria, Bohannan writes:

Tiv pride themselves on their family abilities and their subsistence wealth. Today however their ideas of economic exchange and their traditional methods of investment and economic aggrandizement are being undermined by a new economic system which demands different actions, motives and ideas (1955, p. 60).

Unfortunately, similar things can be said in 2010 about other traditional peoples, including the Inuit, the first nations people of North, Central and South America. Ethnic groups and communities worldwide are under intense pressure to abandon their cultural and economic way of life in the name of economic development. An Inuit elder leader narrated to me the conflict and divisions that development programs created in his community of Rankin Inlet in the Canadian arctic. He reported a sense of pressure to adopt and engage in 'entrepreneurial' behaviour, explaining that values such as personal gain and individualism being encouraged as part of the drive for economic development contradicted their traditional way of provisioning based on collective undertaking and sharing. Young people, he said, are no longer attracted to learning traditional skills; and if they do, they are only part of a leisure pursuit. The Inuit

community of Rankin Inlet indeed are making efforts to build community-based commercial activities based on customary skills. However, there as elsewhere their efforts often go under-appreciated. There is frequently a clash between officials in charge of economic development offices and educational institutions on the one hand, and community leaders on the other.

As result of misunderstandings like these, CBE's efforts are often constrained and even discouraged. Most of them, in many different countries, are not well supported by financial and legal institutions in their struggle to overcome other productive challenges such as under-capitalisation and reduced access to technology. What lie behind the clash are different understandings of development and entrepreneurial activity.

Finally, CBEs not only have to manage in a global environment dominated by giant MNC's that have the advantages of mobility, outsourcing and scale to cut costs, but they also has to deal with the ideological imagery created by them. Globalization is not just about a set of business ideas and practices but it also embodies '... a set of political ideas and beliefs coherent enough to warrant the status of a new ideology, but also constitutes the dominant ideology of our time...' (Steger, 2005, p. 11). In fact, this ideology promotes values and norms of consumerism as constituting identity around world. MNCs with well-built marketing budgets decide what is produced and consumed everywhere. They define what is 'normal' and 'authentic' (Guliz, 1999). The products of TNC's are regarded in poor countries as modern, fashionable and consequently highly desirable, and as status symbols (Friedman, 2000). In this way, global competition can have the effect of threatening the survival of any local firms, including CBEs. A simple example is a CBE that produces local soft drink, but the young people prefer to buy Coca Cola.

Conclusions and Further Research

I hope to have shown that with their rich endowments of non-monetary exchange embedded in a tradition of reciprocity, CBEs possess a resource well-equipped to provide sustained competitive advantage. At least three conclusions may be drawn from this.

First, CBEs, with their access to this resource, have strong potential as instruments of provisioning and improved well-being in communities that may be relatively disadvantaged with respect to other resources. They should be searched out, encouraged and supported with appropriate support from financial and legal institutions.

Second, the potential argued for in this article should help us to recognise and take advantage of the diversity of economic logics that exist in different regions and locales. Too often they are seen as instances of one basic economic form in various stages of development, and in need of re-direction when stray too far from the standard form.

Third, the arguments given above should underline for us the potential of culture as a resource, and not—as often argued, an impediment, in achieving improved well-being for disadvantages peoples.

There is clearly a rich vein of research to be done in locating other forms of enterprise that exploit this same resource of reciprocity and solidarity as a non-monetary contribution to the common good. It is grossly under-recognised the extent to which the functioning of many contemporary societies and economies depends in elements of co-operation, trust, reciprocity and ‘gift economy’ (Offer, 2006). Features of reciprocity and gift economy are at the basis of the functioning of families and communities in every society.

For example, rural families in North America as well as in post Soviet Union, engage in a wide range of alternative economic activities that exploit reciprocal exchange as protection from

poverty. Alternative market arrangements, such as local currencies, community support agriculture initiatives and micro-credit create a context for the co-existence of monetary and non-monetary relations (Hinrichs, 2000; Pratt, 2007). Open source software itself is often cited as an outstanding example of the reciprocity-based gift economy, creating openness and relationships among people sharing and developing the software, while challenging digital commodification (Best, 2003).

The above are just a few examples of the role of non-monetary reciprocity in contemporary life. Add to these the significance of the volunteer element in the not-for-profit sector in Canada or in global institutions such as Habitat for Humanity. In business, research on immigrant ethnic enclaves in the last 15 years has contributed to our understanding of the role that personal networks have for starting a venture (e.g. Fadahunsi, Smallbone, & Supri, 2000). What needs further consideration, however, is the extent to which communities themselves, as collective units, may function as entrepreneurs and enterprises, and may benefit in those functions from the gift economy and social capital at their disposal.

References

- Alberti, G., & Mayer, E. (1974). Reciprocidad andina: ayer y hoy. In G. Alberti & E. Mayer (Eds.), *Reciprocidad e intercambio en los Andes peruanos*. Lima, Peru: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- Anderson, R. (2002). Entrepreneurship and Aboriginal Canadians: A case study in economic development. *Journal of Development Entrepreneurship*, 7(1), 45-66.
- Ardichvili, A., Cardoza, R., Ray, S. (2003). A theory of entrepreneurial opportunity identification and development. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(105-123).
- Barber, K. (Ed.). (1998). *The Canadian Oxford Dictionary*. Toronto, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99-120.
- Bendick, M., & Egan, M. L. (1995). Worker Ownership and Participation Enhances Economic Development in Low-Opportunity Communities. *Journal of Community Practice*, 2(1), 61-86.
- Berkes, F., & Adhikari, T. (2006). Development and Conservation: Indigenous Businesses and UNDP Equator Initiative. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 3(6), 671-690.
- Best, K. (2003). Beating them at their own game: the cultural politics of the open software movement and the gift economy. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 6(4), 449-470.
- Bohannen, P. (1955). Some Principles of Exchange and Investment Among the Tiv. *American Anthropologist*, 57(1), 60-70.
- Bourdieu, P. (1983). Ökonomisches Kapital, kulturelles Kapital, soziales Kapital. In R. Kreckel (Ed.), *Soziale Ungleichheiten (Soziale Welt, Sonderheft 2)*. Göttingen Otto Schartz & Co.
- Bowen, G. L., Martin, J. A., Mancini, J. A., & Nelson, J. P. (2000). Community Capacity: Antecedents and Consequences. *Journal of Community Practice*, 8(2), 1-21.
- Brenkert, G. G. (2002). Entrepreneurship, Ethics and the Good Society. In R. E. Freeman & S. Venkataraman (Eds.), *Ruffin Series in Business Ethics #3, Ethics and the Entrepreneur* (pp. 5-43). Charlottesville, VA: Ruffin Publishing.
- Bygrave, W., & Minniti, M. (2000). The social dynamics of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 24(3), 25-.
- Chrisman, J. J., Bauerschmidt, A., & Hofer, C. W. (1998). The determinants of new venture performance: An extended model. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 23(1), 5-29.

- Dampha, A., & Camera, K. (2005). *Empowering communities through forestry: Community-based enterprise development in the Gambia. Working Paper No. 8*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).
- de la Cadena (1989). *Cooperacion y Conflict Cooperacion y Conflict en la Comunidad Andina: Zonas de Producción y Organización Socia*. Lima, Peru: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- Equator Initiative (2009). Equator Knowledge Zone Retrieved 16 February 2010 from <http://www.equatorinitiative.org/knowledgebase/index.php>
- Fadahunsi, A., Smallbone, D., & Supri, S. (2000). Networking and ethnic minority enterprise development: Insights from a North London study. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 7(3), 228-240.
- Flora, C. B., & Flora, J. L. (1993). Entrepreneurial Social Infrastructure: A Necessary Ingredient. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 529, 48-58.
- Flora, J. L. (1998). Social Capital and Communities of Place. *Rural Sociology*, 63(4), 481-506.
- Flora, J. L., Sharp, J., Flora, C., & Newlon, B. (1997). Entrepreneurial Social Infrastructure and Locally Initiated Economic Development in the NonMetropolitan United States. *The Sociology Quarterly*, 38(4), 623-645.
- Friedman, T. L. (2000). *The Lexus and the olive tree* (Rev. ed.). New York: Anchor Books.
- Granovetter, M. (1985). Economic action and social structure: the problem of embeddedness. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 91(3), 481-510.
- Greenwood, D. J. (1992). Labor-Managed Systems and Industrial Redevelopment: Lessons from the Fagor Cooperative Group of Mondragon. In F. A. Rothstein & M. L. Blim (Eds.), *Anthropology and the Global Factory: Studies of the New Industrialization in the Late Twentieth Century* (pp. 177-190). New York: Bergin & Garvey.
- Guliz, G. (1999). Localizing in the global village: local firms competing in global markets. *California Management Review*, 41(4), 64-83.
- Hadi, A. (2001). Health Knowledge through Micro-Credit Programmes: Experience of BRAC in Bangladesh. *Health Promotion International*, 16(3), 219-227.
- Harvey, M., & Evans, R. (1995). Strategic windows in the entrepreneurial process. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 10(5), 331-348.
- Hazare, A. (1997). *Ralegan Siddhi: A Veritable Transformation* (B. S. Pendse, Trans.). Ralegan Siddhi, India: Ralegan Siddhi Pariwar Publications.
- Helmsing, A. (2002). Perspectives on economic localized development. *Eure-Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios Urbano Regionales*, 27(84), 33-61.
- Hinrichs, C. (2000). Embeddedness and local food systems: Notes on two types of direct agricultural market. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 16(3), 295-303.

- Hodson, R. (2002). Worker participation and teams: New evidence from analyzing organizational ethnographies. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 23(4), 491-528.
- Hoffman, N. P. (2000). An Examination of the "Sustainable Competitive Advantage" Concept: Past, Present, and Future. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 2000(4). Retrieved from <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/hoffman04-2000.pdf>
- King, A. (1995). Avoiding Ecological Surprise: Lessons From Long-Standing Communities. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(4), 961-986.
- Kranton, R. (1996). Reciprocal exchange: A self sustaining system. *American Economic Review*, 86, 830-851.
- Lean, M. (1995). *Bread, bricks, and belief : communities in charge of their future*. West Hartford, Conn., USA: Kumarian Press.
- Lietaer, B., & De Meulenaere, S. (2003). Sustaining cultural vitality in a globalizing world: the Balinese example. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 30(9), 967-984.
- MacLeod, G. (1986). *New age business: Community corporations that work*. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Social Development.
- Morrison, R. (1997). *We Build the Road as We Travel*. Philadelphia, PA: New Society Press.
- Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 242-267.
- Netting, R. M., Stone, M. P., & Stone, G. D. (1989). Kofyar cash-cropping: Choice and change in indigenous agricultural development. *Human Ecology*, 17(3), 299-319.
- OECD (1995a). Floriculture Using Local Energy in Japan *Niche markets as a rural development strategy* (pp. 16-31). Paris, Washington, D.C.: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development; OECD Publications and Information Centre [distributor].
- OECD (1995b). Retirement Living in Elliot Lake, Canada *Niche markets as a rural development strategy* (pp. 75-87). Paris, Washington, D.C.: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development ; OECD Publications and Information Centre [distributor].
- Offer, A. (2006). *The challenge of affluence: self-control and well-being in the United States and Britain since 1950*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Peredo, A. M. (2001). *Communal Enterprises, Sustainable Development and The Alleviation of Poverty in Rural Andean Communities*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Calgary, Calgary.
- Peredo, A. M. (2003). Emerging Strategies Against Poverty: The Road Less Traveled. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 12(2), 155-166.
- Peredo, A. M., & Chrisman, J. J. (2006). Toward a Theory of Community-Based Enterprise. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(2), 309-328.

- Polanyi, K. (1977). *The livelihood of man*. Pearson, H. W. (Ed.). New York: Academic Press.
- Polanyi, K. (2001 [1944]). *The great transformation: the political and economic origins of our time* (2nd Beacon Paperback ed.). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Pratt, J. (2007). Food Values: the local and the authentic. *Critique of anthropology*, 27(3), 285-300.
- Quintero, A. O. (2006). *Lessons from the Equator Initiative: The Community-Based Enterprise of Nuevo San Juan, Mexico*. Winnipeg, MB: Natural Resources Institute, University of Manitoba.
- Spender, J.-C. (1994). Knowing, managing and learning: A dynamic managerial epistemology. *Management Learning*, 25, 387-412.
- Steger, M. B. (2005). Ideologies of Globalization. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 10(1), 11-30.
- Venkataraman, S. (1997). The distinctive domain of entrepreneurship research: an editor's perspective. In J. Katz & R. Brockhaus (Eds.), *Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence, and Growth* (Vol. III, pp. 119-138). Greenwich, CO: JAI Press.