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ABSTRACT

Several studies, mostly from the US, Canada and UK have focused on ethnic entrepreneurs and analysed co-ethnic network functions. The present paper complements those researches by focusing on ethnic entrepreneurs in Melbourne, Australia. A significant finding was that, in co-ethnic networking, only family members and close friends were called upon to support ethnic business owners by providing information, emotional succour, financial supports, as well as offering advice on business plans. Ethnic entrepreneurs' involvement in the co-ethnic community was low. Further, only about one-third frequently engaged with other business persons of all networks. Another was that co-ethnic, multi-ethnic and Australian networks in Melbourne were underutilised by ethnic entrepreneurs in sustaining and growing their businesses. Additional benefits from networking are identified.
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INTRODUCTION

The growth of international migration and foreign-born populations in host societies during the post World War II period is an essential factor in the global economic concept (Kloosterman & Rath 2001, 2003; Sanders 2002). This fact and other studies imply that the immigrant and ethnic communities, in general, and immigrant and ethnic entrepreneurs, in particular, would affect the economy of the host society in a wide range of ways (Agrawal and Chavan 1997; Bates 1994; Bonacich 1993; Butler & Greene 1997; Morris 2000; Zhou 2004).

Although several schools of thought look at ethnic entrepreneurship from different views, they all concur that, for ethnic entrepreneurs, networking is a vital part of their entrepreneurial processes. Though each approach has different points of view in terms of how and why ethnic entrepreneurs use networking, all approaches all accept that using networks is one of the main strategies that ethnic entrepreneurs apply to overcome obstacles (Bates 2003; Deakins & Freel 2003; Light & Gold 2000; Waldinger, Aldrich, Ward & Associates 1990).

Various researchers have contributed according to their own interests towards understanding this topical area. However, a literature review indicates a focus on networking between ethnic entrepreneurs inside their communities (Menzies, Brenner, Filion, Lowry, Perreault & Ramangalahy 2000) but there is very little research about that relationship across ethnic groups (Tsui-Auch 2005). In Australia, research on networking across ethnic groups especially is not evident.
According to OECD annual report (2007), the immigration phenomenon has gained strength over the last half-century in many countries, particularly developed countries such as the USA, Canada, Australia and most of the European countries. The Australian immigrant and ethnic groups’ context appears to be unique compared to other OECD countries as Australia has been settled by immigrants and the Australian economy is strongly dependent on immigrants.

This paper presents the outcomes of an investigation on ethnic entrepreneurship and networking in the larger Melbourne area, one of the biggest, multicultural and cosmopolitan in Australia. The research was to determine the characteristics, usage and benefits to ethnic entrepreneurs of ethnic and Australian networks. Specifically, the objectives were to:

- Determine how, and the extent to which, ethnic networks supported or facilitated the ethnic entrepreneurial processes, and
- Identify benefits that an ethnic entrepreneur could utilise or tap into from other ethnic networks and from Australian business networks.

Clarifying how these ethnic entrepreneur networks performed and facilitated ethnic businesses in an Australian context required identification of key socioeconomic patterns of selected Australian immigrant and ethnic entrepreneurs. It also required a review of the literature regarding the ethnic entrepreneurship phenomenon, social capital and network-related concepts relating to the reported research.

**Ethnic, immigrant, and minority entrepreneurs**

One definition of an *ethnic entrepreneur*, by Aldrich and Waldinger (1990), accepted by many sociologists and experts (Chaganti & Greene 2002; Greene & Chaganti 2004; Light & Gold 2000; Sequeira & Rasheed 2004; Zhou 2004). Aldrich and Waldinger (1990, p.112), stated that: ‘what is ethnic about ethnic entrepreneurs may be no more than a set of connections and regular patterns of interaction among people sharing common national background or migration experiences’. According to Butler and Greene (1997), an *immigrant entrepreneur* is a person who arrived in the host country and started a business as a means of economic survival. Greene and Chaganti (2004) modified the above definition of immigrant entrepreneurs via the situational context, indicating that it is geographical change that encourages someone to act entrepreneurially. On the other hand, *minority entrepreneur*, a term often used in American contexts, in accordance with a report from U.S. Department of Commerce (1997), refers to individuals who run a business and do not belong to the majority population. Greene and Chaganti (2004) inferred that the definition of minority entrepreneur had government policy making implications, and mentioned that ‘minority entrepreneur’ is usually associated with policy setting, where it refers to business owners who are distinguished from the majority population by race or ethnicity, and even sometimes gender. In the Australian context, aboriginal entrepreneurs may be categorized as minority entrepreneurs but are excluded from the present study. The terms ‘immigrant entrepreneur’ and ‘ethnic entrepreneur’ are used interchangeably.

**CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY**

Key findings from a literature review (partially reported below) helped develop a conceptual framework (see Figure 1) for the present research, as well as aided the posing of research questions, the development of the methodology (including the data gathering instrument) and subsequent discussion of the findings.

Menzies and her colleagues (2000) believed that most scholars, regardless of their approaches, could justify that the ethnic community was one main source of providing ‘Co-ethnic markets’, ‘Co-ethnic suppliers’, ‘Co-ethnic employees’, and ‘Finance’ for ethnic entrepreneurs. Salaff, Greve, Wong & Li ping (2003) were of the view that ethnic communities provide resources such as information, business ideas, customers, suppliers and employees.

It is noteworthy that each network exists in a particular social, economic and political environment and is affected significantly by the environment surrounding it (Aldrich & Zimmer 1986). In other words, when studying particular network(s), the researcher or scholar should bear in mind the nature of the
environment in which the study was being conducted. That environment has certain features, such as the community and social capital, which were integral to the research.

Figure 1: Conceptual framework guiding this research

\[\text{Co-ethnic network functions}\\
\text{(Co-ethnic suppliers, Co-ethnic employees, Co-ethnic market, Finance, Information, Emotional support)}\\
\]

This research relies on network theory. Research papers written by Bates (1994), Smith and Holmes (1997), Aldrich, Elam and Reese (1997), Sandberg and Logen (1997), Perreault, Brenner, Menzies, Filion and Ramangalahy (2003), Brenner, Menzies, Ramangalahy, Amit and Filion (2000), Menzies, Filion, Brenner and Elgie (2003), and Mitchell (2003) were consulted to justify the suitability of the methods adopted for the present research. Blackburn et al. (in O’Donnell 2004) indicated that quantitative methods sometimes cause confusion, especially when the aim of research is to explain a phenomenon rather than predict it. However, Witt (2004) said that empirical studies in networking ‘must use quantitative measures to estimate information’ (Witt 2004, p. 393). Hence, the present research used the quantitative methodology and sought to determine the characteristics of some ethnic networks in Melbourne through answering the following questions:

1) What are the characteristics of ethnic networks in Melbourne that facilitate the ethnic entrepreneurial process?
2) To what extent do ethnic entrepreneurs in Melbourne use available resources inside their co-ethnic networks?
3) What benefits could an ethnic entrepreneur obtain from networks outside their community to sustain or enhance the success of their business?

Questionnaires were administered to obtain data on:
- Demographic aspects of the business owner and the business itself
- Aspects of personal networking of the business owner
- Benefits currently accruing to ethnic businesses from ethnic networks
- Additional benefits for ethnic businesses from all business networks

The sample frame included ethnic entrepreneurs from different ethnicities who employed others in their businesses. The responding businesses were small or medium sized and located in Melbourne (city and environs), Australia. Two procedures, stratified and snow-ball sampling, were employed simultaneously to select participants. To draw up lists of businesses in recruiting participants, different
methods and sources were utilized, including sources available from ‘the New Enterprise Incentive Scheme’ (NEIS), (an Australian government department which is focusing on developing small businesses run by both Australian-born and immigrants in Australia), personal networks, friends’ networks, ethnic business associations, and cluster areas in different suburbs in Melbourne. By using mail survey and personal contacts during 10 months of data collection, 130 usable questionnaires were obtained. The return rate of mail survey was very low, less than 1%, so almost all questionnaires were completed through personal contacts.

**Participant characteristics**

Ethnicity-wise, 55% (72 participants) of participants were Chinese, about 17% (22) were Thai, 8% (11) were Vietnamese and the rest were from Asian countries except for 2 Italians and one Ghanaian. For purposes of the analysis, all participants were put into five clusters; namely, Chinese, Thai, Vietnamese, South Asian, and Other Ethnicities.

Male business owners (62%) dominated the number of participants. Close to 37% of participants were younger than 40 years old and just about 5% of them were older than 60 years. Those aged 40-49 years and 50-56 years comprised 39% and 17.5%, respectively. Majority (61.5%) of participants claimed that they possessed a diploma or university degree. Business owners with a post graduate degree comprised 16% and with high school or 12th grade qualification comprised 15% of participants. Nine participants (7%) did not provide their education background. Almost 83% (108) were married.

About 80% of participants were currently running just one business, about 11% (14) had two businesses, and 9% (12) ran more than two businesses. Seventy-eight participants (60%) were running their businesses without pre-migration business experience, compared to 50 business owners who ran businesses similar to those they had in their home countries. The vast majority of the participants had small businesses in service sectors such as restaurants (26%), retailing (14%), grocery shops (6%), and information technology (7%). Only three of them (2%) owned manufacturing firms. Forty-eight businesses (37%) were being run by a maximum of two employees, excluding the owner, 15 businesses had 10-15 employees (11.5%) and only 8 businesses had between 16-20 employees.

**FINDINGS**

**Ethnic networks’ facilitation of the ethnic entrepreneurial process**

In a sense, the ethnic entrepreneur lies at the intersection of personal and ethnic networks. Hence, consideration of the ethnic entrepreneurs’ personal networks could be an antecedent that adds value to the ethnic networks’ facilitation of the ethnic entrepreneurial process.

**Ethnic entrepreneurs’ personal networking**

Mitchell (in O’Donnell, Gilmore, Cummins & Carson 2001) suggested that, to comprehend the characteristics of a network, business or personal, one should study the structure of the network and its interactive dimensions (also known as network processes). Presented below are findings in accordance with that recommendation.

Participants were asked for information on ‘business plan advice before starting-up’ in order to explore the structural dimensions of ethnic entrepreneurs’ networks. Only about 8% of participants never asked for business advice or discussed their business plan with people they knew. However, the majority of them (59.3%) had discussed their business plan with different people (up to a maximum of 5 persons) before starting their business. Forty-two participants (32.8%) claimed that they had had discussions with more than 5 persons about their plan to run a business. These broad patterns differ among the five cluster groups. For instance, in the Chinese cluster, 8.5% had never asked for business plan advice; whereas 27% of the Vietnamese had never asked some advice for business plan. In contrast, all Thai and South Asian people had had discussions with other people to obtain some guidance before starting their businesses.

The data revealed that ‘family members’ comprised the group with the highest percentage (84.4%) involved in pre-discussion. The next group was the ‘close friends from the same ethnicity’ with 71%,
and ‘acquaintance or member of same ethnic community’ with 34.4%. Among different groups, all Thai and the majority of Chinese and South Asian people (77.5% and 70.5% respectively) sought advice from at least members of their family.

The data showed that only 15.5% had high density network structures; these participants comprised twelve Chinese, six Thai, one Japanese and one Latin who had discussed their business plan with a wide range of people that included family members, relatives, and close friends either from same ethnicity or from other ethnicities. When it came to soliciting advice from Australian business associations or Government bodies, only 14% of participants had done so, indicating that such associations/bodies were underutilized.

Regarding percentage of ‘friends from the co-ethnic community’, only 4.6% had less than 10% of their friends from their own ethnicity (implying a large range) while 62.3% claimed that more than 50% of their friends belonged to their own ethnicity (indicating a small range). The Chinese, Thai, and Vietnamese participants, having more friends from their same ethnicity at 75%, 63.6%, and 63.6% respectively, exhibited a small range.

Regarding network membership, sixty-nine (about 53%) participants claimed that they were members of a network/association. Of these, for both social and business purposes, some 35 ethnic entrepreneurs (about 51%) participated actively in at least their co-ethnic non-business network/association, 16 participants (23%) participated in at least the co-ethnic business association, and 12 of them (17.3%) were members of an Australian association. The reasons why participants joined networks were varied, such as having social activity and fun, finding information, meeting different people and overcoming/solving business problems. ‘Finding solution(s) to business problems’ (at 53.6%) and ‘having fun and social activity’ (at about 51%) were the main reasons cited to join the network by those participants who were members of a network. This compares with ‘finding information’ (23%), and ‘meeting different people’ (17.3%).

Only about 15% of network-member participants believed that participating in their ethnic community was at least important for them, with the rest indicating neutrality or low-very low level of importance (see Figure 2). This is borne out by the low numbers of network-member participants (15%) reporting attendance at more than 10 meetings within their ethnic community for business or social purposes within the last year. More than half the network-member participants had never attended any business or social meetings inside their communities within the last year. Hence, only few participants considered that their contributions to ethnic community were important and that their involvement in the ethnic community was significant.

Figure 2: Network-member participants’ perception of the importance of their contribution to their ethnic community

![Level of contribution to ethnic community by network-member respondents](image)

Source: Survey on Multi-ethnic business networks in Australia, focusing on Melbourne metropolitan area
About 29% of participants spent less than 10% of their time establishing relationships with other business people, while 30.1% spent more than 50% of their time doing so. Time spent maintaining business relationships showed similar patterns. About one-quarter of participants spent less than one hour per week maintaining business relationship while 29.4% spent more than five hours. These figures indicate that only about one-third of the participants frequently engaged with other business persons.

Benefits and support from co-ethnic networks

Menzies et al. (2003) wrote on the ethnic community as an initial network for ethnic entrepreneurs and how it facilitated support and provided benefits which included pools of ethnic employees, suppliers, ethnic customers, financial sources, and information and emotional sources. In this section, fresh empirical findings are presented regarding ethnic network-facilitated benefits and support.

(a) Employees

Majority of participants (69%) currently hired employees from their own ethnicity, indicating that the co-ethnic community was the major source of employees for the ethnic entrepreneurs. Among Chinese, Thai, and Vietnamese entrepreneurs, the percentages of co-ethnic workers currently employed were 70.5%, 96%, and 64% respectively. This approach of hiring co-ethnics hasn’t changed significantly over time for 84% of total participants. Among Chinese participants, only 11% had changed their approach to recruit employees over time. Forty-one per cent of Thai participants and 36.4% of Vietnamese claimed that, in the past, they have had workers from other ethnicities in their businesses.

(b) Suppliers

Dissonance regarding the preferences of ethnic entrepreneurs regarding the supplier source-pool and the current reality of supplier usage was also explored. Though about 62% of ethnic entrepreneurs preferred to use co-ethnic suppliers, only about 22% of them claimed they currently used only co-ethnic suppliers. Preferences for use of other-ethnicity suppliers stood at about 38% whereas actual usage showed 11%. Non-immigrant suppliers were preferred by about 40% of ethnic entrepreneurs, while actual usage was only 6.5%. In all these instances, the preferred situations were not achieved. The significant dissonance between preferences and actual use needs further investigation. Nevertheless, preference for using a mix of all groups was 51% whereas about 60 per cent of participants currently used suppliers regardless of ethnicity of the supplier.

(c) Customers

Ethnic entrepreneurs appeared to welcome all types of customers. About 64% of participants claimed that their customers comprised people from different ethnicities as well as non-immigrants. In addition, 75.5% said that they usually/always preferred to have customers regardless of their ethnicities. However, only 8% said that they rarely liked to have customers from their own ethnicity, thereby supporting the preceding findings.

(d) Finance

Of the several ways that exist to obtain funds for starting up businesses, three capital raising methods were claimed to be used as follows: Using ‘own savings’ (about 80% of the participants), ‘loans from different resources’ (about 83%), and using one’s credit (22%). Similarly, 77% of Chinese used their own savings, whereas 81% of Chinese also took loans from different sources. Majority of Thai participants (85%) used own savings, while borrowing from different resources (90%). In terms of loans actually secured, the most prevalent source was the family (53.5% of participants), followed by financial agencies (45%). The majority of ethnic entrepreneurs who used loans from financial agencies were Chinese (55%), a finding requiring investigation.

Regarding the preferred source of raising funds, the survey found that borrowing from banks (63.5%), family (42%), and business partners (12.8%) were sequentially the more preferred alternatives for ethnic entrepreneurs requiring additional funding. However, 62.2% of participants preferred never to borrow money from their own ethnic community or from financial agencies (58%).

(e) Information
Co-ethnic friends formed the largest source of information needed to establish the business (74.6%), followed by family (41.5%). Information from co-ethnic business networks was sought and received by 30.1% of participants before establishing their businesses. About 13% sought and received information from their Australian counterparts and about 12% from Australian government bodies. For running the business, the first information source used was co-ethnic friends, followed by friends from other ethnicities (32.5%). Significantly, during running the business, ethnic entrepreneurs received more information support from Australian business associations (17.8% of participants) and government bodies (24%) than they did during the pre-establishment stage. Information from ethnic business networks was equally frequently received (about 30% of participants) during pre-establishment and during the actual running of the business.

(f) Emotional support

About 88% of participants at start-up had received emotional support mainly from the family (84.2% of participants), followed by from co-ethnic friends (54.3%). This contrasts with such support from members of the ethnic community not falling into the category of co-ethnic friends, Australian business associations, and government bodies at 5.1%, 9%, and 7%, respectively. When ethnic entrepreneurs faced business problems during running the business, the family was again the first source of emotional support (about 86% of participants), followed by co-ethnic friends (55.1%). Co-ethnic business networks, Australian business associations and government bodies were least likely sources to encourage ethnic entrepreneurs to overcome their problems (8.4%, 2.8%, and 2.7%, respectively).

Additional benefits and support accruing from non co-ethnic networks

Additional benefits that ethnic entrepreneurs asked for or received from other business networks (other-ethnic and Australian) included mentoring, role models, easy access to overseas markets, legal advice, protection from social and political threats, training courses, arranging meetings with other groups, managerial accreditation, and utilizing new technology. While legal support (39.2% of participants) was the main benefit that ethnic entrepreneurs asked for or received from their co-ethnic communities, fewer ethnic entrepreneurs sought those benefits from other ethnic communities, particularly for training courses (about 9%), which was lowest percentage. About one-fifth had asked for or received advice from other-ethnic networks on their business plan, arranging meetings with other groups, legal support and in using new technology. Slightly less than one-fifth of participants had also sought or received support from other ethnic networks to gain access to overseas markets, protection from social threats and for mentoring. Australian business networks were used significantly for solicitor support and, to a lesser degree, for protection from social threats.

Benefits that majority of ethnic entrepreneurs claimed they did not need from their co-ethnic communities or from other networks were role models (50.4%), training courses (50%), and mentoring (49.6%).

In addition, the ethnic entrepreneurs were less aware of the availability of those benefits from either other ethnic communities or Australian business networks than they were of availability from their own community (see Table 1).
Table 1: Awareness of availability of cited benefits from different networks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unaware if available from…</th>
<th>Mentoring</th>
<th>Role model</th>
<th>Easy access to overseas market</th>
<th>Solicitor support</th>
<th>Protect from social threats</th>
<th>Training courses</th>
<th>Arranging meeting with other groups</th>
<th>Managerial accreditation</th>
<th>Utilize new Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic network</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ethnic networks</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian business</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey on Multi-ethnic business networks in Australia, focusing on Melbourne metropolitan area

Table 2 shows that the majority of participants preferred to obtain mentoring, role models, managerial accreditation, and utilizing new technology from their co-ethnic communities. Only for legal support, protection from social threats, and arranging meeting with other groups, did the majority prefer to approach Australian networks/associations. Training courses were sought equally from co-ethnic and Australian business associations.

Table 2: Choice of network to obtain cited benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred network</th>
<th>Mentoring</th>
<th>Role model</th>
<th>Easy access to overseas market</th>
<th>Solicitor support</th>
<th>Protect from social threats</th>
<th>Training courses</th>
<th>Arranging meeting with other groups</th>
<th>Managerial accreditation</th>
<th>Utilize new Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own ethnic</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ethnicities</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian business</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey on Multi-ethnic business networks in Australia, focusing on Melbourne metropolitan area
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Regarding ethnic network characteristics, it is clear that as the research participants were mainly running small businesses in service sectors, their needs and support were often limited to aspects such as access to employees, market, suppliers, finance, information and emotional support. Family members and close friends from the same ethnicity played significant roles to help ethnic/immigrant entrepreneurs to run their business by providing diverse types of support that included critical help such as finance, information, emotional support and employees, via people who were close to them, indicating a reliance on strong ties. Hence, in contrast to expected large-scale use of ethnic networks, there were only very specific and small fractions of the ethnic communities, namely families and close friends, which actually facilitated the ethnic entrepreneurial processes in this research population.

Pursuing the second research objective, ethnic businesses were found to underutilise benefits offered by co-ethnic communities, Australian business networks/Government bodies and other ethnic communities/networks. In the case of co-ethnic networks, it was a very small segment of the ethnic networks (namely people very close to business owners) that was exploited for major support in the form of information, emotional succour, employees and finance. The reason why participants underutilised co-ethnic communities/networks might be due to their low levels of contribution to their co-ethnic communities. Underutilisation of other networks in this research could be explained by Kloosterman and Rath’s (2003) assessment that ethnics and immigrants might not be capable of easily linking to appropriate social/business networks within the host society. Further development of strong relationships between ethnic business owners and Australian business associations/government bodies could enable ethnic entrepreneurs become aware of the availability of required support from the latter for business growth and sustainability.

Underutilised additional networking benefits included mentoring, providing role models, protection from social threats, providing training courses, arranging meetings with other ethnic groups, providing managerial accreditation, and access to new technology. Such underutilisation indicated that there should be pro-action by ethnic entrepreneurs to seek these from all types of business networks, whether Australian or ethnic business. Therefore, there appears to be great scope to further exploit these opportunity structures to further grow and sustain ethnic enterprises among the research population. Some steps were already in place, such as the research participants welcoming all types of customers regardless of ethnicity and in practice utilising suppliers regardless of their ethnicity, though preferring to deal more with co-ethnic suppliers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Aldrich and Zimmer (1986) observed that entrepreneurs are able to recognize opportunities by using their personal networks and business networks. Bolton and Thompson (2004) said that one of the ten key action roles regarding entrepreneurship is about utilizing networks in a perfect and efficient way. Hence, the use of business networks appears to be dependant upon an entrepreneur’s personal network as well as the entrepreneur’s personal attributes. Thus, it was surprising that the majority of the research participants involved themselves only relatively marginally in their co-ethnic networks and only about one-third frequently engaged with other business persons. It is recommended that they significantly increase such interaction to further exploit entrepreneurial opportunities. For research purposes, the present low-order involvement needs investigation.

The present underutilisation of additional benefits implies that ethnic entrepreneurs should actively develop and use multi-ethnic business networks as well as Australian business associations/government bodies. More investigation is required on how to do that productively, as well as on the process of establishing multi-ethnic networking.
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