

Social and cultural capital: enhancing emancipatory Indigenous entrepreneurship

ABSTRACT

This research explores and analyzes Māori entrepreneurs in the screen industry, and identifies ways their life histories and experiences, culture and identity combine to shape their entrepreneurial intent. Evidence was found demonstrating that these factors combine to enrich their cultural and social capital, which, in turn enhances their desire for emancipation through entrepreneurial endeavor. The paper makes a contribution to the entrepreneurship literature because it brings together the small but growing body of Indigenous entrepreneurship literature, and focuses on a study that looks, in-depth, at individual Indigenous entrepreneurs, exploring their social and cultural contexts in a comprehensive and rigorous manner. From such research and theory building, it is hoped that other oppressed peoples, Indigenous or otherwise, may draw on entrepreneurship as a means to break free from their oppression, to restore and rebuild their cultures, better define and enhance their identities, and to create organizations that are more meaningful for themselves and their communities.

Keywords: Indigenous, entrepreneurship, Māori, screen production, cultural capital, social capital

Introduction

There are approximately 370 million Indigenous people across 70 countries around the world. Less than a million of these are Māori, including some who are entrepreneurs in New Zealand's screen industry; they have created organizations that embody their values, have transformed their lives, and contributed to their communities. These entrepreneurs have followed their own paths, embraced risk-taking, challenges and innovations, and expressed the self-belief necessary to embark on these new pathways in business, confirming that entrepreneurship is an economic activity underpinned by individual, cognitive and social factors, which impel certain types of people to generate new economic activity and knowledge.

It is known that Indigenous peoples practice traditions unique to their cultures, and that they retain social, cultural, economic and political characteristics, which make them distinct from the majority cultures in their homelands (Dana, 1995). While many continue to suffer the negative consequences of conquest, Indigenous peoples are increasingly looking outside their respective communities to build capacity, engaging in entrepreneurship, as a means of achieving their goals for economic wellbeing, cultural revitalization and self-determination (Bajada & Trayler, 2014; Fryer, Quijano, Sadeghi, Calero, Villegas & Vargas, 2012).

A rich literature has examined the role of social and cultural capital in entrepreneurship; a study of Indigenous entrepreneurs in Alaska (Light and Dana, 2013) showed that beyond the boundary of supporting cultural capital, social capital ceases to encourage entrepreneurship. However, something important that research has not yet resolved is the ways that social and cultural capital can work together to support entrepreneurship. The findings from such research could be important for

Indigenous peoples because of the significant role that entrepreneurship might play in economic development strategies that address and ameliorate poverty and disenfranchisement.

This paper addresses that gap in the literature by offering a recent study of Māori entrepreneurs in the screen industry in New Zealand. These individuals are successful screen producers, whose body of work is primarily Māori-centric, contributing to linguistic and cultural revitalization. Their companies have provided employment opportunities for other Māori, in front of and behind the camera, and a business that is meaningful for many Māori, financially, socially, culturally and professionally.

The paper is structured as follows, first focusing on the literature that informs our understanding of Indigenous entrepreneurship, and in particular Māori entrepreneurship. This is followed by an overview of Māori people and society, before introducing the study, its methodology and findings, and culminating in a discussion that highlights the contribution this study makes to the Indigenous entrepreneurship literature.

Entrepreneurship

Rindova, Barry and Ketchen (2009), refer to the motives for entrepreneurship as being more than merely wealth creation. They bring attention to the emancipatory aspects, “intended not only to create new wealth but also to bring about new states in relevant economic, social, institutional, and cultural environments” (Rindova, Barry and Ketchen, 2009, p. 478). Furthermore, they note that dominant themes in existing

entrepreneurship research often focus on opportunity recognition and opportunity creation. However, from their emancipatory perspective, they suggest a focus on individuals seeking to remove constraints in their economic, social, technological, cultural and institutional environments. One suggestion for research directions has particular resonance for this study, to examine more broadly the various environments in which entrepreneurs take actions.

To better understand the environments in which entrepreneurship occurs, one needs to explore, ‘the world-context’, the world they interact with, and live in (Cope, 2005). For Gupta and Fernandez (2009) individuals construct themselves and their environments by drawing on context-specific concepts and other symbolic structures that they are most familiar with. They note, “The communities, societies, and cultural contexts in which people participate provide the interpretive frameworks by which people make sense, organize perceptions, and take action” (Gupta and Fernandez, 2009, p. 305). Welter (2011) reinforces this view, and describes the contexts that shape economic behavior as: social, societal, spatial and institutional. Thus, social contexts may include networks, such as households and family, whilst institutional contexts incorporate the broader culture and society, in which are embedded the consequent attitudes and norms, policies and regulations that enable or constrain entrepreneurship. Welter (2011) discusses community, neighborhood and tribal entrepreneurship as examples that bridge social and institutional contexts, because social commitment, nonprofit goals, or benefits to the wider community may be as important as self-interest; she proposes a way to contextualize entrepreneurship theory, by taking account of situational, geographic or temporal boundaries, such as the country context, in which the theory is applied.

An understanding of cognition and cognitive theory further informs the analysis of individual behavior within its social and/or cultural context. For Mitchell et al. (2002), economic theories have contributed to a better understanding of entrepreneurship and ‘when’ it occurs, but is less useful for describing the ‘how’ and ‘why’. They recognize that the cognitive perspective provides deeper insight into entrepreneurship, by focusing on how entrepreneurs think, “to provide a theoretically rigorous and testable argument for such distinctiveness” (Mitchell, Busenitz, Lant, McDougall, Morse and Smith, 2002, p. 96). They state that, “entrepreneurial cognitions are the knowledge structures that people use to make assessments, judgments, or decisions involving opportunity evaluation, venture creation, and growth” (Mitchell, Busenitz, Lant, McDougall, Morse and Smith, 2002, p. 97). Kirby (2006) concurs, noting that individuals are more likely to activate their entrepreneurial potential if they believe they have the ability to do, and there are adequate opportunities and social support.

Wadeson (2006) reinforces these views, introducing self-efficacy into entrepreneurship analysis, which he defines as a cognitive characteristic that “refers to the degree to which someone believes he/she has the ability to successfully complete a task”, (Wadeson, 2006, p. 99). He elaborates, “Culture would seem to have a significant role, some of the more obvious ways in which culture might have an impact are through subjective norms, social persuasions (self-efficacy theory), and the role of social self-justification” (Wadeson, 2006, p. 109). These notions of social support and culture are best explicated by reference to social and cultural capital in the entrepreneurship literature.

Bourdieu (1986) has influenced entrepreneurship research and theorizing (Dacin, Dacin and Matear, 2010; Davidsson and Honig, 2003; Steyaert, 2007;

Terjesen and Elam, 2009;), drawing on cultural capital, which exists in three forms, the embodied state (long-lasting dispositions of mind and body, the culture); the objectified state (cultural goods and artifacts, including language) and the institutionalized state (symbolic factors, conferred by institutions, such as educational qualifications or titles related to nobility). Social capital, on the other hand “is the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition, membership in a group” (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 86). Thus, social capital is linked to the size or strength of the networks, which can be mobilized, and access to the economic, cultural or symbolic capital, which is derived from those networks.

Carolis and Saporito (2006) develop this thinking further by exploring the reasons why some individuals exploit entrepreneurial opportunities whilst others do not. They refer to research, which emphasizes social networks, and social capital, and find that it may be a useful indicator of opportunity, but not necessarily a predictor. However, they propose a model, which “suggests an explanation of this nexus through exploring how both external (i.e., social capital) and internal factors (i.e., cognition) affect why some people and not others exploit opportunities” (Carolis and Saporito, 2006, p. 42). They draw on a ‘bonding social capital perspective’ to explore the internal ties of a given collective, and the substance of the relationships within that network, to analyze why some individuals within those communities and networks might be more likely to exploit opportunities. Further, they define three distinct dimensions of social capital, as follows:

- Structural dimensions, which refer to the network structure and patterns of connections (e.g., cultural and professional networks and connections)

- Relational dimensions, which refers to the nature of personal relationships (e.g., cultural and professional relationships)
- Cognitive dimensions, which refer to, “shared systems of meanings and language facilitate the exchange of information, learning and knowledge creation that allows individuals to share each other’s thinking processes” (Carolis and Saporito, 2006, p. 45). These may also encapsulate the shared system of meanings within specific cultures and professions.

Carolis and Saporito (2006) also note that one needs to understand the social life and human interactions of individuals to best understand their cognition, and recognize that these factors play a role in whether, and how they might exploit entrepreneurial opportunities. They conclude that, “focusing on the relationships among social capital, cognitive processes, and entrepreneurial opportunities, this model lays the groundwork for further theory development and empirical research” (Carolis and Saporito, 2006, p. 52). Research on Indigenous entrepreneurship is one field in which a growing body of empirical studies and theory development is occurring.

Indigenous entrepreneurship is an emerging area of research interest, distinct within the broader field of entrepreneurship (Dana, 2015). Hindle and Moroz (2010) highlight the relative importance of communities rather than individuals, and emphasize culture and social norms over resources and profits. They conclude that, “The emerging sub-field of Indigenous entrepreneurship research, offers to provide better evidence, greater understanding and greater hope of addressing the distinct and chronic problems of Indigenous disadvantage which have proved insoluble for centuries” (Hindle and Moroz, 2010, p. 385).

Light and Dana (2013) look at social capital, specifically within the context of Indigenous entrepreneurship. They acknowledge that social capital involves relationships of trust and reciprocity, but caution that too much social capital may inhibit entrepreneurship if it reduces objectivity or protects mediocrity. They also recognize that some entrepreneurship research has focused on social capital, whilst subsuming the important role that cultural capital plays in supporting new venture creation, thereby ignoring the symbiotic relationship between the two. Their research looked at an Indigenous community in Alaska where social capital was strong, but the culture did not support commercial entrepreneurship, which was reflected in the low levels of participation in business. They conclude that, “If a group’s cultural capital does not support and endorse the selection of entrepreneurship as a vocation, then the group’s strong social capital will not encourage entrepreneurship of group members” (Light and Dana, 2013, p. 616).

Foley and O’Connor (2013) show how Indigenous entrepreneurs drew on network ties, related to historical and cultural influence on social capital. The authors suggested that underlying social capital dimensions are unique to cultural context. For Peredo and Chrisman (2006), community-based entrepreneurship informs their analysis of impoverished communities and Indigenous peoples, where, “economic considerations may become secondary to other interests, such as cultural or environmental preservation” (Peredo & Chrisman, 2006, p.310). They acknowledge the importance of ‘embeddedness’, social capital and social networks, where embeddedness refers to the ways economic transactions are, “affected by the location of individuals and organizations in networks of personal relationships” (Peredo & Chrisman, 2006, p. 313), and where networks can provide invaluable support and nurture self-confidence.

On this point, Cahn notes, “In Indigenous societies throughout the world ‘business’ and economic activities are embedded in cultural and social aspects, creating unique styles of entrepreneurship, which are often community-oriented, and with diverse livelihood outcomes” (Cahn, 2008, p. 1). She found that, “where micro-enterprises blend well with fa’aSamoa [Samoan culture] an, Indigenous style of enterprise develops, and [is] a motivating factor and asset, which enhances entrepreneurial activity” (Cahn, 2008, p. 16). Focusing on Australia, Furneaux and Brown note that ‘Encouraging entrepreneurship has been advocated as the most promising avenue for economic development for Indigenous communities in Australia’ (Furneaux & Browne, 2008, p. 133). They looked at the barriers that Aboriginal entrepreneurs in Australia face, primarily relating to access to capital, encompassing financial, human, social, physical, organizational and technological capital. They note that though social capital may be strong in Indigenous communities, it can also drain resources from nascent firms, because of the cultural value of reciprocity. However, they extol the importance of partnerships between Indigenous communities, business and government, as a stimulus for entrepreneurial initiatives.

Dana and Anderson (2007) state that, “There is a rich heterogeneity among Indigenous peoples, and some of their cultural values are often incompatible with the basic assumptions of mainstream theories. Indigenous entrepreneurship often has non-economic explanatory variables. We propose that entrepreneurship opportunity recognition and evaluation is therefore culturally determined: however, we note that culturally determined opportunities for entrepreneurship are often disrupted by entities external to Indigenous peoples” (2007, p. 601). Thus, an understanding of

Indigenous culture and values by outsiders is an important step in nurturing Indigenous entrepreneurship.

In summary, Indigenous entrepreneurship is a sub-field within entrepreneurship, and the study of Indigenous entrepreneurship must incorporate analyses of the social and cultural contexts and consequent capital, which may include collective or communal orientation, inclination towards kin-based forms of social organization, and emphasis on employing forms of exchange as much or more for social and cultural purposes as for material gain. Before discussing the study upon which this paper is based, it may be useful to share further background information on the Māori.

Maori people and society

Māori are part of the Polynesian diaspora, who have traversed and populated the Pacific for over three thousand years. Traditional Maori society was tribal, and kinship-based, founded on a political economy, which Mauss (1954) describes as one of gift-exchange and reciprocity. The ancient cosmological beliefs of the Māori honored family, tribe, spirituality and stewardship, values that exemplified the connectivity between all living things, and ancestral linkages to the pantheon of gods (Henare, 2001).

Dutch explorer Abel Tasman arrived in 1642, after which the name New Zealand was conferred on the country. Englishman James Cook came upon New Zealand in 1769. Two months later, Frenchman De Surville arrived, bringing tools and trade goods previously unknown to the Māori. These commodities provided a strong incentive to maintain good relations with the pale-skinned visitors. Wilson (2012) states that, “From the 1790s, Māori produced pork and potatoes for this

trade”, particularly the increasing number of whaling and sealing vessels which plundered the South Pacific in search of their prey.

The first settlement of Pākehā (Europeans) was in the Bay of Islands, where the earliest explorers had landed in the 18th century. By and large, relations between Māori and Pākehā flourished in the early 19th century. In 1814, three missionaries were dispatched from Sydney. According to Lineham (2012), “These men were not ordained ministers but Marsden believed that introducing European civilization, culture and industry to Māori was the first step towards them becoming Christians”. These early missionaries also provided an invaluable conduit to the European world.

By the 1830s, Māori owned ships, delivering manufactured goods such as Kauri tree spars, treenails, treated flax (for rope), potatoes and pigs throughout the Pacific, particularly to the New South Wales Penal Colony. Producing goods for trade coincided with the traditional value of hospitality and gift-exchange, about which Petrie notes, “The rapid expansion of Māori commerce was not simply chance, but had been advanced by deliberate strategies in line with customary practice” (Petrie, 2006, p. 40). Further, Petrie affirms that in 1830 alone, twenty-eight ships made fifty-six voyages between Sydney and New Zealand carrying Māori produce.

In 1834, a consortium of chiefs, whom, we can assume, already had some experience of international trade, requested that the British Crown recognize a national flag, which would ensure protection of their vessels in international waters. This may have come about as a consequence of the seizure of the locally built trading vessel, the *Sir George Murray*, by Sydney customs officials, because it did not fly a flag of registration. The adoption of a national flag was followed in 1835 by the Declaration of Independence, an assertion of sovereignty over New Zealand by the Chiefs who signed that document. Some New Zealand historians assert the

Declaration emerged because the British in New Zealand were concerned by the increasing interest of the French and their colonial expansion in the Pacific (Moon and Fenton, 2002). However, this view does not take account of the growing recognition by Māori that federalism was one political form that could forge a unified nation, whilst retaining tribal sovereignty at the local level. This political system would have been antithetical to British imperialism, especially in light of the Revolutionary War, and consequent American Declaration of Independence in 1776. It seems far more likely that Chiefs were influenced by American federalism, rather than British monarchy, in their aspirations for nationhood and the expansion of their trading empires. Notwithstanding, the Declaration was drafted and translated to English, and counter-signed between the Confederation of United Tribes and the British Resident to New Zealand, James Busby. It was duly sent to King William IV, and recognized by the British Parliament in 1836 (Keane, 2014).

Four years later, Governor Hobson arrived to promote a Treaty with Māori, guaranteeing protection of New Zealand as a formal colony of Britain. After days of consultation amongst the tribes gathered at the settlement of Waitangi, the Treaty of Waitangi was signed on February 6th, 1840. It is known as the founding document of New Zealand, however, more than one Treaty was drafted. Multiple copies were dispatched so that new signatories from tribes around the country could sign one of the documents. The original Māori-language version of the Treaty, signed at Waitangi on February 6th, ceded 'governorship' (*kawanatanga*) to Queen Victoria (the Crown). The English-language version ceded 'sovereignty'. The opposing language of these two versions led to a breakdown in relations between the tribes and the early governors of the settler colony (Scott, 1975; Adams, 1977; Orange, 1989; Kawharu, 1989). It was only a matter of months before the chiefs realised their

relationship with the British Crown was not to be the mutually beneficial partnership they had envisaged, but one of British control over trade, legislation, jurisdiction and all other social institutions. Māori concerns and protest eventually resulted in the Land Wars of the 1850s-1860s (Belich, 1986).

Whilst Māori proved to be worthy opponents, ultimately the sheer force of the British military wore down Māori resistance. From the late 1800s until the mid-1900s Māori progressively suffered the worst consequences of a colonized and conquered people. The economic dominance of the new settlers was reinforced by repressive legislation, military and judicial might, which combined to undermine the collective ownership of resources, and served to individuate and expropriate Māori lands (Orange, 1989). The results of this economic oppression have been devastating for Māori. However, more subversive and odious has been the socio-cultural oppression. This has resulted not just in the loss of communally owned land, and the loss of people through disease and poverty, but the diminution of language and culture, as the English language and culture were assimilated (Walker, 1990).

In the aftermath of World War II, Māori began an unprecedented urban migration (King, 2003). Whilst this further served the needs of assimilation it also introduced increasing numbers of traditionally isolated and rural Māori to the institutions, technologies and opportunities of the Post War economy. Māori became educated, thereby improving their socio-economic status. A secondary effect of this was increased empowerment, growing calls to acknowledge past grievances, and a desire for Māori sovereignty (Awatere, 1984). The Māori Land March in 1975 was pivotal in bringing together diverse groups to highlight the plight of landless Māori. In that same year, government created a Tribunal to investigate Treaty grievances. However, it was not until 1984 that the Waitangi Tribunal was given the power to

look retrospectively to 1840. Since 1985 successive New Zealand governments have devolved hundreds of millions of dollars to tribes as meager settlement for proven breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi (Bourassa & Strong, 2002). Though Māori have grown in political strength and unity, a significant proportion of Māori still languish economically and socially (Bécares, Cormack & Harris, 2013). Alongside the long-term impoverishment has been the ongoing decline of traditional Māori culture and language, which are critical to Indigenous wellbeing (Colquhoun and Dockery, 2012).

However, in recent decades there has been a resurgence of Māori identity, and strident calls from Māori leaders for self-determination. Walker (1990) has termed this, the Māori Renaissance, which has also seen a surge in the Māori economy, business, and entrepreneurial spirit, as evidenced by the findings from the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor, GEM NZ, study (Howard and Chittock, 2006). One finding suggested that, if Māori were a separate nation, they would be the seventh most entrepreneurial in the world (Howard et al., 2002). On that point, Devlin (2007) asks whether Māori entrepreneurship is a fact or a fallacy. He refers to a study that defines Māori entrepreneurship, distinguishes between individualistic and collective entrepreneurship, and concludes that, “the concept of collective entrepreneurship also has meaning for community entrepreneurship because it combines business risk and capital investment with the social values of collective action” (Frederick and Henry, 2004, p. 133).

Another paper, focusing more specifically on Māori entrepreneurship that is informed by collective action and traditional Māori culture and values, refers to *Kaupapa Māori* (Māori-centric) entrepreneurship as a particular type of “entrepreneurial flair, underpinned by a sense of commitment to Māori community,

whether it be *whānau* (kin-group), *hapū* (sub-tribe), or *iwi* (tribe)... *Kaupapa Māori* entrepreneurship is entrepreneurship and innovation for, with and by Māori” (Henry, 2007, pp. 546-547). Overall, Tapsell and Woods also explore the connection between social entrepreneurship and Māori enterprising, finding that, “Context matters when exploring new ideas of social entrepreneurship” (Tapsell and Woods, 2010, p. 146). For Overall *et al.*, “Culture must be seen as an asset, not an inconvenience to be dispensed with” (2010, p. 150). For these authors, Māori entrepreneurship has a long history, is founded on Māori culture and values, is collective in nature, and must be understood within its socio-cultural context. For this study, the New Zealand screen industry is the context, which De Bruin (2005) acknowledges is a leading contributor to economic growth and global positioning for the country.

In the earliest years of filmmaking in New Zealand, Māori were more likely to be the objects of European curiosity. It was not until the 1940s that Māori began to tell our own stories on film, first through the work of Ramai Te Miha Hayward (Gauthier, 2008). It was similar for television, which was introduced to New Zealand in 1960. Again, in the early years, Māori were more likely to be objectified, rather than the authors of our stories. Over the last thirty years, visionary and strong-willed individuals broke down the social and institutional barriers, to forge the domain we now refer to as the Māori screen industry (Henry and Wikaire, 2013).

The New Zealand Government has a legal commitment to Māori broadcasting as a consequence of Treaty grievances taken to the Waitangi Tribunal. The findings of the *Māori Broadcasting Claim* (WAI 176, the number allocated to each Claim by the Tribunal) and *Te Reo Māori Claim* (WAI 11) have been an important incentive to force the government to accept some legal and financial responsibility for the revitalization of Māori language and culture through broadcasting. In 1996 Aotearoa

Television Network (ATN) was set up, as a national Māori television channel, but it survived for less than two years, closing in a shroud of accusations and acrimony. In the aftermath of the dissolution of ATN, the government consulted with the Māori broadcasting community, which resulted in a series of recommendations to ensure a more robust Māori Television Strategy (Māori Television, 1998). Finally, in March 2004, the Māori Television Service was created, producing over 1,000 hours of programming annually, and legislated to protect and enhance Māori language and culture.

Alongside the legislative environment, within the screen industry, there has been an increase in the number of Māori practitioners. According to Census data there were almost one thousand Māori employed in screen production, approximately 10% of all those engaged in the industry, whilst Māori comprise approximately 15% of the total New Zealand population (Statistics Department, 2006, 2013). Therefore, though Māori are proportionally under-represented, they are still a significant community within the industry. Of further interest is that Māori men and women are almost equal in proportion, which appears to contradict statistics in the United States, where men are in the majority (Lauzen, 2014). In a study of urban Aboriginal entrepreneurs in Canada, Todd (2012) considered how social capital operates among women, assisting personal development and contributing to the community.

Māori screen production is a small part of the total New Zealand economy and screen industry, and Māori comprise a minority within that industry. However, the screen industry can still be viewed as a significant contributor to Māori economic development, and more importantly to aspirations for revitalisation of language, culture and storytelling. This is particularly relevant given that Māori stories have been embodied in some of the most critically and financially successful films made in

New Zealand, ‘Once Were Warriors’ (1994), ‘Whale Rider’ (2002), and ‘Boy’ (2010) among these. The growth of the Māori screen industry, in film, television, video, and more recently on-line gaming (Nihoniho, n.d.) and app development (Koziol, n.d.), can be seen as a further contribution to the social and cultural capital that Māori may draw on, which has been enhanced by the Māori Renaissance.

The study

Dana and Dana (2005) advocate inductive, qualitative research when studying small business and entrepreneurship. They highlight advantages including the increased ability to learn directly from subjects, which offer insights into ‘deeper holistic understanding’ (Dana and Dana, 2005, p. 80). Dana and Dumez (2015) go further, referring to the paradigms that have come to dominate epistemological debates around qualitative research. For example, positivist paradigms predominate for quantitative research, whilst a range of interpretative and constructivist paradigms are evolving for qualitative research. They suggest that, “A researcher, before embarking on a research project, should identify an ideal position in one of these paradigms and stick to it for the duration of the research... Ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, theories of truth, validity, and reliability would vary depending on the chosen paradigm” (Dana and Dumez, 2015, p. 155).

Kaupapa Māori Research, is a term used to describe research founded on Māori-centric philosophy and worldview. Kaupapa Māori Research is predicated on the notion of, ‘for, with, and by Māori. It has evolved as a body of literature since the 1980s, as Māori intellectuals sought to define Māori knowledge, in the face of the dominant Eurocentric knowledge-systems. Early writers saw it as a

reaction to, and release from the positivist 'science' of the dominant culture (Cram, 1993; Smith, 1997; Sueffert, 1997). Later writing has developed the ontology, epistemology and methodology of Kaupapa Māori Research (Henry & Pene, 2001; Pihama, Cram and Walker, 2002; Bishop, 2005). Thus, Kaupapa Māori is drawn upon as a methodology, and a set of research methods and procedures, which are informed by Māori ethical principles and values (Smith, 1999). In recent years, it is not just Māori who have adopted the Kaupapa Māori paradigm, as non-Māori working alongside Māori in research have adopted a Kaupapa approach to their research (Barnes, 2013); and other Indigenous researchers have adopted similar standpoints in relation to their scholarship (Foley, 2004; Peredo *et al.*, 2004, Porsanger, 2004). Kaupapa Māori Research principles influence the way the methodology was developed and applied in this study, seeking to discover Māori experience, and contributing to new Māori knowledge (mātauranga), whilst remaining sensitive to Māori culture and values.

This study comprised a mixed methodology, in two phases. The initial phase involved an online survey of Māori screen practitioners, to better understand the community and context of the Māori screen industry (the survey and findings are addressed in more detail in another paper). The second phase involved in-depth interviews with a sample of Māori who own production companies, that had been in existence (at the time the research was conducted) for five or more years, and which had created in excess of \$1 million of film and/or television productions.

Throughout the period of the study, there were twenty companies that met these criteria, and the owners of each company was approached and invited to participate.

Ten agreed to be interviewed, within the required timeframe (over one year). The researcher knew all of the participants, having been a colleague in the past. In this instance, the researcher is both an insider and an outsider, an academic attempting to conduct a rigorous investigation within the field. Whilst there is a growing body of work that looks at Māori ‘insider research’ (Smith, 1999; Moewaka Barnes, 2000; Kahotea, 2006; Webber, 2009), it has tended to focus on Māori researching ‘inside’ specific Māori communities, juxtaposed against non-Māori conducting research in those communities, as a means of critiquing the non-Māori research. However, a number of authors provide guidance on ways to ameliorate the impacts on the insider-researcher (Rabbit, 2003; Eppley, 2006; Chavez, 2008; Wicks and Roland, 2009). Having familiarity with a given community and established relationships may provide the researcher with an enhanced opportunity to access participants, as well as ensuring the researcher is privy to ‘insider’ information that might not be entrusted to an outsider. However, there are shortcomings and limitations. For example, prior knowledge of the community may exacerbate biases or preconceived ideas, which can be disadvantageous. Thus, whilst the insider-researcher may enjoy rapport with participants, they must be continually on guard to minimize ‘bias’ and ‘over-rapport’, thereby ensuring their impartiality whilst conducting the research.

A ‘phenomenological’ approach was adopted, involving “description and analysis of lived experience to understand how meaning is created through embodied perception” (Starks and Trinidad, 2007, p. 1373). Cope (2005) distinguishes phenomenological enquiry from more positivistic forms of inquiry, locating it within the ‘interpretive paradigm’. He also invokes the researcher to acknowledge the philosophical, ontological and epistemological underpinnings of their research methods, stating that, “a central tenet of phenomenology is that explanations should

not be imposed before the phenomenon has been understood from within” (Cope, 2005, p. 166). He goes on to suggest that using personal contacts can be helpful, with representatives chosen not just because of their availability, but for the richness and depth of their story. For Cope, this is a methodology that “respects and values the experiences of the participants, prioritizing their interpretations of their experiences rather than trying to confirm or refute existing theoretical propositions” (Cope, 2005, 179).

The interviews were conducted, either through visiting their production offices, or homes, or in one case, inviting the interviewee to the Marae (traditional meeting house and community center), so participants would feel comfortable. Most interviews began with mihimihi (introductions/welcome), karakia (prayer/communion) and kai (sharing of food), which accords with Māori culture. Prior to interviews, a semi-structured set of questions had been developed to guide discussions, but they would be used as prompts rather than an explicit interview schedule. Questions focused on: background information, involvement in the screen industry, major career influences, main influence to start a production company, constraints and challenges encountered, main things that helped and supported their business. The interviews were filmed and used later in a documentary about the research. This research output was deemed to be valuable as it would allow the data, the life-stories of these entrepreneurs, to be shared more easily with Māori communities who might not otherwise gain access to scholarly research and writing. This according with the previously mentioned value that Kaupapa Māori Research must be for, with and by Māori.

Findings

The findings were derived from combining the analysis of the social context of each individual, with the thematic analysis of their interviews. Participants were an equal mix of males and females, ranging in age from thirty-two to sixty years, with a variety of educational backgrounds, marital status, sexual orientation, and knowledge of Māori language and culture. They came from different tribes, but all their companies were based in Auckland. The interviews highlighted these differences, but the similarities were equally pronounced, in terms of their commitment to strengthening Māori culture, identity and language, and their reasons for starting production companies.

Table 1 provides a brief summary of each participant, and their personal and professional contexts, which are complemented by comments below.

Table 1: Summary of the personal and professional contexts of each participant

Individual context	Professional context
Rhonda, female, 60s, from a large, urban, working-class, mixed (Māori-Pākehā) parentage family, left school young, travelled internationally, before working in business, rising to management roles. She is not a native speaker of Māori.	Went into partnership at 40 in a recording studio, then bought out the company and began producing award-winning television documentaries, and programs in Māori language, then diversified into new technologies, including ADR software, app-development, and book publishing. She has owned her company for over 15 years, and now focuses primarily on her online publishing

	venture.
Claudette, female, 40s, from a Māori family that moved to the city for better opportunities for their children, went to university and on to become the first Māori woman sports reporter, before becoming a political journalist. Claudette is a speaker of Māori.	Began a company when she realized she could not tell stories the way she wanted whilst working for mainstream broadcasters. She has gone on to produce a wide range of social and political documentaries for over ten years. Claudette ceased trading and went into politics, after completion of this study.
Brad, male 50s, born in a rural community and raised by his grand-father, the first Māori doctor in the region, a scholar who infused him with ancient stories. He trained as a journalist, going on to work in mainstream television, but continued to write books and screenplays. Brad is a speaker and translator of Māori.	Brad is a partner in a number of companies, which have produced television drama and documentaries. He is a respected writer in Māori and English, having authored a number of books, as well as working on a variety of screenplays, often as the Māori consultant.
Te Kauhoe, male, 40s, born in a rural community, he became a Māori-language learner at university, and went on to become a language expert and teacher. He was offered a role in a Māori-language TV show and he and his family moved to Auckland in his late 30s.	Te Kauhoe worked as a presenter and journalist for mainstream TV for many years, before beginning his own company with his wife, producing Māori-language programming for MTS. Te Kauhoe died unexpectedly in 2011, and his wife continues to run their company.
Nicole, female, 40s, was born in a rural community, into a mixed (Māori-Pākehā) parentage family. She was sent to boarding school as teenager, and chose to remain in the city. Her father owned his own business and her mother was a teacher.	Nicole began work in a company making TV commercials, and started her own company, making primarily mainstream television. She did not speak Māori but sent her son to Kōhanga Reo (Māori immersion education). At his behest she made a program for Māori youth in Te Reo, and has been producing that program and many TV productions and drama for more than ten years.

Robert, male, 60s, born and raised in a rural community, where he did not learn English until going to school. Robert has been a life-long advocate of traditional Māori culture and language. He is a respected linguist and advocate for his tribe.	Robert was amongst the first Māori trained in TV production by the state broadcaster in the 1970s. He went on to become a journalist and presenter in the first dedicated Māori TV show (Koha), but left to start his own company in the 1980s, and has since produced an extensive catalogue of TV documentaries and children's programs, primarily in Te Reo. He has since left production to become an academic.
Tearepa, male, 30s, born in an urban community, into a mixed (Māori-Pākehā) parentage family. His father maintained strong ties to home and tribe, so when Tearepa went to university, he also began learning Te Reo.	Tearepa was working for a Māori production company, when an opportunity arose to direct a piece. From there he went on to setup his own company producing children's programming in Te Reo and making documentaries. He has gone on to write and direct Māori short films, and a critically acclaimed feature film, which were produced by the company he owns in partnership with two others.
Pio, male, 50, was born in an rural community, but brought to the city as a child, where he was educated and went on to work in a variety of different places, before securing a job as a DJ on the first Māori radio station in Auckland.	Pio is most prominent for his roles as an actor, comedian and TV presenter. However, he and his wife have owned a TV production company for many years, which produces a range of family entertainment, travelogue and documentaries for mainstream and Māori TV. He is also a partner in other TV companies, focusing on programming specifically for Māori TV.
Kay, female, 40s, was adopted as an infant by a Pākehā family in a rural community. Her family emphasized values around faith and social justice.	Kay trained as a journalist, and went to work in mainstream TV, then transferred to Māori programming. She started her own company so

She found her Māori birth as an adult, and does not speak Te Reo, but is passionately committed to producing programs for her children, who have attended Kura, immersion education centers.	that she could make programs that she wanted to, particularly in Te Reo, and coinciding with the start of Māori TV. Many of her productions are education-focussed but she has also produced and directed a wide range of documentaries about Māori people and issues.
Whetu, female, 40s, was born in a rural community, into a mixed (Māori-Samoan) parentage family. Hers was the first Samoan-Māori family in the region. She left home and came to the city to become an actress, and has appeared in a number of TV and film dramas.	Whetu has owned a number of production companies, some with different partners. Her first company produced a series of short film dramas, focusing on Māori and Pacific women in the 1990s. She went on to produce TV for a tribal television network. In recent years she has worked with the guild for Māori in screen production.

In-depth analysis of the interview data found a range of similarities. Each recalled people, who shaped, informed, empowered and encouraged their life choices, career pathways and entrepreneurial endeavors. These included family-members, parents, teachers or other educators, partners and colleagues who had all played a pivotal role enhancing their self-belief and self-efficacy, alongside a passion for Māori culture, language and story-telling. Rhonda said, “One of the things that my parents insisted on was that when we left school, we were not allowed to work in the [factory]”. For Claudette, “we were babies of that generation that came to the city for better jobs, for a better lifestyle, so we had to succeed”. Brad noted, “The whole thing of storytelling and genealogy was actually instilled in me as a baby”. For Pio, “There was no real help from mum and dad, with regard to academic achievement, other than, they created a really wonderful home life and a base”. Kay stated, “Wanting to

do something that contributed to the world was just something that I grew up believing was what you did”.

Furthermore, they had all found places that complemented the people, by further nurturing their self-belief and drive to be part of a creative community, and enhancing Māori language, culture and creativity. These places included: birthplaces (villages, tribal communities), home environments, schools, communities, work places, and other significant sites that enhanced their achievements in their chosen fields. Nicole said, “We go home every Christmas, and as a whānau (extended family) all camp together on our whenua (land/tribal land), one of the reasons is to ensure that our kids know the value of their whānau (family), hapū (sub-tribe) and iwi (tribe)”. Claudette, “went to university and found a whole new world, and fully embraced it to the point of protesting, joining movements, sit-ins, it was just amazing, there were things outside of nursing and teaching that Māori girls could do”. Brad, “hated journalism because I had to get over my shyness, but I look back now and go ‘man’, actually that was the best thing I could have done”. Tearepa went on to learn Māori because, “I just wanted to get closer to my nana, and reconnecting to who I was as Waikato and Ngati Pāoa (his tribes)”.

These people and places had infused each of them with a passion for story telling, to craft creative careers, and engage in entrepreneurial endeavor. Tearepa said, “I fell in love with stories with my brother on a big double bed that we used to share when I was a little kid and dad was there and he used to roll over and tell us something”. For Whetu, “when we were kids, she (mother) would pile us all into the bed, and she would tell us these tales of her growing up”. Nicole remembers, “We had to learn to lose in hockey, and be able to walk back on that field the next day and believe we could win, it is the same in business”.

Taken in combination, the people, the places and the passion, enhanced their self-belief, and a desire for autonomy and self-determination, not just for themselves individually, but also for the communities (whānau, hapu and iwi), and for Māori in general. Taking control of Māori story telling was an important aspiration in each of their professional lives, as was the drive to create viable and robust organizations in which they could enact authentic identities and inwardly derived Māori values. Te Kauhoe said, “all Māori, I believe, want to tell their own stories. I thought, I’d love to make my own stuff”. And Kay felt, “I never actually went into it thinking, I want to create a business, if I want to control the projects, I have to have a company”. For Pio, “You were at the total mercy of the production houses that grabbed you, as a perceived talent, and you were milked like a ‘cash cow”. Robert believes, “it’s best that we make the program and sell it to them, rather than them dictating to us, what sort of programs they want”. For Whetu, owning her own company was about, “tino rangatiratanga (self-determination), we have to really strive for our own economic independence”. And Rhonda believes that, “Anything’s possible, that’s my mantra, no-one can tell me that it can’t be done, it’s just not being done right now”. These views highlight an essence of invincible Māori-ness as a key driver of their entrepreneurial endeavor. Each of these individuals own, or was a partner in, companies created for-profit. Their businesses operate in a highly competitive environment, and were managed and organized according to the legal principles of New Zealand commerce. However, behind and within these companies, was a desire to produce stories, either solely in the Māori language, or with strong Māori cultural content. Each was also committed to creating organizations that met not only their own personal needs, financially and professionally, but which also contributed to Māori cultural and linguistic revitalization, providing pathways for other Māori to

enter and succeed in screen production, and from which authentic Māori stories and knowledge would emerge.

Discussion

We find that community-based enterprise has been utilised by Indigenous peoples to ensure cultural preservation. Indigenous businesses in a variety of locations have benefitted from strong cultural foundations. Furthermore, entrepreneurship, particularly emancipatory entrepreneurship, provides opportunities for Indigenous peoples to bring about social change in their economic, social and cultural environments. We have been encouraged to take account of the context in which entrepreneurship occurs, whether the community, social or cultural context. The cognition of individual entrepreneurs, how they think and whether or not they believe they can succeed, must also be factored into the analysis. Concepts such as self-efficacy, and being supported by cultural norms, were introduced, as predictors of entrepreneurial endeavor.

Finally, the different forms of capital, social, cultural, institutional and economic were explored, and the ways that social and cultural factors emerge from value systems, and that these in combination can contribute, or not, to new venture creation. In particular, the work of Light and Dana (2013) provides a theoretical framework within which this study can be located. To reiterate, Light and Dana propose a model linking entrepreneurship, and social and cultural capital.

	Cultural Capital	
	Negative	Positive
Social Capital		
Strong	No entrepreneurship	High entrepreneurship
Weak	No entrepreneurship	Low entrepreneurship

Table 2: Entrepreneurship, social capital and cultural capital (Light and Dana, 2013, p. 618)

The findings from our present study suggest that these Māori entrepreneurs have access to strong social capital, from their family, tribal and professional communities. Further, we find a history of entrepreneurial endeavor in traditional Māori society, which feeds into the cultural context. Though almost extinguished by colonization and increasing impoverishment, the Māori Renaissance of recent decades, complemented by acknowledgement and settlement of grievances emerging from breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi, have combined to engender positive cultural capital and support for entrepreneurship. These entrepreneurs are unashamedly Māori, in that they celebrate their unique and distinctive culture, not just in the organizations they create, but also the things they produce.

These factors, taken in tandem with personal and professional contexts that nurtured self-efficacy, a passion for story-telling, and a determination to take control, to be emancipated, by creating their own businesses, suggest the Light and Dana

model is applicable. The statement that their findings, “have implications for a broad range of situations involving entrepreneurship or the lack of it among propinquitous ethno-religious or ethno-racial groups in the developed as well as in the developing world” (Light and Dana, 2013, p. 618), has resonance for this and other such studies.

Conclusion

This research explored and analyzed Māori entrepreneurs in the screen industry, and identified how the life histories and experiences, culture and identity of participants combined to shape their entrepreneurial intent. Clear evidence was found demonstrating that these factors combine to enrich their cultural and social capital, which, in turn enhances their desire for emancipation through entrepreneurial endeavor.

Thus, this paper makes an important contribution because it brings together the small but growing body of Indigenous entrepreneurship literature, and focuses on a study that looks, in-depth, at individual Indigenous entrepreneurs, exploring their social and cultural contexts in a comprehensive and rigorous manner.

The singular focus of this paper on one Indigenous population, Māori, within a specific industrial sector, the creative sector, is a limitation, which can be addressed through future research, in other Māori business sectors, or among other Indigenous peoples. This will provide further elucidation of these contexts and concepts.

From such research and theory building, it is hoped that other oppressed peoples, Indigenous or otherwise, may draw on entrepreneurship as a means to break free from their oppression, to restore and rebuild their cultures, better define and

enhance their identities, and to create organizations that are more meaningful for themselves and their communities.

REFERENCES

- Adams, P. (1977). *Fatal necessity: British intervention in New Zealand, 1830-1847*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Awatere, D. (1984). *Māori Sovereignty*. Auckland, New Zealand: Broadsheet Publishing.
- Bajada, C., & Trayler, R. (2014). A fresh approach to Indigenous business education. *Education+ Training*, 56(7), 613-634.
- Barnes, A. (2013). What can Pākehā learn from kaupapa Māori educational research? Working paper 1, New Zealand Council for Educational research, Wellington, New Zealand. Retrieved from:
http://www.nzcer.org.nz/system/files/Pakeha_Kaupapa_Maori_Research.pdf
- Bécares, L., Cormack, D., & Harris, R. (2013). Ethnic density and area deprivation: Neighbourhood effects on Māori health and racial discrimination in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Social Science & Medicine*, 88, 76-82.
- Belich, J. (1986). *The New Zealand wars and the Victorian interpretation of racial conflict*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.
- Bishop, R. (2005). Freeing Ourselves from Neocolonial Domination in Research: A Kaupapa Maori Approach to Creating Knowledge. In Denzin, N., Lincoln, Y. (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 3rd Ed: 109-138. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Bourassa, S. C., & Strong, A. L. (2002). Restitution of land to New Zealand Maori: The role of social structure. *Pacific Affairs, University of British Columbia*, 75(2), 227-262.
- Cahn, M. (2008). Indigenous entrepreneurship, culture and microenterprise in the Pacific Islands: case studies from Samoa. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development: An International Journal*, 20(1), 1-18, DOI: [10.1080/08985620701552413](https://doi.org/10.1080/08985620701552413)
- De Carolis, D. M., & Saporito, P. (2006). Social capital, cognition, and entrepreneurial opportunities: A theoretical framework. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 30(1), 41-56.
- Colquhoun, S., & Dockery, A.M. (2012). *The link between Indigenous culture and wellbeing: qualitative evidence for Australian Aboriginal peoples*. Perth, Australia: Centre for Labour Market Research. Retrieved from: https://business.curtin.edu.au/files/2012.01_LSIC_qualitative_CLMR1.pdf
- Cope, J. (2005). Researching entrepreneurship through phenomenological inquiry: philosophical and methodological issues. *International Small Business Journal*, 23(2), 163-189.
- Cram, F. (1993). Ethics in Māori Research. In L. Nikora (ed.), *Cultural Justice and Ethics. Proceedings of a Symposium at the Annual Conference of the New Zealand Psychological Society*: 28-30. University of Victoria, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Dacin, P. A., Dacin, M. T., & Matear, M. (2010). Social entrepreneurship: Why we don't need a new theory and how we move forward from here. *The academy of management perspectives*, 24(3), 37-57.
- Dana, L-P (1995), "Entrepreneurship in a Remote Sub-Arctic Community: Nome, Alaska," *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 20 (1), pp. 55-72.

- Dana, L-P (2015), "Indigenous Entrepreneurship: An Emerging Field of Research," *International Journal of Business and Globalisation* 14 (2), Special Issue on Advances in Business Research, Ronald S. J. Tuninga, editor, pp. 158-169.
- Dana, L-P., Anderson, R. (2007). A multidisciplinary theory of entrepreneurship as a function of cultural perceptions of opportunity. In Dana, L-P & R. Anderson (Eds.), *International Handbook of Research on Indigenous Entrepreneurship* (pp.3-8). Cheltenham, United Kingdom: Edward Elgar.
- Dana, L-P., Dana, T. (2005). Expanding the scope of methodologies used in entrepreneurship research. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 2(1), 79-88.
- Dana, L-P., Dumez, H. (2015). Qualitative research revisited: epistemology of a comprehensive approach', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 26(2), 154–170.
- Davidsson, P., & Honig, B. (2003). The role of social and human capital among nascent entrepreneurs. *Journal of business venturing*, 18(3), 301-331.
- De Bruin, A. (2005). Multi-level entrepreneurship in the creative industries: New Zealand's screen production industry. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 6(3), 143-150.
- Devlin, M.H. (2007). Māori entrepreneurship: fact or fallacy? *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 4(4), 407-418.
- Foley, Dennis, and Allan John O'Connor (2013), "Social Capital and the Networking Practices of Indigenous Entrepreneurs," *Journal of Small Business Management* 51(2), pp. 276–296
- Frederick, H.H., Henry, E. (2004). Innovation and entrepreneurship amongst Pākehā and Māori in New Zealand. In Stiles, C. H., & Galbraith, C. S. (Eds.) *Ethnic*

- entrepreneurship: Structure and process (115-140)*, Vol. 4. Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing.
- Fryer, M., Quijano, U., Sadeghi, P., Calero, C., Garcia Villegas, S., & Vargas, S. (2012). *Implementation of the Strategy for Indigenous Development (GN-2387-5): Lessons from the Portfolio Review*. New York: Inter-American Development Bank.
- Furneaux, C., Brown, K. (2008). Australian Indigenous entrepreneurship: a capital based view. *Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 9(2), 133-144.
- Goss, D., Jones, R., Betta, M., & Latham, J. (2011). Power as practice: A micro-sociological analysis of the dynamics of emancipatory entrepreneurship. *Organization Studies*, 32(2), 211-229.
- Gupta, V., Fernandez, C. (2009). Cross-cultural similarities and differences in characteristic attributed to entrepreneurs. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 15(3), 304-318.
- Gauthier, J. (2008). Lest others speak for us: the neglected roots and uncertain future of Maori cinema in New Zealand (57-73). In P. Wilson, M. Stewart (eds.), *Global Indigenous Media: Cultures, Poetics, and Politics*. Durham, UK: Duke University Press.
- Henare, M. (2001). Tapu, mana, mauri, hau, wairua. A Maori philosophy of vitalism and cosmos (197-221). In J. Grim (ed.), *Indigenous traditions and ecology: The interbeing of cosmology and community*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press for the Centre for the Study of World Religions.
- Henry, E. (2007). Kaupapa Māori Entrepreneurship. In Dana, L-P., Anderson, R. B. (eds.), *International Handbook of Research on Indigenous Entrepreneurship* (pp. 536-548). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

- Henry, E. (2012). *Wairua Auaha: emancipatory Māori entrepreneurship in screen production* (Unpublished doctoral thesis, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand). Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10292/4085>
- Henry, E., & Pene, H (2001): Kaupapa Māori Research, Locating Indigenous ontology, epistemology and methodology in the academy. *Organization*, 8(2), 234-242. San Francisco, CA: Sage, Publications.
- Henry, E., Wikaire, M. (2013). *The Brown Book: Māori in screen production*. Auckland, New Zealand: Ngā Aho Whakaari, Association of Māori in Screen Production.
- Hindle, K., & Moroz, P. (2010). Indigenous entrepreneurship as a research field: developing a definitional framework from the emerging canon. *International Entrepreneurship Management Journal*, 6: 357-385. DOI [10.1007/s11365-009-0111-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-009-0111-x)
- Kawharu, I. H. (1989). *Waitangi: Māori & Pākehā Perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Keane, B. (2014). He Whakaputanga – Declaration of Independence - The aftermath of the declaration'. Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand. Wellington (updated 2-Apr-14). Retrieved from: <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/he-whakaputanga-declaration-of-independence/page-3>
- King, M. (2003). *The Penguin History of New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books.
- Kirby, D. A. (2006). Creating entrepreneurial universities in the UK: applying entrepreneurship theory to practice. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 31, 599-603.

- Koziol-Repia, J. (n.d.) Jordan Koziol-Repia: App Developer. Māori Future Makers: profiles of inspirational Māori. Te Puni Kōkiri, Ministry of Māori Development, Wellington, New Zealand. Retrieved from: <http://www.maorifuturemakers.com/jordan-koziol-repia-app-developer>
- Lauzen, M. (2014). *Boxed In: employment of behind-the-scenes and on-screen women in 2013-2014 prime-time television*. Report from the Centre for the Study of Women in Television and Film. Retrieved from: <http://womenintvfilm.sdsu.edu/research.html>
- Lineham, P.J. (2012). *Missions and missionaries - First missionaries*. Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand (updated 13-Jul-12). Retrieved from: <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/missions-and-missionaries/page-2>
- Light, I., & Dana, L. P. (2013). Boundaries of social capital in entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 37(3), 603-624.
- Māori Television (1998). *A Summary of Views*. Ministry of Broadcasting and Ministry of Māori Affairs Report. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Broadcasting. Retrieved from: <http://www.rsm.govt.nz/cms/pdf-library/policy-and-planning/archived-rspp/Māori-tv-summary-of-views.pdf>
- Mauss, M. (1954). *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. New York, US: Cohen & West.
- Mitchell, R. K., Busenitz, L., Lant, T., McDougall, P. P., Morse, E. A., & Smith, J. B. (2002). Toward a theory of entrepreneurial cognition: Rethinking the people side of entrepreneurship research. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 27(2), 93-104.

- Moon, P., & Fenton, S. (2002). Bound into a fateful union: Henry Williams' translation of the Treaty of Waitangi into Māori in February 1840. *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 111, 51-63.
- Nihoniho, M. (n.d.). Manu Nihoniho: Games Developer. Māori Future Makers: profiles of inspirational Māori. Te Puni Kōkiri, Ministry of Māori Development, Wellington, New Zealand. Retrieved from:
<http://www.maorifuturemakers.com/maru-nihoniho-games-developer>
- Orange, C. (1989). *The Story of a Treaty*. Wellington, New Zealand: Allen & Unwin.
- 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. B., Galbraith, C. S., Honig, B., & Dana, L. P. (2004). Towards a theory of Indigenous entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 1(1-2), 1-20.
- Peredo, A. M., & Chrisman, J. J. (2006). Towards a theory of community-based enterprise. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(2), 309-328.
- Petrie, H. (2006). *Chiefs of industry: Māori tribal enterprise in early colonial New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.
- Pihama, L., Cram, F., & Walker, S. (2002). Creating methodological space: A literature review of Kaupapa Maori research. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 26(1), 30.
- Porsanger, J. (2004) An essay about Indigenous methodology. Doctoral Seminar, University of Tromsø, Sweden. Retrieved on May 14th 2010 from:
<http://uit.no/getfile.php?PageId=977&FileId=188>

- Rindova, V., Barry, D., & Ketchen, D. (2009). Entrepreneurship as emancipation. *Academy of Management Review*, 34(3), 477-491.
- Scott, D (1975). *Ask That Mountain: The Story of Parihaka*. Wellington, New Zealand: Heinemann.
- Smith, G. (1997). Development of kaupapa Māori theory and praxis. (Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Auckland, New Zealand).
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonising methodologies, research and Indigenous peoples*. Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago Press.
- Starks, H., & Trinidad, S. B. (2007). Choose your method: A comparison of phenomenology, discourse analysis, and grounded theory. *Qualitative health research*, 17(10), 1372-1380.
- Statistics Department. (2006, 2013). Census Data Reports. New Zealand Government, Wellington. Retrieved from: www.stats.govt.nz/census.aspx
- Terjesen, S., & Elam, A. (2009). Transnational entrepreneurs' venture internationalization strategies: A practice theory approach. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(5), 1093-1120.
- Todd, R. (2012), "Young Urban Aboriginal Women Entrepreneurs: Social Capital, Complex Transitions and Community Support, *British Journal of Canadian Studies* 25 (1), pp. 1-19.
- Wadeson, N. (2006). Cognitive aspects of entrepreneurship: Decision-making and attitudes to risk (91-113). In M. Casson, B.Yeung, A.Basu, & N.Wadeson, (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Entrepreneurship*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Walker, R. (1990). *Ka whawhai tonu matou: struggle without end*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Publishing.

- Welter, F. (2011). Contextualizing entrepreneurship—conceptual challenges and ways forward. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(1), 165-184.
- Wiklund, J., Davidsson, P., Audretsch, D. B., & Karlsson, C. (2011). The future of entrepreneurship research. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(1), 1-9.
- Wilson, C. (2012). New Zealand History. Ministry for Culture and Heritage, online Encyclopedia. Retrieved from:
<http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/media/photo/charles-wilson>, updated 20-Dec-2012