Teaming with intent: harmonising heritage, innovation and multiple generations within the Māori entrepreneurial team

Mānuka Hēnare; Billie Lythberg; Christine Woods

University of Auckland Business School & Mira Szászy Research Centre for Māori and Pacific Economic Development, University of Auckland, New Zealand

Key words

Abstract

Māori are the indigenous peoples of Aotearoa-New Zealand. Contemporary Māori entrepreneurs innovate from a long history of indigenous economic development in Aotearoa-New Zealand and, further back, the wider Pacific region. Their entrepreneurial practice is informed by a tribal worldview that – among other things – acknowledges spiritual and human ancestors and descendants not yet born as part of the entrepreneurial team, and prioritises holistic wellbeings and value creation, including poverty resistance, over profit maximisation. This paper explores the composition of the Māori entrepreneurial team to present a nuanced understanding of the relation between indigenous entrepreneurship and cultural values in Aotearoa-New Zealand.

Our guiding questions are: How does culture inform indigenous entrepreneurship, and who or what comprises the Māori entrepreneurial team? The paper begins with a focused literature review to locate our definitions of 'indigenous' and 'indigenous entrepreneurship' from both academic and practitioner viewpoints before leading into a discussion on entrepreneurial teams from conventional business ideology and a Māori world view. We review work by academics from Aotearoa/New Zealand who draw on indigenous knowledge as well as the work of Joseph Schumpeter, one of the "founding fathers" in the field of entrepreneurship. Next, we analyse one Māori model of entrepreneurship, the Takarangi spiral of innovation. This model balances heritage with opportunity and ancestors with descendants, to hold in productive and generative tension the archetypes of the Māori team who span generations within the living and instantiate ancestors and those yet to be born. We conclude by identifying further questions currently in development, and others yet to be explored.

1. Introduction

Māori are the indigenous peoples of Aotearoa-New Zealand. Contemporary Māori entrepreneurs innovate from a long history of indigenous economic development in Aotearoa-New Zealand and, further back, the wider Pacific region. Their entrepreneurial practice is informed by a tribal worldview that – among other things – acknowledges spiritual and human ancestors and descendants not yet born as part of the entrepreneurial team, and prioritises holistic wellbeings and value creation over profit maximisation. This paper explores the composition of the Māori entrepreneurial team to present a nuanced understanding of the relation between indigenous entrepreneurship and cultural values in Aotearoa-New Zealand.

While Māori are acknowledged as entrepreneurial (Petrie 2006, Henry 2007) and their economic future is acknowledged as intrinsically linked to the economic future of tauiwi (people who are not Māori) there has been "little exploration into how Māori can cultivate entrepreneurship by using their own distinctive cultural values" (Nicholson et al 2012: 38; see also Durie 2003; Haar and Delaney 2009). Significantly, there is a lacuna of Māori business and economic history. This is important both for aspiring Māori entrepreneurs *and* for tauiwi, rendered as partners, who wish to engage effectively with them. Indeed, as Peredo and Anderson (2006: 270) have identified, "The theme of partnerships involving indigenous enterprises with other indigenous enterprises and non-indigenous bodies, including NGOs, government agencies, funding organisations, and non-indigenous individuals and corporatism is recognized as a vital topic demanding further attention".

Hēnare (1998, 2005; Hēnare et al 2013) has explored definitions of indigenous people and Māori thoughts on globalisation, proposing that with the John Naisbitt paradox of globalisation the more global the international economy becomes the stronger are the local economies. In this paradox the small

indigenous economies could well flourish because with globalisation comes the weakening of hegemonic tendencies of the nation state. Thus, economic partnerships between Māori and tauiwi – indigenous and non-indigenous – become ever more appealing.

We believe that a common tension in nascent partnerships between indigenous and non-indigenous enterprises emerges from different business and economic histories and contrasting approaches to both the entrepreneurial team and its aspirations. Despite growing acknowledgement that Māori entrepreneurial approaches and teams differ from recent dominant Anglo-New Zealand models there remains "an assumption that conventional Anglo-Western business ideology can be applied to a Māori framework without modification; it is Māori who are expected to adapt" (Nicholson et al 2012: 38; see also Durie 2003). This approach is echoed by theorists who question whether indigenous peoples can reconcile their cultural endowments with the 'Schumpeterian style intrusions' of European economic and social methods (Stiles 2004: 1, cited by Peredo and Anderson 2006: 262). As Peredo and Anderson (2006: 262) explain "The implication is that the requirements of entrepreneurship are universal, and successful entrepreneurial responses require that indigenous people leave behind, or at least adapt, those features of culture, which are incompatible." What is at stake here is "the fundamental issue of the relation between entrepreneurship and cultural values" (Peredo and Anderson 2006: 254), which we argue is precisely what determines the composition of, and guides toward success, the Māori entrepreneurial team.

Hēnare (2001, 2005, 2011) draws on William Lazonick (2003:39) to explore what determines the growth of the Māori economy, which Hēnare has named the Economy of Mana. Following Lazonick he proposes that the problem with conventional theory of the market economy is that it lacks a theory of economic development. In addition, he argues for a Māori focused historical-transformation methodology as a way to understand the nature of the innovative process, and the social and political conditions of Aotearoa-New Zealand and the Anglo-Western world that constrain and promote innovation over time. Both Lazonick and Hēnare share Schumpeter's (1954) requirement that the successful application of the methodology requires "historical experience".

Our assumption is that all cultures have within them notions and practices of innovation and entrepreneurship. Our guiding questions are: How does culture both inform and influence indigenous entrepreneurship, and who or what comprises the Māori entrepreneurial team? The paper begins with a focused literature review to locate our definitions of 'indigenous' and 'indigenous entrepreneurship' from both academic and practitioner viewpoints before leading into a discussion on entrepreneurial teams from conventional business ideology and a Māori world view. We review work by academics from Aotearoa-New Zealand who draw on indigenous knowledge as well as a Schumpeterian inspired understanding of entrepreneurial behavior. Next, we analyse the Takarangi spiral of innovation that balances heritage with opportunity, and ancestors with descendants, to hold in productive and generative tension the archetypes of the Māori team who span generations within the living *and* instantiate ancestors and those yet to be born (Tapsell & Woods 2008a, 2008b, 2010; Overall, Tapsell & Woods 2010; Kawharu, Tapsell & Woods 2013). We conclude by identifying further questions currently in development, and others yet to be explored.

2. Towards a definition of indigenous entrepreneurship

In their seminal article, *Indigenous entrepreneurship research: themes and variations*, Peredo and Anderson (2006) provide a careful delineation of the emerging field of Indigenous entrepreneurship. Specifically, they address the two 'obvious questions': Who are indigenous people, and what is indigenous entrepreneurship? Drawing on key authors in the field they provide a useful summary of the various definitions and emerging areas of interest (Foley 2003, Peredo, Anderson, Galbraith, Benson & Dana 2004, Hindle and Landsdown 2005, Lindsay 2005, Dana 2006). Three key aspects emerge from this summary that speaks to both the notion of indigeneity and its possible influence on entrepreneurial activity:

1) Indigenous peoples are those who identify as the original inhabitants of the land, and is both self- and community-defined (i.e. one who identifies as indigenous and is accepted as such by their community (Lindsay 2005: 1; Hēnare et al 2013);

2) Some form of domination by later inhabitants occurred "through conquest, occupation, settlement or other means" (General Assembly and United Nations as cited in Peredo & Anderson 2006: 225);

3) Indigenous people have a culture that is distinct to that of the dominant society.

This third aspect speaks directly to the second 'obvious' question: What *is* indigenous entrepreneurship? Peredo and Anderson (2006: 261) state: "By far, the dominant theme in indigenous entrepreneurship research to date is the relationship between indigenous entrepreneurship and indigenous culture". Of particular note is the collective social and economic organization that is common to indigenous societies: specifically "communal or collective patterns of social organization, including property arrangements and distribution of resources" (Peredo & Anderson 2006: 256). Simply put "Indigenous entrepreneurship is more holistic than non-Indigenous entrepreneurship: it focuses on both economic and non-economic goals" (Lindsay 2005: 265). Peredo and Anderson (2006: 270) conclude by noting: "the concept of indigenous entrepreneurship … is open to debate. Not only does it inherit the question of whether the notion of entrepreneurship can be culturally transformed, there is also a difference of approach concerning the location and ultimate goals of indigenous entrepreneurship."

In the 1820's Māori leaders coined the expression Māoritanga as a means of describing the collective will, and modes of 'mahi' translated as work and productivity of the kinship groups. In other words tribal or kinship modes of production were the norm. Philosophically and historically speaking, Māoritanga refers to Māori culture-society and its four wellbeings; spiritual wellbeing, ecological wellbeing, kinship wellbeing, and finally economic wellbeing. In combination they instantiate levels of partnership: of the spiritual with humanity; of humanity in ecological systems; of humans with other humans; and economies embedded in the spiritual, ecological and human societies in which they are located (Hēnare, 2001; 2003; 2014). This worldview gives rise to community based development goals that include social and cultural aspirations as well as economic goals.

The following table summarises the prevalent conceptions of indigenous entrepreneurship from academic and practitioner viewpoints, according to their research in the area of Māori entrepreneurship over the last decade:

Perspectives	Focus	Primary interest	Defining features
Academic view of indigenous entrepreneurship	Activity in the profit, not for profit, and public sectors	Social and economic development	Operates at the intersection of social and economic entrepreneurship. Creation, management and development of ventures by indigenous people, for indigenous people
Practitioner view of indigenous entrepreneurship	Continuum of activity ranging from individual to community action	Nation building – economic, social and cultural	Guided by tribal narratives and a tribal worldview

Table 1: Conceptions of indigenous entrepreneurship
Adapted from Tapsell and Woods (2010: 540)

In accord with this table, Māori academic Ella Henry (2007: 542) determined that indigenous entrepreneurial activity is "underpinned by social objectives to improve wealth and wellbeing for the community, rather than the individual". Whereas in mainstream economic discussions/theories the term 'social' is a qualifier, usually prefixed to 'entrepreneur[ship]', 'enterprise', [and so on], indigenous entrepreneurship is by its very nature harnessed to and underpinned by community wellbeing[s] (Keelan & Woods 2006; Tapsell & Woods 2008a, 2008b; Henry 2007). For Māori this is observed as an adherence to Kaupapa Māori approaches informed by a Māori worldview and realized in the composition of the Māori entrepreneurial team.

3. Māori entrepreneurship: background

Māori ancestors departed South East Asia 5,000 years ago as part of Austronesian trading, exploring and settling many atols and islands of the great Pacific Ocean. They began arriving in what is now known as Aotearoa-New Zealand from their East Polynesian home islands over 1000 years ago and rapidly developed a culture distinct from, but reflective of, the cultural landscape whence they came. Māori accounts tell the living history of an Economy of Mana, of economic sovereignty measured by inclusive prosperity and wellbeing in a time of peace and harmony (Hēnare et al 2013). When Cook,

Banks and Tupaia arrived on the HMS Endeavour in 1769 there were over 800 hapū (tribal descent groups) that exercised authority over lands, villages, resources and waterways (Henry 2007; Tapsell and Woods 2008a). Tupaia "an adventurous Tahitian", was on board with Cook, and due to the cognatic relationship between Tahitian and Māori languages he was able to be understood by Māori and discern familiar traits within local custom (Henry 2007: 537). As a result of Tupaia's ability to engage appropriately in interactions and transactions the visits by Cook were largely mutually beneficial, with Māori engaging in trading opportunities relatively unmolested and the explorers able to barter for the resources they required to stay alive and afloat, and to map Aotearoa-New Zealand's coastline in peace.

Māori were quick to recognise the economic opportunities presented to them when "Within about thirty years of Captain James Cook's arrival, the potential market for Māori enterprise expanded from a purely domestic one restricted to a relatively small population to encompass Europe, Asia, North and South America, Australia and the wider Pacific" (Petrie 2006: 28). Whalers, sealers and other Euro-American ships began to call at Aotearoa-New Zealand harbours, encountering Māori willing and prepared to trade indigenous resources – timber, flax (for ropes), kumara (sweet potatoes), water, pigs, and so on – as well as those newly acculturated, including potatoes, which by 1803 could be purchased by the ton (Petrie 2006: 28). The extent of Māori engagement in entrepreneurial innovation is further attested to by Northland rangatira (chiefs) of the time: Ruatara became the first person to harvest wheat in Aotearoa-New Zealand, and Rawiri Taiwhanga the first to produce butter on a commercial scale (Petrie 2006: 29).

Māori Aotearoa-New Zealand's international personality was recognized by the USA, France and Great Britain in 1831 with the appointment of James Busby as the British Resident to look after British and Māori interests. Together Māori leaders, with the help of Busby, selected an official trading flag of Nu Tireni ('New Zealand') in 1834, and in late 1835 they formed a Confederation of Tribes who then declared independence and signed a document titled 'He Whakaputanga o Te Rangatiratanga o Nu Tireni'. It stated that Nu Tireni was a free and independent country and announced that the Confederation of Tribes would establish a parliament for the passing of laws for peace, justice and trade. The sovereignty and independence of Nu Tireni was recognized by Britain, the USA and France. Thereafter, in 1840, British initiated a treaty with Māori leaders and people, which is referred to as Te Tiriti o Waitangi in Māori and Treaty of Waitangi in English.

Hēnare (2011; 1988; Hēnare & Douglas 1988) observes that in the Preamble of the Māori language text of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Queen Victoria through her agent Captain Hobson utilises two Māori expressions condensed together into 'te rongo me te ātanoho' as a key guarantee and overall principle defining the intended relationship between Māori and the British Crown. This is rendered as the guarantee of peace (te rongo) and a quality of life as determined by Māori (te ātanoho). According to Hēnare, in mid-nineteenth century Māori leaders' thinking, 'te rongo me te ātanoho' constitutes 'good life' as prosperity in a time of lasting peace. The Treaty of Waitangi jurisprudence holds that the two language treaty, Māori and English, must be considered in a holistic way but the Māori language version takes precedence when the meanings are unclear. The treaty is ratified as a living document not just an historical work, and as such is 'always speaking' (Hēnare 2011). The treaty therefore informs the intergeneration discourse of Māori and the Crown and its governments on matters to do with economic development and politics.

The Treaty was signed by the British Crown and representatives of indigenous hapū in 1840, ostensibly to establish the legal means to protect its indigenous peoples and establish the rights of British settlers but also in order to clarify the economic interests of each party. The British Crown guaranteed in the preamble that peace and Māori life as defined by Māori would be protected; to "uphold [Māori] chiefly trusteeship (Article II: tino rangatiratanga) in exchange for sovereignty (Article I: kawanatanga), pre-emption (Article II: Crown received first right of refusal on any land sales) and British citizenship (Article III: enabling access to international markets)" (Tapsell & Woods 2010: 256).

However the impact of this Treaty was not as most Māori envisaged. At a Treaty signing in 1840, Nōpera Panakareao of Te Rarawa made his now famous statement that 'the Shadow of the Land goes to the Queen, the substance remains to us.' In years to come it would seem that precisely the opposite was true, particularly in Northland where the treaty was drafted and first presented for signing and where the capital of this young nation was situated. Following the signing, Governor Hobson moved the capital

from Northland's Kororāreka to Auckland and demanded that port taxes be paid to the government and not to local tribes. The ramifications were catastrophic as ships diverted to duty-free ports overseas and burgeoning local economies collapsed (Petrie 2006: 34). More generally, the process of colonization was devastating; lands and resources were confiscated (NZ Settlement Act 1963) and illegally acquired (outside Article II pre-emption clause, Treaty of Waitangi) sometimes with the assistance of complicit younger Māori individuals. "Māori were eventually left destitute in forced poverty that led to hunger, famines and death at the expense of colonial expansion and exploitation of once Māori controlled resources" (Hēnare et al 2013; Tapsell & Woods 2010: 547; Kawharu 1977; Walker 1990). Within a century of signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, Māori "were left bereft of their land, language and mana (power, influence, respect)" (Henry 2007: 547) and in deep states of inequality relative to settlers from the United Kingdom.

Throughout this period of colonization was the consistent demand by Māori for the Treaty of Waitangi to be recognized and upheld. In 1975 the Aotearoa-New Zealand government created the Treaty of Waitangi Tribunal. This tribunal was charged with the power to investigate breaches of the Treaty. Claims have been drafted, heard and settled, including those specific to tribal descent groups and some more broadly positioned and argued. For example, Wai 262 *Ko Aotearoa Tēnei*, is a longstanding claim for government recognition of, and reparation for, resources lost through colonization. More than any other claim, Wai 262 underpins the ontological divide between Māori and later settlers through its expansive definition of taonga ('treasures' both tangible and intangible, including natural resources). This includes things and technologies perhaps unimaginable in 1840 yet which are considered taonga today, including born-digital technologies and objects. Such an interpretation of the treaty is arguably entrepreneurial in spirit: Wai 262 hinges on claimants representing their ancestors who would have been thinking of their descendants and their opportunities for entrepreneurial activities when they signed the Treaty, reading against the grain of the document for their ancestral agency; that it has been ratified signals an acceptance of this if not by mainstream Aotearoa-New Zealand at least by the Waitangi Tribunal itself.

Furthermore, Wai 262 signals the chronoclasm that occurs when Māori cosmological conceptions are measured against dominant Anglo-New Zealand conceptions of time and space. For Māori the past continuously shapes the future in the present, just as ancestors and descendants are instantiated in, and influence the actions of, those now living. "In te ao Māori [the Māori world], the child is considered a learner from the time of conception, providing the child with the ability to recall the past, connect with the present and to explore the unknown" (Clarkin-Phillips et al 2012: 12).

Waitangi Tribunal recompense has been made with lands and other resources returned to Māori. However, the so-called settlements represent only 1-2% of the total loss of land, waterway, control of flora and fauna, loss of foreign exchange earnings through Māori enterprise and trade. This has seen a limited capability and therefore constrained resurgence of tribal enterprise and entrepreneurship. Māori entrepreneurs who adhere to Kaupapa Māori – a term describing "traditional Māori way of doing, being, thinking, encapsulated in a Māori worldview or cosmology" – have been key leaders in this resurgence (Henry 2007: 542).

Graham Hingangaroa Smith (1990: 100) has summarized Kaupapa Māori in the following way:

A Kaupapa Māori base (Māori philosophy and principles) i.e. local theoretical positioning related to being Māori, such a position presupposes that:the validity and legitimacy of Māori is taken for granted
the survival and revival of Māori language and culture is imperative the struggle for autonomy over our own cultural well-being, and over our own lives is vital to Māori survival.

As Pihama and Gardiner (2005: 9) acknowledge, "these features speak not to content per se, but to Māori aspirations, philosophies, processes and pedagogies, which are consistently found within successful Māori initiatives".

In common with other indigenous entrepreneurs, Māori entrepreneurs engage in entrepreneurial activity that is underpinned by objectives that aim to improve the wellbeing of the community. The challenge or tension is that entrepreneurs need flexibility to "capitalise on opportunities and develop new innovations, without being hamstrung by community decision-making processes and shared ownership of resources" (Henry 2007: 543). At the same time they are connected to a worldview where the collective wellbeing is the fundamental. As Mark Solomon, Chairman of South Island tribal entity Ngāi Tahu

explains: "We're kaupapa-based. We are more relationship based than you [non-Māori] are and if your kaupapa doesn't match ours then to be blunt we don't want to work with you" (NZ Herald, 11 May, 2011). Such challenges align with the questions at the core of this paper. They highlight the importance of understanding the people who make up the teams that lead indigenous enterprises, and "the fundamental issue of the relation between entrepreneurship and cultural values" (Peredo and Anderson 2006: 254) if non-indigenous enterprises are to be able to partner effectively with them.

4. Entrepreneurial teams

The growing literature relating to entrepreneurial teams focuses primarily on the start up or new venture. The new venture is broadly defined "as a firm in its early stages of development and growth "(Klotz et al 2014: 2). Teams leading an entrepreneurial venture are referred to by a number of terms, often interchangeable, including: founding team, entrepreneurial team or start up team. In this context, a team is understood as "two or more individuals who have a financial interest and participate actively in the development of the enterprise" (Cooney 2006: 229). Klotz et al (2014) broaden this definition to include those participating in the development and implementation of a new venture and thus describe the new venture team (NVT) as "the group of individuals that is chiefly responsible for the strategic decision making and ongoing operations of a new venture" (2014: 2). They then go on to outline several aspects of the new venture context that make it unique including the fact that there are few established norms or practices. The team must create the initial policies and procedures and shape the culture of the emerging enterprise. While the literature in this part of the entrepreneurship field does not speak directly to the context of the indigenous entrepreneurial team, it does dispel "one of the great myths of entrepreneurship... the notion of a lone hero, battling against the storms of economic, government, social, and other environmental forces before anchoring in the harbor of success" (Cooney 2006: 226). Successful entrepreneurial activity is rarely carried out by a single 'hero' entrepreneur; rather it can be understood as the actions of a team of people, engaged in opportunity seeking behavior akin to the notion of cooperating groups (Foster 2000).

While little has been written about the entrepreneurial team in the indigenous context, what has been written acknowledges that whatever entrepreneurial activity does occur comes from the interaction of a wider range of actors than the new venture start up typically described in entrepreneurship literature. Lindsay (2005: 9) notes:

> the Indigenous 'team' involved in new venture creation and development may involve not only the entrepreneur and the business's entrepreneurial team but also the entrepreneur's family, extended family, and/or the community. Thus, in Indigenous businesses, there are more stakeholders involved than with non-indigenous businesses. For this reason, Indigenous businesses can be regarded as more complex than non-indigenous businesses and this complexity needs to be reflected in defining entrepreneurship from an Indigenous perspective.

Nicolson, Hēnare and Woods (2012) explore family business from an indigenous perspective through the concept of Umanga Whangatanga where they consider the underlying ethics of Māori, specifically whanau (family) and its relationship to business. The family does not sit *alongside* the business as suggested by the overlapping circles model found extensively in family business literature (Gersick et al 1997). Rather the business enterprise or Umanga is located *within* the context of the Whanaungatanga – broadly defined as kinship relationships that develop a sense of belonging. As is the case with other indigenous societies, human activity such as a business enterprise dwells within, not alongside, the Māori community context. The enterprise emerges from a cultural foundation rather than the other way around, as is the case with a typical western business where the business is the 'end' rather than the 'means'. If this is the case then the key actors in the tribal entrepreneurial team can also be understood to emerge from this cultural context. We now turn to consider one framework that explores this complexity through a Māori centered model that considers entrepreneurial activity in Māori tribal communities through archetypes drawn from Māori oral traditions.

5. The Māori tribal enterprise team

In a series of papers authored by Tapsell, Woods and colleagues (Tapsell & Woods, 2008a, 2008b, 2010; Overall, Tapsell & Woods 2010; Kawharu, Tapsell & Woods 2013) they argue that Māori "provide an

illustration of how innovative activity, culturally and historically situated, can emerge as a result of self-organisation of a tribal community" (Tapsell & Woods 2010: 550). They are interested in the structures and boundaries of Māori enterprise leadership and seek to draw on Māori culture as a means of both understanding this and developing frameworks that might guide both research and practice (Tapsell & Woods 2008a). In particular, they draw on the fundamental understanding that the Māori world "is viewed through a genealogical matrix of complementary but different counterpoints" (Tapsell & Woods 2010: 545; Tapsell 1995).

In this section we consider these counterpoints as developed in the Takarangi framework, a double spiral of innovation that balances heritage with opportunity and ancestors with descendants. We suggest that this framework holds in productive and generative tension the archetypes of the Māori team. Further, this team spans generations within the living *and* instantiates ancestors and those yet to be born (Tapsell & Woods, 2008, 2008a, 2010; Overall, Tapsell & Woods, 2010, Kawharu, Tapsell & Woods, 2013). The Takarangi framework symbolically represents a double spiral of creativity and innovation, and demonstrates that heritage can serve as a pathway for innovation when each is held in productive tension by the other.

Figure 1: Takarangi (Overall et al, 2010: 156)

Six propositions guide the development of this framework. We consider each proposition in turn to provide a theoretical background to the framework and situate the roles of the Māori tribal entrepreneurial team members within it.

1)   *Innovation is historically and culturally situated*. From a Māori perspective, tikanga or customary practice emerging from a Māori worldview guides innovation.

2)   *Colonisation is a critical component of the particular historical context of indigenous entrepreneurship*. Of particular importance, as stated above, is the impact of colonization, both in terms of the disruption that it caused to people and the allocation of resources that have resulted.

3)   *Entrepreneurship can be understood as dynamic change resulting from innovation that takes the form of the introduction of new combinations: the deliberate formation and reformation of cooperating groups.* Drawing on the work of one of the theoretical forefathers of entrepreneurship, Joseph Schumpeter, this framework uses his work as a theoretical foundation to understand entrepreneurial action. In his early work, Schumpeter (1911) explored how innovation – the combining and recombining of existing resources – could be applied to social change (Swedberg 2006; Becker, Knudsen & Swedberg, 2012; Newth & Woods 2014). Implementing these new combinations is what characterizes enterprise. One such combination is the combining and recombining of cooperating groups (Foster 2000).

4)   *Innovation emerges from the novelty-creating, self-organizing actions of entrepreneurs or Potiki who are part of cooperating groups*. Several actors "combine and recombine" in a tribal enterprise. There is the opportunity seeking Potiki. The Māori narrative of the Maui Potiki describes an ancestor hero who saw opportunities and took advantage of them (Keelan & Woods 2006). The Potiki is recognized as the genealogical embodiment of the qualities that enable Māori to explore and access new opportunities. Whilst the Potiki represent opportunity, the Kaumatua (elders) represent heritage. Kaumatua have the primary responsibility for maintaining customary practices or tikanga; they are the customary

magistrates or cultural councilors (Winiata 1967: 88). They provide the intermediary sounding board or tikanga-based perspective whenever an innovation requires some form of tikanga check and balance (Tapsell et al 2013). The third group is that of Rangatira. Rangatira are recognized as leaders within a community and held in high regard. They are accountable to the community and seek to guide decisions concerning their communities. As such they are seen as visionary leaders who are skilled in navigating both opportunity and heritage for the wellbeing of the community (Tapsell et al 2014).

5) *Innovation takes place along a continuum at and between the edges of chaos and stability.*

Edge of chaos: autonomy   **Edge of stability: connectivity**

	Chaos	**Opportunity**	**Spiral of innovation**	**Heritage**	**Regimentation**
Tribal actors	*Isolated potiki*	Potiki	Rangatira	Kaumatua	Rigid Kaumatua
Outcome	Random changes and outcomes; disintegration certain.	Instability – unpredictable changes and outcomes; Disintegration possible.	Flexible new order involved radical and/or incremental change	Stability – incremental changes, Ossification possible	Systems are resistance to change; ossification certain

Highly unstable   **Highly stable**

Table 2: Continuum of innovation
Adapted from Tapsell & Woods 2010: 549

The Potiki operates at the edge of instability and chaos whilst the Kaumatua is at the edge of connectivity and stability. Drawing again on Schumpeter's notion of combining and recombining resources, the Rangatira, Kaumatua and Potiki combine to develop innovative change that is guided by Tikanga. This is represented metaphorically by Takarangi.

6) *Innovation is a recurring double spiral, symbolically represented by Takarangi, a double spiral of creation that incorporates opportunity and heritage*. This double spiral embodies the intersectional moment, "the point of creation where the past continuously meets the future" (Tapsell & Woods 2010: 545). These spirals represent genealogical balanced boundaries. This model argues that entrepreneurial activity in Māori tribal communities occurs through the interaction of the opportunity-seeing entrepreneur (Potiki), the elder heritage protector (Kaumatua) and the visionary leader (Rangatira). The interaction between these groups in the Māori community gives rise to innovation occurring between the edges of chaos and stability (Tapsell & Woods, 2010). Tradition and heritage form the pathway for innovation whilst the opportunity seeking adventurers and leaders are necessary if steps are to be taken along that pathway.

Returning to our guiding questions – how does culture inform and influence indigenous entrepreneurship, and who or what comprises the Māori entrepreneurial team? – we now turn to extend further the genealogical dynamic of cooperating groups, drawing on potential insights from a Māori worldview of wellbeing and the notion of belonging and its connection with entrepreneurship.

A Māori worldview encompasses a relational view of the world: "I belong therefore I am" (Hēnare 2004).

Many Māori values place particular emphasis on respect and care to engender belonging, These values include: *manaaki*, meaning to show respect or kindness; *aroha*, which is to show care, empathy, charity and respect; *hau* which means to respect, promote and maintain vitality, *kaitiakitanga*, which includes stewardship, guardianship and wise use of resources, and *hapai* meaning to uplift others. Care is at the heart of the Māori values system and calls upon humans to be *kaitiaki*, caretaker of the *mauri*, the life principle, in each other and in nature (Spiller, Erakovic, Hēnare & Pio 2011: 155)

Hēnare (2011; cf Merrill 1954) proposes that the four Māori wellbeings (introduced above) establish four capitals of economic significance – spiritual capital, ecological and environmental capital, kinship as human capital and economic capitals. Nicholson et al (2013: 43) have argued that "the objective of Māori business and its unique strength is to generate collective wealth in these broader spiritual, environmental, socio-cultural and economic realms". In service of these wellbeings, and benefitting from them, is a Māori entrepreneurial team rooted in ancestral knowledge or kawa atua (knowledge handed

down from the spiritual world) and the man-made directives (tikanga tangata) that determine how these kawa are understood and enacted (Nicholson et al 2013: 38). Simultaneous with this use of generative traditional principles and in reference to the actions of ancestors there is strategic forethought for future descendants (Nicholson et al 2013: 43) and an emphasis on "value-creating" rather than "profit-maximising" (Nicholson et al 2013: 44). Thus multiple generations and their wellbeings are instantiated in the Māori entrepreneurial team.

Returning to the foundational genealogical dynamic of Takarangi, to date the genealogical connection to ancestors and descendants has not been discussed beyond an understanding of the roles of the living Potiki, Kaumatua and Rangatira. We would suggest that the Māori tribal entrepreneurial team extends beyond the interaction of living human-to-living human interaction. Whilst ancestors are of the past, from a Māori worldview they are also in the present and part of the future: "the past present and future exist in every moment" (Kelly et al in press: 9; Hēnare 2001). Time is not represented in a linear and fixed fashion, nor are the realms of humans and ancestors discrete. Those who have passed on live through the living generation and in turn will live through those that follow. Using the spiral framework, ancient wisdom and experience merge with the contemporary context to enable future possibilities. Ancestors and descendants are thus active participants in the construction of entrepreneurial opportunities.

Also present in Figure 1 are Papatūānuku, the sky father, and Ranginui, the earth mother. This is both a reference to ancestral origins as well as the environmental wellbeing mentioned above.[1] All of these influence the opportunities that are and can be developed by the team. These are the cooperating groups that – in Schumpeterian terms – need to be combined and recombined as new ventures are undertaken, according to the specific parameters of each venture. Thus we propose a Guiding Proposition 7:

7) *Cooperating groups include ancestors and descendants who come together as active participants, alongside Potiki, Kaumatua and Rangatira, in the construction of entrepreneurial opportunity and the generation of conditions conducive to successful innovation.*

6. Concluding comments and future research

Understanding the relation between indigenous entrepreneurship and cultural values is a central theme of research in the emerging field of indigenous entrepreneurship. This paper has explored one understanding of the composition of the entrepreneurial team in a tribal context, drawing on the framework provided by the Takarangi spiral of innovation. We have extended this framework by suggesting that the team composition spans generations within the living, and instantiates ancestors and those yet to be born. This framework thus enables the balancing of heritage with opportunity and ancestors with descendants, to hold in productive and generative tension the archetypes of the Māori team. Its usefulness will hopefully emerge from its foundation in a Kaupapa Māori perspective, whereby cultural values are the foundation upon which the Māori tribal enterprise is built. To understand how entrepreneurial activity takes place in an indigenous context we must understand where opportunities come from and how they can be realized. The combining and recombining of these various cooperating groups enables opportunities not only to emerge but also to be developed and implemented in a generative tension with heritage and tradition. This framework thus provides one nuanced understanding of the relation between indigenous entrepreneurship and cultural values.

Further research is required to position more explicitly the particular contribution of women to the Māori entrepreneurship model proposed. What is particular to the cultural values and entrepreneurial drive of female Potiki, Rangatira and Kuia (feminine of Kaumatua)? What specific influence do female ancestors exert within the entrepreneurial team; what influence might female descendants not yet born have upon decision-making and opportunity seeking? Is there a 'Hinepreneur' (hine = woman) model yet to be explored?

---

[1] Least the identities above be taken as generically male actors on a somewhat passive 'mother earth', we offer assurance that beyond the conceptually male and female Ranginui and Papatuanuku all other roles could be taken by either sex/gender, according to mana, and birth status, etc. They too play a role in the team. Thus, we see the full "genealogical matrix of complementary but different counterpoints" (Tapsell & Woods 2010: 545; Tapsell 1995).

Likewise, where is the place for young people within the Takarangi model – not descendants yet to be born, but those already living. Despite the archetype of the Potiki (literally 'youngest sibling'), young people, known as rangatahi, are seldom found in key positions within Māori committees, authorities, and national organizations (Mead 1994). This contradicts an aphorism well-known in Aotearoa-New Zealand that describes the need for young people to assume active roles in leadership and economic development: Ka pū te ruha, ka hao te rangatahi – The old net is cast aside, the new net goes fishing. Rangatahi is an old name for a net, now used for young people. The very notion of the net is extremely productive, symbolising the need for the strength and vigour of the fresh and new; figuratively representing the meshwork of whakapapa or relational connections that – like the Takarangi spiral – hold Māori in generative relationships with each other and the Māori world; and metaphorically underpinning the 'net-work' that ultimately drives successful Māori entrepreneurship. As Evans and Wolf (2005: 104) noted, the power of teams is somehow more than the sum of their parts: "The network, in other words, is the innovator". Finally, what role does the marae, the central meeting place for hapu members and a place of enhanced ancestral presence, play as both a lynchpin for Māori entrepreneurial teams and a structural attractor for enterprise? Exploration of these research strands will add to the body of work already supporting the Takarangi framework, contributing further details to our understanding of the relation between indigenous entrepreneurship and cultural values.

References

Becker, M., Knudsen, T., & Swedberg, R. (eds.). (2012a). *The Entrepreneur: Classic texts by Joseph A Schumpeter*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Cooney, T., 2005. Editorial; What is an Entrepreneurial Team? *International Small Business Journal*, 23 : 226-235.

Durie, M. 2003. *Ngā kahui pou: launching Māori futures*. Wellington, NZ: Huia.

Evans, P. & Wolf, B. 2005. Collaboration rules. *Harvard Business Review*. July-August 2005: 1-8.

Foley, D. 2003. An examination of Indigenous, Australian Entrepreneurs'. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship* 8: 133-151.

Foster, J .2000. Competitive selection, self-organisation and Joseph A. Schumpeter. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics* 10: 311-28.

Gersick, K. E., Davis, J. A., Hampton, M. M., & Lansberg, I. 1997. *Generation to Generation: life cycles of the family business*. Boston Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Press.

Haar, J. & Delany, B. 2009. Entrepreneurship and Māori cultural values: Using 'whanaungatanga' to understand Māori business. *New Zealand Journal of Applied Business Research*, 7(1): 25-40.

Hēnare, M. 1988. Ngā Tikanga me Ngā Ritenga o Te Ao Māori: Standards and Foundations of Māori Society. *The April Report: Report of the Royal Society of the Royal Commission on Social Policy*, III(I). Wellington: Government Printer: 5-41.

Hēnare, M. & Douglas, E. 1988. Te Reo o Te Tiriti o Waitangi. The Treaty Always Speaks. In *The April Report: Report of the Royal Society of the Royal Commission on Social Policy*, III(I). Wellington: Government Printer: 79-220.

Hēnare, M. 1998. Globalisation: An Indigenous Religious/Cultural Perspective. Camilleri, J. & Muzaffar, C., (eds.) *Globalisation: The Perspectives and Experiences of the Religious Traditions 0f Asia Pacific*. Selangor, International Movement for a Just World: 75-89.

Hēnare, M. 2001. Tapu, mana, mauri, hau, wairua. A Māori philosophy of vitalism and cosmos. *Indigenous Traditions and Ecology: The Interbeing of Cosmology and Community*. J.A. Grim (ed.) Cambridge: Harvard University Press for the Centre for the Study of World Religions: 197-221.

Hēnare, M. 2004, Kaupapa Māori and Organisations [Hand-out] (Department of Management and Employment Relations, The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand).

Hēnare, M. 2005. The Implications of Globalization for Indigenous Communities of New Zealand – Aotearoa and Elsewhere – A Step Towards Te Ao Mārama or Towards Te Pō? Patman, R. & C. Rudd (eds.) *Sovereignty under Siege? Globalization and New Zealand*. Aldershot: Ashgate: 111-128.

Hēnare, M. 2011. Lasting Peace and the Good Life: Economic Development and the 'Te   Ātanoho' Principle of Te Tiriti o Waitangi. *Always Speaking: The Treaty of Waitangi and Public Policy*. Tawhai, V.M.H., & Gray-Sharp, K. (eds.). Wellington: Huia: 261-275.

Hēnare, M. Middleton, A. & Puckey. A. 2013. *He Rangi Mauroa Ao te Pō: Melodies Eternally New. Ngā Rangi-Waiata a Te Aho: Ngā Waiata o te Māramatanga. Songs of Te Aho: Songs   on the Theme of Knowing*. Te Aho Collective Alliance Oral and Traditional History Wai   1040 Paparahi o te Raki Waitangi Tribunal Claim (Northern Enquiry).

Henry, E. 2007. Kaupapa Māori entrepreneurship.*International Handbook of Research on   Indigenous Entrepreneurship*. Dana, L., & Anderson, R.B. (eds.): Cheltenham, UK, Northampton, Mass.:
 Edward
 Elgar: 536-548.

Hindle, K. and Landsdown, M. 2007. Brave spirits on new paths: Toward a globally relevant paradigm of indigenous entrepreneurship research. *International handbook of   research*. Dana, L., and
 Anderson, R.B. (eds.): 8-10. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Kawharu, M., Tapsell, P. & Woods, C. 2013. Resistance and challenge: the shaping of indigenous entrepreneurship, a Māori context. ANZAM Conference, Hobart,   Australia, December 2013.

Keelan, J & Woods, C. 2006. Mauipreneur: understanding Māori entrepreneurship.   *International Indigenous Journal of Entrepreneurship, Advancement, Strategy and   Education*, Vol. II (1): 1-20.

Kelly, D. Jackson, B. Hēnare, M. In press. 'He Apiti Hono, He Tātai Hono': Ancestral Leadership, Cyclical Learning and the Eternal Continuity of Leadership, in *Core-Periphery Relations and
Organisation Studies*.

Klotz, A., Hmieleski, K., Bradley, B. & Busenitz, L. 2014. New Venture Teams: A Review of the
 Literature and Roadmap for Future Research, *Journal of Management*, 40: 226-255.

Lazonick, W. 2003. Understanding Innovative Enterprise. Towards the Integration of   Economic Theory and Business History. *Business History around the World*. Amatori, F. & Jones, G. (eds.)
Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press: 31-61.

Lindsay, N.J. 2005. Toward a cultural model of indigenous entrepreneurial attitude. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 5: 1-17.

Mead, A. 1994. Māori leadership. *Te Pua*, 3(1): 11 – 20.

Merrill, R. S., 1954. 'Some Social and Cultural Influences on Economic Growth: The Case of the Māori.' *Journal of Economic History*, 14:401 – 408.

Newth, J., & Woods, C. R. 2014. Resistance to social entrepreneurship: how context shapes innovation. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*.
 DOI**:**10.1080/19420676.2014.889739: 1-22.

Nicholson, A., Woods, C. & Hēnare, M. 2012. Umanga whanaungatanga: family business. *Journal of Australian Indigenous Issues*, 15(4): 36–50.

Overall, J., Tapsell, P & Woods, C. 2010. Governance and indigenous social entrepreneurship: when context counts. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 6(2): 146–161.

Peredo, A.M., Anderson, R., Galbraith, C., Benson, H. & Dana, L. 2004. Towards a theory of indigenous entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 1(1/2):1-20.

Peredo, A.M. & Anderson, R.B. 2006. Indigenous entrepreneurship research: themes and variations. *International Research in the Business Disciplines*, 5: 253-273.

Petrie, H. 2006. *Chiefs of Industry: Māori Tribal Enterprise in early Colonial New Zealand.* Auckland: University of Auckland Press.

Pihama, L. & Gardiner, D. 2005. Building baseline data on Māori, whānau development and
 Māori reaching their potential. Literature Review prepared for Te Puni Kōkiri, Wellington, New Zealand.

Schumpeter, J.A. 1954. *History of Economic Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, G.H. 1990. Taha Māori: Pākehā Capture. *Political Issues in New Zealand Education*,   edited by J.
 Codd, R. Harker & R. Nash: Palmerston North: Dunmore Press: Solomon, M. NZ Herald, Auckland, New Zealand. 11 May, 2011.

Spiller, C., Erakovic, L., Hēnare, M. & Pio, E. 2010. Relational well-being and wealth: Māori businesses and an ethic of care. *Journal of Business Ethics*: 1-17.

Spiller, C., Pio, E., Erakovic, L. & Hēnare, M. 2011. Wise up: creating organizational wisdom through an ethic of Kaitiakitanga. *Journal of Business Ethics*: 1-13.

Stiles, C. 2004. Failures of indigenous adaptation: a historic case study. *Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management*. New Orleans, LA, USA.

Swedberg, R. 2006. Social entrepreneurship: the view of the young Schumpeter, in *Entrepreneurship as Social Change*. Steyaert, C., &. Hjorth, D., (eds.): 21-34.   Cheltenham; Edward Elgar

Tapsell, P. 1995. Comets and whakapapa: a study of tribal toanga through the eyes of Te Arawa. Unpublished MA Special Topic, Department of Anthropology, University of   Auckland, Auckland.

Tapsell, P., & Woods, C. R. 2008a. Indigenous entrepreneurship in a Māori context. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy,* 2(3): 192-203.

Tapsell, P., & Woods, C.R. 2008b. A spiral of innovation framework for social   entrepreneurship: social innovation at the generational divide in an indigenous   context. *Emergence*, 10 (3): 25-34.

Tapsell, P., & Woods, C. R. 2010. Social Entrepreneurship and Innovation: self-organisation in an indigenous context. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, 22(6):* 535-556.

Waitangi Tribunal (2006) *Wai 262: The Flora and Fauna and Cultural Intellectual Property Claim Statement of Issues* (Wai 262, 2.314), Te Rōpu Whakamana i te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Waitangi Tribunal. Wellington: Ministry of Justice.

Woods, C.R. 2011. Reflections on Pedagogy: a journey of collaboration. *Journal of Management Education*, 35: 154-167.

Walker, R. 1990. *Ka whawhai tonu mātou: struggle without end*. Auckland: Penguin.

Winiata, M. 1967. *The changing role of the leader in Māori society.* Auckland: Blackwood and Janet Paul.