

## 2. Gender, Diversity & Indigeneity

### Interactive paper

#### THE HYBRID NATURE OF MĀORI TRIBAL ENTERPRISE:

#### THE BEST OF BOTH WORLDS

Diane Ruwhiu

Department of Management  
University of Otago  
PO Box 56, Dunedin, 9054  
New Zealand  
[diane.ruwhiu@otago.ac.nz](mailto:diane.ruwhiu@otago.ac.nz)  
+64 3 479 8075

Maria Amoamo

Department of Management  
University of Otago  
PO Box 56, Dunedin, 9054  
New Zealand  
[maria.amoamo@otago.ac.nz](mailto:maria.amoamo@otago.ac.nz)

## 2. Gender, Diversity & Indigeneity

### Interactive paper

#### THE HYBRID NATURE OF MĀORI TRIBAL ENTERPRISE:

#### THE BEST OF BOTH WORLDS

#### ABSTRACT

*The notion of the Māori economy and the many different forms of organisation that operate within it, is not new. However, there has been a tendency for scholars and practitioners alike to subsume discussion of Māori enterprise and the activities they undertake, within the purview of economic development. This perspective sits uncomfortably with Te Ao Māori, the Māori world, which represents a much more holistic and contextual paradigm that naturally draws us into spaces where the social and economic overlap. The purpose of this paper is to offer some thoughts regarding the convergence of literature regarding hybrid social enterprisers and Māori tribal forms of organisation that may provide an alternative way to think about and enact Māori development.*

**Key words:** Indigenous/Māori management and organisations, indigenous organisational theories, multicultural organisations, collectives and communities

This interactive paper is our first attempt at articulating a potential research idea beyond discussions ‘over a cup of coffee’. A key theme of this discussion paper is ‘the best of both worlds’ to represent the tensions and opportunities that exist at the nexus of Māori and non-Māori worldviews as critical features of the complex ‘hybrid’ landscape in which Māori enterprise operate in. While the notion of the Māori economy, and Māori enterprise is not new. Previous research has involved exploration of various notions of Māori values in business (Ruwhiu & Cone, 2013; Spiller & Stockdale, 2013), Māori entrepreneurship (Frederick & Henry, 2004; Haar & Delaney, 2009) and Māori tribal organisations (Barr & Reid, 2014). There has also been some very exciting research on innovative Māori businesses involved in areas such as geothermal activities (Bargh, 2012) and traditional foods (Dana & Hipango, 2011). In terms of building a robust and dynamic field of research around the notion of Māori economy and forms of organisation – we are excited! However, what is missing is an in-depth exploration of the different forms of economy (such as tribal economy, or a customary economy) in which Māori enterprise operates and specific focus on organisational forms, which are critical to issues of governance, legal structure, resource management and process of appropriate mission or strategy.

Our aim with this paper is to focus discussion onto the organisational form (notions of economy are being developed elsewhere) of our tribal enterprises. We envision our discussion to be focused on ‘Māori tribal enterprise - the best of both worlds’. Today in New Zealand, we have tribal enterprises that are not only financially successful, but also deliver very specific cultural, social and environmental outcomes for their tribal base. This is a very important point for consideration. Māori tribal enterprises, such as Wakatu Incorporated, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (TRONT) and Waikato-Tainui have different structures, governance, kaupapa (guiding principles) and strategy, derived from specific legislative and tribal geo-political contexts, and socio-historical experiences that make their organisational forms distinct. But each of them has a very clear mandate to operate commercial activities for the benefit of their people, today and in the future.

It is important to recognise that there are distinct Māori enterprise groups, ranging from micro sized operators to large multi-national tribal corporations. We are aware that there are other

distinctions that can categorise the forms of organisation even further (e.g. marae based enterprises), but our intention here is to provide a broad scope. Needless to say, these groupings have their own forms of organisation, but for this discussion paper we will be focusing on the tribal form of organisation.

[INSERT TABLE 1 HERE]

In that light, below we don't provide a paper in an academic sense. We have key themes which we see as parts of the 'jigsaw puzzle' that we would like to discuss. The hope is that we develop further our thinking on these themes, and the concepts therein, that will move us forward in a productive manner. The underlying assumption driving this interactive discussion paper is recognition that there are multiple forms of economy that operate interdependently and from within which different forms of organisation and enterprise emerge, and through which, communities are nurtured and sustained. This raises questions as to the multidimensional nature of Māori tribal enterprise and the types of organisations involved, the nature of their governance and structure, and the specific legislative geo-political context within which they operate. When considering the Māori tribal enterprise as a collective governance model, we are drawn to the relationship between economic and social objectives, which lead to different value propositions, expectations and outcomes. The primary question driving our thinking is whether Māori tribal forms of organisation are hybrid social enterprises.

The discussion paper continues as follows: we begin with identifying critical issues in relation to the conceptualisation of the Māori economy, before briefly discussing key characteristics of Māori tribal forms of organisation. We then touch on the field of hybrid social enterprise, which is defined as one that pursues the dual mission of achieving both financial sustainability and social purpose and does not fit neatly into the conventional categories of private, public or non-profit organisations (Doherty, Haugh, & Lyn, 2014; Haigh, Walker, Bacq, & Kickul, 2015; Holt & Littlewood, 2015). Not because we see a precise fit. Nor is it to suggest that every tribal organisational form is the same, for indeed they are not. But rather, because we 'think' some of the critical questions arising within the field of hybrid forms of organisation might lead us to questions and answers useful for our own

thinking in relation to Māori tribal enterprise. To conclude we offer some summative thoughts and pose some broader questions for consideration.

### THE MĀORI ECONOMY

The notion of the Māori economy can be associated with an emerging discourse of 'diverse economies' (Gibson-Graham, 2006) and 'hybrid economies' (Altman, 2004). Such discourse seeks to reflect the *diversity* and *complexity* of Māori enterprise whereby the dynamics of Māori values and culture overlap with market values and culture in a way that disrupts the capitalist/non-capitalist binary in favour of the Māori economy as 'a complex array of intersecting and diverging co-ordinates' (Bargh, 2011, p.65). Importantly, we do not distinguish between the literature regarding the notion of Indigenous economy and the Māori economy. However, we do recognize there is an existing theorisation of Indigenous economy and we have used it to inform how we think about and understand the dynamics of the Māori economy.

Today, the Māori economy is a "globally connected, prosperous, and profitable sector of the New Zealand economy" (Spiller, Pio, Henare, & Erakovic, 2011, p.223) and is testament to a strong Māori economic base built on the distinctive forms organisation that pre-existed colonisation and those that subsequently emerged. In the 2015 report, *Te Ohanga Māori 2013: Māori Economy Report*, the Māori economy was estimated to be \$42.6bn (Nana, Khan, & Schulze., 2015). Economic development has been the most cited area for Indigenous communities to realise their potential (Anderson, Dana, & Dana, 2006; Hindle & Lansdowne, 2007). However, our exploration of the Māori economy and the forms of organisation that evolve within it must acknowledge the history of colonial repression that has shaped the Māori experience. While colonisation per se is not the central concern of this paper, it is important to reflect on the destructive impacts of colonial processes, such as capitalism on Indigenous forms of economy. Modern capitalism involved the appropriation of resources, including labour and led to the destruction of pre-existing traditional economies, through the suppression of alternate, Indigenous forms of consumption and production (Banerjee, 2008; Jalata, 2013; Kuokkanen, 2011). A direct consequence for Māori was the rejection and censure of Te Ao Māori, and the imposition of a new religious doctrine (Christianity), different socio-political and

economic structures, based around capitalist ethics of individualism, and common law (Jackson, 1992; Smith, 2012). Communal ownership, a lack of innovation and an incapacity for deferred gratification were not only viewed as characteristic of kin-based societies like the New Zealand Māori, but criticised loudly at political levels that such a perspective constituted a barrier to economic growth and an impediment to extensive economic changes (Petrie, 2002).

Therefore, the current (dominant) infrastructure of socio-economic development that operates globally, fails to meet the aspirational needs of Indigenous communities while the central philosophical assumptions of the system remain solely in the tradition of self-interested behaviour, profit accumulation, individualism and competition. This approach to economic development views social, cultural and environmental obligations as friction, as cost, something to be controlled, mitigated or eliminated. However, it is widely acknowledged that there are various forms of capitalism and associated modes of economy (Banerjee, 2008; Bruff & Horn, 2012; Lin, 2010) that have evolved through the continued negotiation of relationships and exposure to different socio-cultural contexts. Appreciation of the many different forms of economy has long been recognised in sociology, and anthropology (Fiske, 1991; Mauss, 1970), particularly those that move away from exchange based transactions to those based on social contribution, and in doing so have driven the emergence of new forms of value creation in a wide range of business practices and forms of organisation (Arvidsson, 2009, 2011).

At the heart of our perspective is a notion of economy that ‘fits’ with forms of social organisation that are derived from context-specific socio-historical culturally constituted frameworks. We position the notion of economy as a social construct, which is the synthesis of a series of interdependent processes, including cultural, values, history, social organisation, systems of exchange, geo-political relations, and ecology, as main factors (Biggart & Delbridge, 2004; Bourdieu, 2005; Granovetter, 1985). That being so, there are features such as, cultural values and traditional knowledge that make the Māori economy different. Indigenous modes of economy are rooted in localised concepts of wealth, accumulation and distribution characterised by conscious articulation and practice of Indigenous cultural values, such as stewardship of nature and contribution to community (Bunten, 2011).

Characteristics of Indigenous economy are: the philosophical space driving economic activity is associated with the respective Indigenous worldview (which therefore informs the central cultural values, sustains customary social relationships, defines identities, and shapes personal and cultural well-being); and, an approach that values ‘accumulation of sharing’ (equitable distribution of wealth amongst the community) (Kuokkanen, 2011). More than this, it represents a system of exchange that can take into account multiple strands of social, cultural, economic and political issues in society. These factors provide context, content, logic and boundaries in which an economy functions and are foundational to the creation of resilient Māori organisations, modes of economy and strong communities, today and in the future. In particular, a form of economy that enables Māori enterprise to centrally locate their cultural and social obligations at various levels (iwi, hapu, whanau) within their organisational framework. It is in this space, where we see an important opportunity to develop a research agenda that explores the potential and distinctiveness of our Māori forms of organisation, specifically tribal enterprise that are connected to landscapes and people.

### **THE TRIBAL ENTERPRISE**

While successful Māori business is not a new conception (for example see King, 2003; Petrie, 2006; Salmond, 1991), the contemporary tribal form of enterprise is relatively new as a result of the return of assets and compensation from the New Zealand government, in compensation for grievances committed during the period of early colonisation. The return of assets to some Māori tribes has resulted in centralised corporate structures mandated to protect and grow each respective tribe’s asset base. This centralisation, has caused some tension given that traditionally the control of collective resources resided with the whanau (family) and hapū (clan) (Barr & Reid, 2014). Barr & Reid (2014) also make the very pertinent point that successful economic development for Indigenous peoples is highly dependent on level of alignment between the political and economic institutions developed to manage assets and traditional political and economic structures.

Contemporary iwi organisations utilise modern institutional, legal and governance models (e.g. trusts and companies). The result is a blended organisational form that operates as a representative body for the tribe and while there are different forms currently in operation they have

an economic, financial growth agenda that sits alongside more social, cultural and environmental objectives for the tribal membership. Therefore, modern tribal enterprises typically pursue economic, social and cultural roles. The success of Māori tribal enterprises is in part due to their ability to negotiate the capitalist system in a way that is embedded in the relational and culturally constituted worldview of Indigenous Māori, thus enabling their own theories, models and mechanisms of practice.

Cultural values are an important differentiator and contribute to the success of whanau and enterprises. It is important to note that cultural values of tikanga (customary Māori obligation) and mātauranga (Māori epistemology) are foundational to iwi organisational structure. Thus, cultural legitimacy is bound to the rules and norms associated with these values and give contemporary iwi their identity as uniquely Māori organisations. We accept the difficulties associated with the summing up of a complex values-based system of relations, exchange and beliefs that underpin any articulation of a worldview, but suggest that it is important to identify the set of deeply embedded Māori values distinctive to Māori knowledge (Table 2). Māori values provide the thread of continuity which integrates and holds together the social fabric of Māori culture (Marsden, 2003), providing continuity in the transmission of cultural meaning and practice within the community. Given our overall aim in this discussion paper, our aim with this simple table is to provide some brief insight into some of the central values that drive Māori behaviour and practice in an organisational setting.

[INSERT TABLE 2]

Māori tribal enterprises necessarily embody both the financial aspirations of economic prosperity and social/cultural/environmental vitalisation. For the most part, tribal entities chose to adopt corporate organisational structures that separate the commercial from tribal development needs. As a brief example, Tainui Group Holdings (TGH) established in 1999 is the corporate entity that manages the financial settlement and properties returned as part of the Waikato-Tainui Raupatu (land confiscation) settlement with the Crown through the Treaty of Waitangi claims processes. TGH as the commercial arm of the Waikato-Tainui tribal authorities is strictly a commercial business model, with strong governance, responsible for wealth creation. The Waikato-Tainui tribal authorities are

responsible for the distribution of wealth to its tribal members (see [www.tgh.co.nz](http://www.tgh.co.nz) and <http://www.waikatotainui.com/>). TGH works with and provides the financial support for the Waikato Raupatu River Trust, which has an overall objective to restore and protect the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River (Waikato Raupatu River Trust, 2014), and the Waikato-Tainui College for Research and Development (Waikato-Tainui College for Research and Development, 2014). In addition, Waikato-Tainui offers doctoral scholarships and kaumatua (older person) medical grants of up to \$500 per 12 month period or more are available to all registered Waikato-Tainui kaumaatua aged 60 and over to assist with certain medical and health and wellbeing purposes.

The landscape of tribal enterprises is heterogeneous and complex. The aim of this interactive discussion paper is to consider Māori tribal forms of organisation that have evolved within an indigenous economy based on the traditional and localised system of exchange, where the primary activity was not exchange for profit or competition but the sustenance of individuals, families and community (Jalata, 2013; Kuokkanen, 2011; Petrie, 2007). This corresponds with, and can be extended to broader views on indigenous entrepreneurship as operating ‘at the intersection of social and economic’ (Anderson et al., 2006; Peredo, Anderson, Galbraith, Honig, & Dana, 2004) and that explicitly acknowledges the particular historical and cultural context from which such activity arises (Tapsell & Woods, 2008). The genesis of our thinking in this paper responds to the social-economic nexus that forms the foundation for the governance and strategic direction of Māori tribal enterprise. Our argument then is that these forms of organisation are closely aligned with the notion of hybrid social enterprises.

### **HYBRID SOCIAL ENTERPRISE**

Hybrid social enterprises are organisation that trades, not for private gain, but to generate positive social and environmental externalities (Doherty et al., 2014). Michael Porter suggests that the notion of shared value is fundamental to social businesses:

“Shared value is fundamentally about the ability to both create economic value and let us call it social or societal benefit simultaneously. Businesses create shared value when they can make a profit—create economic value—while simultaneously meeting important social needs or

important social goals like improving environmental performance, reducing problems of health, improving nutrition, reducing disability, improving safety, and helping people save for retirement” (Driver, 2012, p.423).

Therefore, at its heart, the notion of a hybrid social enterprise involves a fundamental ‘re-think’ of the ways in which our business activities are organised, how stakeholders are engaged and even how resources are viewed to align profit and societal impact (Santos, Pache, & Birkholz, 2015; Wilson & Post, 2013). Hybrid organisational forms draw on at least two different sectoral paradigms, competitive market and social business, and are often associated with the emergence of novel institutional forms, new resource configurations and novel governance structures that challenge traditional conceptions of economic organizing (Doherty et al., 2014; Santos et al., 2015; Wilson & Post, 2013). Hybrid organisations are those that design their business models based on the alleviation of a social or environmental issue and operate by blending traditionally for-profit practices with traditionally non-profit practices (Haigh et al., 2015).

Interest in the hybrid social enterprise is growing. Few can ignore the implications of societal issues impacting our society (Wilson & Post, 2013). In addition, challenges including climate change, environmental degradation, and social justice have drawn critical attention (Knights & O’Leary, 2006; Senge, Hamilton, & Kania, 2015). There has been a proliferation of many different types of social enterprise providing services to a wide variety of community stakeholders, operating in a wide variety of sectors, including education (such as Khan Academy, which is a non-profit educational organization created in 2006 to provide a free, world-class education for anyone, anywhere - <https://www.khanacademy.org/>), microfinance (such as the Grameen Bank, which develops commercially viable models of providing loans to the very poor - <http://www.grameenfoundation.org/>), and healthcare (such as, Unite for sight that operates eyeclinics worldwide in areas of poverty - <http://www.uniteforsight.org>) Each of these hybrid social enterprises have developed a combined business model that is effective in both financial and societal value that enables them to grow and fulfil their mission (Haigh et al., 2015; Santos et al., 2015).

However, although hybrid social enterprises bear clear promises, they are also fragile organisations that are continuously walking a fine line between achieving their social mission and

living up to the discipline of the market (Santos et al., 2015). The very structure of the enterprise can limit the acquisition and mobilisation of financial and other resources (Doherty et al., 2014). As such, these forms of enterprise need to consider their relative prioritisation between the two interface conditions of social/environmental missions vs for-profit/non-profit focus (Holt & Littlewood, 2015). In addition, the balance between social mission focus and profit making may vary across different hybrid forms, in part due to the institutional context and the driving forces behind the business model created. Therefore, reflecting the heterogeneity of legal forms, missions, and the diverse contexts in which these differing business models operate (Holt & Littlewood, 2015). Research has highlighted the importance of the types of organisations involved, the nature of their governance and structure, and the specific legislative geo-political context within which they operate (Doherty et al., 2014; Holt & Littlewood, 2015; Santos et al., 2015). Further research is needed to expound further the critical factors, and their interdependencies that can lead to success or failure of this forms of organisation.

### **THOUGHTS TO PONDER**

In New Zealand, Māori development is often separated into social, cultural and economic silos. This perspective sits in contrast to the way that Māori think about the world and their relationship to it. Māori think more holistically and contextually about themselves and the world around them. Social transformation is instigated through innovative and complex systems that cut across tribal, enterprise, government, social, and environmental boundaries. Therefore, what is needed is an approach to Māori development and achievement that ‘makes sense’ to Māori prompting broader meaning and interpretation of the goals of Māori development, and how to achieve them. To do so, we need socio-economic models and frameworks that are capable of responding to the distinctive aspirational expectations of Māori communities and organisations. We suggest (albeit tentatively at this stage) that using the theoretical lens offered by the literature grounding hybrid social enterprises, we can situate Māori tribal forms of organisation, with their own theories, models and mechanisms of practice more holistically.

Broader questions arise in relation to whether there are there new ways of organising social and economic processes that will meet the needs of our Māori communities, and our wider society?

What role do Māori tribal enterprises have in developing business models that meet a need in the Māori community? What are the characteristics of collective governance models, that successfully manage the trade-offs between economic and social objectives? What are the critical management issues and tensions in doing so? Further research is needed that would endeavour to examine the different modes of economy and the subsequent approaches to organisational structure and governance, including strategies and practices, prevalent to each form of Māori tribal enterprise. More broadly, there is a need to examine more deeply the many distinctive forms of Māori organisation, the role they play, how they contribute to the local and collective economy and how they interact with each other. Our challenge is to acknowledge and understand the many forms of Māori organisation that are fortified by identity, connection to landscape and articulation of worldview.

## REFERENCES

- Altman, J. C. (2004). Economic development and Indigenous Australia: contestations over property, institutions and ideology. *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, 48(3), 513-534.
- Anderson, R. B., Dana, L. P., & Dana, T. E. (2006). Indigenous land rights, entrepreneurship, and economic development in Canada: "Opting-in" to the global economy. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 45-55. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.10.005>
- Arvidsson, A. (2009). The ethical economy: Towards a post-capitalist theory of value. *Capital & Class*, 33(1), 13-29. doi:10.1177/030981680909700102
- Arvidsson, A. (2011). Ethics and value in customer co-production. *Marketing Theory*, 11(3), 261-278. doi:10.1177/1470593111408176
- Banerjee, S. (2008). Necrocapitalism. *Organization Studies*, 29(12), 1541-1563.
- Bargh, M. (2011). The triumph of Māori entrepreneurs or diverse economies? *Aboriginal Policy Studies*, 1(3), 53-69.
- Bargh, M. (2012). Rethinking and re-shaping indigenous economies: Māori geothermal energy enterprises. *Journal of enterprising communities: People and places in the global economy*, 6(3), 271-283. doi:10.1108/17506201211258423
- Barr, T., & Reid, J. (2014). Centralized decentralization for tribal business development. *Journal of enterprising communities: People and places in the global economy*, 8(3), 217-232. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JEC-10-2012-005>
- Biggart, N. W., & Delbridge, R. (2004). Systems of exchange. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(1), 28-49.
- Bourdieu, P. (2005). *The Social Structures of the Economy*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Bruff, I., & Horn, L. (2012). Varieties of capitalism in crisis? *Competition & Change*, 16(3), 161-168. doi:10.1179/1024529412Z.00000000011
- Bunten, A. (2011). A call for attention to indigenous capitalisms. *New Proposals: Journal of Marxism and Interdisciplinary Inquiry*, 5(1), 60-71.
- Dana, L., & Hipango, W. (2011). Planting seeds of enterprise Vol. 5 Iss 3 pp. 199 - 211. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 5(3), 199-211. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17506201111156670>

- Doherty, B., Haugh, H., & Lyn, F. (2014). Social enterprises as hybrid organizations: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 16, 417-436.
- Driver, M. (2012). An interview with Michael Porter: Social entrepreneurship and the transformation of capitalism. *Academy Management Learning & Education*, 11(3), 421-431.
- Fiske, A. (1991). *Structures of Social Life: The Four Elementary Forms of Human Relations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Frederick, H., & Henry, E. (2004). Innovation and entrepreneurship amongst Pākehā and Māori in New Zealand. In C. Stiles & G. S. Galbraith (Eds.), *Ethnic Entrepreneurship: Structure and Process* (Vol. 4, pp. 115-140). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Gibson-Graham, J. K. (2006). *A Postcapitalist Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Granovetter, M. (1985). Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 3, 481-510.
- Haar, J., & Delaney, B. (2009). Entrepreneurship and Māori cultural values: Using 'Whanaungatanga' to understanding Māori business. *New Zealand Journal of Applied Business Research*, 7(9), 25-40.
- Haigh, N., Walker, J., Bacq, S., & Kickul, J. (2015). Hybrid Organizations: Origins, Strategies, Impacts, and Implications. *California Management Review*, 57(3), 5-12. doi:10.1525/cmr.2015.57.3.5
- Hindle, K., & Lansdowne, M. (2007). Brave spirits on new paths: towards a globally relevant paradigm of Indigenous entrepreneurship research. In A. Danks & R. B. Anderson (Eds.), *International Handbook of Research on Indigenous Entrepreneurship* (pp. 8-19). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishers.
- Holt, D., & Littlewood, D. (2015). Identifying, Mapping, and Monitoring the Impact of Hybrid Firms. *California Management Review*, 57(3), 107-125. doi:10.1525/cmr.2015.57.3.107
- Jackson, M. (1992). The treaty and the word: the colonisation of Māori philosophy. In G. Oddie & R. W. Perrett (Eds.), *Justice, Ethics and New Zealand Society* (pp. 1-10). Auckland, NZ: Oxford University Press.
- Jalata, A. (2013). Indigenous peoples in the capitalist world system: Researching, knowing, and promoting social justice. *Sociology Mind*, 3(2), 156-178.
- King, M. (2003). *The Penguin History of New Zealand*. Auckland: Penguin Publishing.
- Knights, D., & O'Leary. (2006). Leadership, ethics and responsibility to the other. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 67(2), 125-137.
- Kuokkanen, R. (2011). Indigenous economies, theories of subsistence, and women: Exploring the social economy model for Indigenous governance. *American Indian Quarterly*, 35(2), 215-240.
- Lin, N. (2010). Capitalism in China: A centrally managed capitalism (CMC) and its future. *Management and Organization Review*, 7(1), 63-96.
- Marsden, M. (2003). *The woven universe: Selected readings of Rev. Māori Marsden*. . Otaki, NZ: The Estate of Rev. Māori Marsden.
- Mauss, M. (1970). *The gift: Forms and functions of exchange in archaic societies* (I. Cunnison, Trans.). London: Cohen & West Ltd.
- Nana, G., Khan, M., & Schulze, H. (2015). *Te Ohanga Māori 2013: Māori Economy Report 2013*. Retrieved from Wellington: <http://www.tpk.govt.nz/en/a-matou-mohiotanga/search?q=asset+base>
- Peredo, A., Anderson, R. B., Galbraith, G. 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.
- Petrie, H. (2002). *Colonisation and the Involution of the Māori Economy*. Paper presented at the XIII World Conference of Economic History, Buenos Aires.
- Petrie, H. (2006). *Chiefs of industry: Māori tribal enterprise in early colonial New Zealand*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

- Petrie, H. (2007). *Tribal capitalism: Oxymoron or effeicient mode of production?* Paper presented at the Asia-Pacific Economic and Business History Conference, Sydney, Australia.
- Ruwhiu, D., & Cone, M. (2013). Pragmatic leadership: A return to wisdom. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 19(1), 25-43.
- Salmond, A. (1991). *Two worlds, first meetings between Māori and Europeans 1642-1772*. Auckland: Viking Press, Penguin NZ.
- Santos, F., Pache, A., & Birkholz, C. (2015). Making Hybrids Work: Aligning Business Models and Organizational Design for Social Enterprises. *California Management Review*, 57(3), 36-58. doi:10.1525/cmr.2015.57.3.36
- Senge, P., Hamilton, H., & Kania, J. (2015). The dawn of system leadership. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Winter, 26-33.
- Smith, L. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Zed Books.
- Spiller, C., Pio, E., Henare, M., & Erakovic, L. (2011). Wise Up: Creating organizational wisdom through an ethic of kaitiakitanga. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 104, 223–235.
- Spiller, C., & Stockdale, M. (2013). Managing and leading from a Māori perspective: Bringing new life and energy to organisations. In J. Neal (Ed.), *Handbook of faith and spirituality in the workplace: Emerging research and practice* (pp. 149-173). New York: Springer.
- Tapsell, P., & Woods, C. (2008). Potikitanga: Indigenous Entrepreneurship in a Māori Context. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 2(3), 192-203.
- Waikato-Tainui College for Research and Development. (2014). Waikato-Tainui College for Research and Development. Retrieved from [www.waikatotainui.ac.nz](http://www.waikatotainui.ac.nz)
- Waikato Raupatu River Trust. (2014). Waikato Raupatu River Trust. Retrieved from <http://www.wrrt.co.nz/#sthash.UfIDTG8S.dpbs>
- Wilson, F., & Post, J. (2013). Business models for people, planet (& profits): exploring the phenomena of social business, a market-based approach to social value creation. *Small Business Economics*, 40(3), 715-737. doi:10.1007/s11187-011-9401-0

**Table 1 – Main categories of Māori organisation**

<i>Tribal Bodies</i> (mandated in some form)	Receive, amongst other assets, Fisheries and Treaty Settlement assets. They may have a range of central and local government contracts, including providing social, educational and health services. They tend to have a strong bias for politics.
<i>Māori Collective Businesses</i>	Land Incorporations and other types of collectively owned Trusts. Many are aligned to the business environment and highly involved in exports. Most have been in self governance and management roles for many years and have cemented long term business relationships.
<i>Pan or Localised Māori Services</i>	These are organisations such as Kohanga Reo, Wananga, Health and Social Providers. The majority have high levels of government contracts.
<i>Private Enterprise</i>	These entrepreneurs and small to medium businesses (SMEs) are more akin to standard private companies.

Source: Te Puni Kōkiri (<http://www.tpk.govt.nz>)

**Table 2 – Māori values**

<b>Value</b>	<b>Meaning and underlying principle</b>	<b>Description</b>
Manakitanga	Relationship with people <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mana – power, value &amp; respect</li> </ul>	This refers to the quality of caring, kindness, hospitality and showing respect for others. It reflects an expected standard of behavior, an ideal that one should aspire to.
Whanaungatanga	Relationship amongst people <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whanau – familial relations</li> </ul>	This refers to the collective interdependence between and among humankind, reflecting social relationality between all people.
Wairuatanga	Relationship with the gods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wairua – the spirit</li> </ul>	This refers to respecting the spiritual relationship to the ‘gods’ and the cosmos. Action must not damage the wairua/spirit of anything in the cosmos.
Kaitiakitanga	Relationship with the natural environment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tiaki – to guard</li> <li>• Kaitiaki – a person, group or being that acts as a carer, guardian, protector.</li> </ul>	This refers to acknowledgement that humans are guardians of the environment. Caring for and protecting the natural environment, because we are intertwined.