

How does enterprise assistance support Māori entrepreneurs? An identity approach

LORRAINE WARREN, JASON MIKA AND FARAH PALMER

Abstract

Indigenous entrepreneurs represent a growing segment of the business community in many countries, but face sometimes stark challenges in starting and running enterprises. The success of indigenous entrepreneurs matters because they draw upon their indigeneity as sources of inspiration and innovation, contribute to the collective wellbeing of indigenous peoples, and some represent world class exemplars of sustainable ways of doing business. While enterprise assistance for entrepreneurs is widely accepted as a worthwhile use of public funds few guidelines exist to help policy makers and providers understand the needs of indigenous entrepreneurs and how best to respond. In this paper, we use the theoretical lens of entrepreneurial identity to provide insight into this challenging context. Taking an identity perspective may enable us to tease out how identifying as a Māori entrepreneur can enable and also hinder change in this community context. In doing so we lay foundations for future empirical work.

Keywords: Māori, indigenous, enterprise assistance, entrepreneurial identity

Received 1 October 2017. Accepted 25 November 2017

INTRODUCTION

This paper reports the development of an identity approach to support research and thus provide insight into how Māori entrepreneurs might best be served by enterprise assistance in Aotearoa New Zealand. Indigenous entrepreneurs represent a growing segment of the business community in many countries but face sometimes stark challenges in starting and running enterprises. The success of indigenous entrepreneurs matters because they draw upon their indigeneity as sources of inspiration and innovation, contribute to the collective wellbeing of indigenous peoples, and some represent world class exemplars of sustainable ways of doing business (see e.g., Mika, 2016). While enterprise assistance for entrepreneurs is widely accepted as a worthwhile use of public funds (Reihana, Sisley, & Modlik, 2007) few guidelines exist to help policy makers and providers understand the needs of indigenous entrepreneurs and how best to respond. In this paper, we use the theoretical lens of identity to provide insight into this challenging context.

We argue for identity as a potentially useful explanatory concept for our study because it provides a lens into how context shapes entrepreneurship, an important focus for entrepreneurship scholars in recent years (Welter, 2011). The Aotearoa New Zealand context is different, culturally, socially and economically, through its bicultural population (indigenous Māori and European settlers) and its geographical isolation. As well as the distinctive nature of Māori culture in regard to entrepreneurship, several studies have pointed to the existence of the ‘Tall Poppy’ syndrome (TPS) in Aotearoa

School of Management, Massey University, Palmerston North, Manawatu, New Zealand

Corresponding author: L.Warren@massey.ac.nz

New Zealand, a phenomenon of Australian origin referring to conspicuously successful people being subject to the enactment of envy, jealousy and hostility (Mouly & Sankaran, 2002). Kirkwood (2007) examines this phenomenon in relation to entrepreneurs in Aotearoa, New Zealand, concluding that the notion is pervasive and can damage entrepreneurs who seek a high profile in getting off the ground. Research in this area is still sparse, for both New Zealand and entrepreneurship, particularly Māori entrepreneurship. The notion that identity for Māori entrepreneurs is important is not new; the contribution of this paper is in unpacking the concept more fully than has previously been reported in the literature. Developing a deeper insight into an identity perspective may enable us to tease out how being identified as a Māori entrepreneur can enable and also hinder change in this context, through the interplay of entrepreneurial identity with the evolving community dynamic. In this paper we bring together the literature on entrepreneurial identity in Aotearoa, New Zealand, and indigenous entrepreneurship to better understand how Māori entrepreneurs might best be targeted by assistance programmes, given that present uptake is low (Mika, 2015). In doing so, we extend the use of the identity concept to the contextual aspects surrounding enterprise assistance to Māori entrepreneurs.

MĀORI ENTREPRENEURS: MULTIPLE DISCOURSES

In this section, we consider the phenomena at the heart of this paper: entrepreneurial identity, Māori entrepreneurship and TPS.

Entrepreneurial identity

There is increasing recognition of entrepreneurship as a process within a social and cultural context in the entrepreneurship literature (Welter, 2011). Entrepreneurs must engage in a set of interactions concerning what they do and how they present their activity as part of the social context which they may actually be trying to change. Behaviours are enacted and of course perceived by individuals, in accordance with the wider cultural context. To be well received and therefore successful, they must carry out what it means 'to be an entrepreneur' in the eyes of society. They need to go beyond realising opportunity and creating economic and social value; they must build legitimacy for themselves and their emerging venture in the eyes of the public (Lounsbury & Glynn, 2001). Identity offers a useful theoretical lens for this study, as it captures both perceptions and practices; what entrepreneurs do and how they are seen in society (Alvesson, Lee Ashcraft, & Thomas, 2008; Lewis, 2015). Identity offers a means of understanding the roles that people present and how those roles are received (Nicolson & Anderson 2005) and further, how they rationalise the need to be different (by creating novel value) with a sense of belonging (Shepherd & Haynie, 2009). An entrepreneurial identity can be an asset for challenging the rules and the status quo when creating something new (Brenkert, 2009; Anderson & Warren, 2011; Bureau & Zander, 2014), but this is not universal (Hytti, 2005; Warren & Smith, 2015).

It is appropriate to draw on the literature that views identity as a fluid, social construct, rather than an unproblematic given. Leitch and Harrison (2016) highlight a European tradition of interpretivist studies of entrepreneurial identity taking a social constructivist perspective (Cohen & Musson, 2000; Down & Reveley, 2004; Berglund, 2006; Down, 2006; Mills & Pawson, 2006; Jones, Latham, & Betta, 2008; Reveley & Down, 2009; Watson, 2009; Boje & Smith, 2010; Kjellander, Nordqvist, & Welter, 2012; Williams Middleton, 2013; Lewis, 2015). In this tradition, Down (2006) proposes identity is a mutable achievement in time and space, built through relationships with others, and also in relation to the surrounding social context (Leitch & Harrison, 2016). Identities can serve as powerful drivers for entrepreneurial behaviours around legitimacy, reputation and ethical conduct. Correspondingly,

Watson (2009) talks about the need for entrepreneurs to carry out 'identity work' to legitimise what they do. Williams Middleton (2013) notes that studies explain how entrepreneurs narratively construct and negotiate their identities (e.g., Warren, 2004; Mills & Pawson, 2006; Down & Warren, 2008; Jones, Latham, & Betta, 2008). Here entrepreneurs try to present their story as legitimate to local stakeholders to justify access to resources and opportunities (Lounsbury & Glynn, 2001; Navis & Glynn, 2011). How they do this may require the careful negotiation of conflicting discourses: the need for the entrepreneur to be different and stand out from the crowd in the creation of novelty, and perhaps becoming wealthy as a result, which may be received differently in different cultures.

There is an established sociological tradition (Goffman, 1978) of treating identity as a practice – the presentation of self – in symbolic interactionism (Anderson, 2005). In entrepreneurship the interactive view has surfaced as identity work which is shaped by the social environment (Watson, 2009; Ybema, Keenoy, Oswick, Beverungen, Ellis, & Sabelis, 2009; Brown, 2015). In doing identity work, individuals draw on available socially constructed discursive resources and then weave these discourses into their narrative of identity (Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2003; Alvesson, Lee Ashcraft, & Thomas, 2008; Hamilton, 2014) in line with social attractiveness and dominant interests (Wieland, 2010). Warren and Smith (2015) note how public perceptions of entrepreneurs vary over time, highlighting problems for those who fail to navigate socially contextualised rules. Thus, there is tension between being different, but not too different.

In Westernized economies (including Aotearoa New Zealand), the 'enterprise discourse' has become powerful in the media and through government policy, encouraging people to become entrepreneurs. De Clercq and Voronov (2009: 399) explain, 'discourses of entrepreneurship and enterprise may have taken a special position in capitalist societies by providing a normative prescription of the roles people are to play and how they should interrelate with important institutions in society and one another'. The enterprise discourse promoted by government policy makers identifies entrepreneurs as drivers of economic growth, even aligned to restructuring public services (Du Gay, 2004), or regional development (McKeever, Anderson, & Jack, 2014). The enterprise discourse thus offers stereotypical scripts of 'the entrepreneur' (Down & Warren, 2008; Perren & Dannreuther, 2013), aligned to a plethora of initiatives and schemes that promote competition and high profile achievement.

As Gill and Larson (2014) show, the enterprise discourse is not monolithic, it is shaped by local discourses of home, self and place. Local networks have been shown to legitimise entrepreneurial activity, and the local environment can dramatically impact the ability of entrepreneurs to thrive in that locality, as well as the wider national context (Johannisson & Nilsson, 1989; Hustedde, 2007; Fortunato, 2014; Gill & Larson, 2014). If there is a 'moral space' (Anderson & Smith, 2007) created for entrepreneurship in such discourses, entrepreneurs must understand that as they strive for a legitimate entrepreneurial identity. Warren (2004) showed that an entrepreneurial identity can be negative when constructions of entrepreneurship carry connotations of greed or selfishness – 'the unfriendly face of capitalism'. Otherwise, negative responses may occur, provoking resistance to entrepreneurial action (Doern & Goss, 2012). An identity lens enables us to focus on the subtleties of such interactions. We strive to be able to account for how acceptance of Māori entrepreneurship is granted or withheld and how identity work from Māori entrepreneurs influences that approval during the quest for legitimacy.

Māori entrepreneurship

Studies of Māori entrepreneurship are informed by studies of indigenous entrepreneurship. Indigeneity refers to the quality of being indigenous; with the New Zealand variant of indigeneity being 'Māoriness' or Māoritanga, that is, Māori cultural identity (Rangihau, 1992; NZIER, 2003). Peredo et al. (2004) and Hindle and Moroz (2010) argue for the notion of indigenous entrepreneurship as a separate field, where there is a need to reconcile history and understand indigenous values. In this

perspective, entrepreneurship has often been aligned with the history of an indigenous people which has then been disrupted through colonisation, often by Europeans (Ivory, 2002). As a result, indigenous peoples are typically cast within Western analysis as marginalised subcultures, underdeveloped, impoverished, vanquished, but who may have legitimate emancipatory claims hinged to treaty rights, hard-won court-rulings, legislation and policy provisions, antiestablishmentarianism and outright human suffering (Havemann, 1999; Mikaere, 2000; Howard, 2003; Chakrabarti, 2006; Smith, 1999). Yet, burgeoning indigenous economies suggest indigenous entrepreneurs have much to offer as they seek to create value not just in 'traditional' sectors such as crafts and food, but also in, for example, emerging digital spaces (Walker, Mika, & Palmer, 2017). Mika (2015) summarises three broad views of indigenous entrepreneurship: as poverty alleviation; as fulfilling aspirations for economic independence on indigenous terms; and finally, as an emancipatory endeavour for populations disenfranchised from the states within which they live.

In Aotearoa, New Zealand, while estimated to be worth around US\$42 billion in 2013 (Nana, Khan, & Schulze, 2015), the scale of the Māori economy is insufficient on its own to support a Māori population of around 712,000 (Statistics New Zealand, 2016). Instead, Māori aspirations for economic self-sufficiency are to be met by Māori participation in the Māori, national and global economies (Parker, 2000; Allen, 2011; Durie, 2011; Nana, 2013). There is an economic imperative then to support successful Māori entrepreneurship, yet this must be achieved via policies that recognise past disenfranchisement, inequities, disagreements and false starts. Overall, there is some consensus in the literature that entrepreneurship has always been part of Māori society (Pihama & Penhira, 2005), but how this should be expressed, supported and developed post disruption and in an increasingly urbanised population is subject to debate. Anderson and Giberson (2003) point out the strong tie between process and place for indigenous entrepreneurship. Yet, Mason and Brown (2014) caution policy makers against replicating ecosystems from elsewhere without sufficient local adaptation to the local context.

Who is a Māori entrepreneur and what is Māori entrepreneurship are premised upon a Māori world view. A Māori world view draws upon Māori knowledge, language, culture, methods and self-identification and socialisation as Māori within *te ao Māori* (Māori society). A Māori entrepreneur is thus a person who identifies as Māori and engages in entrepreneurial activity according to a Māori world view, but integrates within this, elements of a Western world view. Māori entrepreneurship is not contingent upon a Western world view, but the prevailing institutions of democracy and capitalism which derive from Western heritage condition Māori entrepreneurship (Mika, 2015). Within this context, the central concern of Māori entrepreneurship is not merely creating economic value through new combinations of products, processes, and markets, but doing so in a way that accords with Māori cultural imperatives. While the degree to which Māori knowledge, values, language and customs are applied may vary, these elements of Māoriness (values, language and customs), which are acquired by socialisation within *whānau* (family), *hapū* (sub-tribe), *iwi* (tribe) and Māori communities, are associated with Māori entrepreneurship. (King, 1975; Black, Bean, Collings, & Nuku, 1992, 2012; Ministry of Justice, 2001; Mead, 2003; Royal, 2005; Gillies, Tinirau, & Mako, 2007). Thus, there is a clash of paradigms between the preoccupation with value creation in Western entrepreneurship and an emphasis on holism, relational well-being, and interconnectedness by Māori seeking to create social, spiritual and cultural value (Pio, Tipuna, Rasheed, & Parker, 2013).

The prioritisation of cultural, social and spiritual values by Māori enterprises is evident in Māori management theory and practice (Warriner, 1999; Puketapu, 2000; Harmsworth & Tahi, 2008; Harmsworth, 2009; Yates, 2009; Spiller, 2010; Knox, Agnew, & McCarthy, 2014; Mika & O'Sullivan, 2014). For instance, Morgan and Mulligan (2006), in examining the characteristics of 30 Māori enterprises, find a common desire to be both culturally and commercially successful, with cultural values the higher priority. Harmsworth (2005) shows that Māori values are instrumental in defining what is a Māori organisation, setting cultural and ethical standards, enterprise direction, and market differentiation.

TPS

Kirkwood (2007) argues that TPS is presumed to have emerged from New Zealand's geographic isolation (Packer, 2014) and has been argued as a mix of the social characteristics of its indigenous Māori population (Haar & Delaney, 2009) and early British immigrants (Packer, 2014), resulting in a discourse pertaining to an egalitarian culture being desirable (Trevor-Roberts, Ashkanasy, & Kennedy, 2003; Peeters, 2004; Hugo, 2006). TPS is often considered to be culturally specific to Australasia, but it is also noted elsewhere, such as the Nordic countries where the 'Law of Jante' (janteloven) discourages people from promoting their achievements (Scott, 2016), or showing pride (Bromgard, Trafimow, & Linn, 2014).

In business, perceptions of success are related to a number of factors such as venture creation, business growth and job creation, and also the accumulation of personal wealth and social stature for business leaders. The likelihood of TPS is linked to wider societal perceptions of what it means to act legitimately in business. There is evidence that managers behave differently in accordance with societal expectations, which differ in societies that aspire to an egalitarian culture, such as Aotearoa New Zealand and the United States, for example, where Americans generally perceive the upward and downward mobility of individuals with respect to wealth to be more legitimate than Australians (Mandisodza, Jost, & Unzueta, 2006).

Within the business context, entrepreneurs are expected to take a high profile role in leading the development of new products, new services, new ventures, new markets, as well as instigating new behaviours, around new technologies for example. In Aotearoa, New Zealand, if TPS is a cultural norm, then this might well impact perceptions of entrepreneurial legitimacy, and perhaps even the notion of being an entrepreneur at all. Kirkwood's exploratory qualitative study (2007) found that over half of the 40 participating entrepreneurs in New Zealand had experienced TPS in their role as business owners; recognising this, they had employed strategies for managing its impact. These strategies included 'staying under the radar', not telling people they owned a business and not 'flaunting' their wealth. In particular, the key way that these business owners managed the effects of TPS was in relation to their assets – not buying expensive vehicles, houses or taking expensive holidays. These results parallel Maritz and Beaver (2011), who found that New Zealand entrepreneurs chose 'lifestyle' pathways that enabled the cloaking of wealth and thus 'hiding' from potential TPS conflict.

Kirkwood (2007) suggests that the effects of TPS may have three significant implications for entrepreneurship in Aotearoa, New Zealand. First, TPS may discourage entrepreneurs from starting a business; second, it may inhibit 'failed' entrepreneurs to establish another business because of the public reaction to their 'fall'. Finally, entrepreneurs may deliberately limit business growth because they do not want to attract additional attention (Kirkwood, 2007). This is worrying for Aotearoa New Zealand, as not only does it need entrepreneurs to grow the economy, it is also allocating resources to support entrepreneurship: this is a tension of legitimisation that needs to be addressed.

ENTERPRISE ASSISTANCE AND MĀORI ENTREPRENEURIAL IDENTITY

Aotearoa New Zealand is eminently concerned with business growth, and sees entrepreneurship, innovation, science, education and infrastructure all having a role in bringing this about (Joyce & Parata, 2014; Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment, 2014; New Zealand Government, 2015). Mika (2015) notes that traditional enterprise assistance policies favour direct intervention addressing specific needs (e.g., advice, markets, finance, technology) within given industries and firms, provided there is evidence of market failure and the benefits of acting outweigh the costs of not doing so; though the results of direct intervention have been mixed (Greene & Storey, 2010; Mason & Brown, 2014). More recently, policy makers have been drawn to more holistic forms of enterprise

assistance, recognising that the complex and dynamic nature of firms and the social and economic environments in which they operate, require more subtle, systemic and contingent policy interventions (Acs & Szerb, 2006; Audretsch, Grilo, & Thurik, 2007; OECD, 2010; Smallbone, 2010; Mason & Brown, 2014).

Māori enterprise development relates to the growth of Māori enterprises within the Māori economy, how that growth is classified and activated, and the business needs, which give rise to help-seeking by Māori entrepreneurs (Mika, 2015). Māori business needs are generally inferred from theory, industry and policy and can be identified as macro and micro (Zapalska, Perry, & Dabb, 2003; Reihana, Sisley, & Modlik, 2007; Battisti & Gillies, 2009). At the macro-level (i.e., business environment), Māori business needs include market access, economic policy, taxation, research and development, property rights, and compliance costs. At the firm-level, Māori business needs include finance, management, marketing, networking, training, technology, and advice.

Mika (2015) finds that publicly funded enterprise assistance performs three roles in respect of Māori entrepreneurship. The first role of enterprise assistance is to satisfy the firm-level business needs of Māori entrepreneurs as clients. These needs are not dissimilar to the business needs of non-indigenous enterprises, with Māori entrepreneurs making use of typical forms of enterprise assistance (i.e., information, advice, facilitation, training, grants and finance) (Storey, 1994). The second role of enterprise assistance is to build the entrepreneurial capabilities of Māori entrepreneurs. Entrepreneurial capabilities are determinants of entrepreneurship that manifest within five forms of capital: social capital, human capital, cultural capital, financial capital, and spiritual capital (Bourdieu, 1986; Firkin, 2001; Light & Gold, 2000; Verter, 2003; Ahmad & Hoffman, 2007; Chu, 2007). Mika (2015) finds, however, that these capabilities are modified by Māori indigeneity, redefining entrepreneurial capabilities, legitimising Māori spirituality, knowledge, institutions, language, values and methods in entrepreneurship. If, as Mika (2015) suggests, cultural authenticity is a key component of the success of such initiatives, then how Māori create an authentic entrepreneurial identity must be part of the picture. This must recognise the imperatives of Māori cultural identity, the enterprise discourse, and further TPS, which seems to be a factor for both Māori and settler cultures in Aotearoa, New Zealand (albeit that TPS might be perceived and expressed differently in the two communities).

While the identity of Māori as *iwi* and *hapū* is well established, there is less recognition of the subtle nuances around the construction of a legitimate entrepreneurial identity. The notion of the 'maui entrepreneur' (Tapsell & Woods, 2008; Keelan, 2010) has found some purchase in attempting to reconcile Māori history and values for entrepreneurs (Dell & Houkamau, 2016). Within Māori mythology, Māui is a charismatic, mischievous mythical figure, who appears in oral traditions throughout the Pacific (O'Sullivan & Dana, 2008; Keelan, 2009). It has been suggested that Māori entrepreneurs have embraced Māui as an inspirational metaphor for innovative pursuits (Keelan, 2009; Hanita, Te Kanawa, & Rihia, 2016; Mika, 2016). Māui achieved many feats, one of which was an adventure to seek the source of fire. Thus, the concept of *ahi kimi* or fire-seeking takes its meaning from a traditional understanding of the importance of interacting with the external world to innovate, through environmental scanning and the recognition and development of opportunities in the wider world (Dell & Houkamau, 2016), thus affording direct connection with the mainstream entrepreneurship literature, while embracing and advocating Māori entrepreneurial freedom and empowerment.

Thus, Dell and Houkamau (2016) contrast fire-seeking with the metaphor of *ahi kā* or fire keeping, an inward focused function, describing the actions and people who keep the home fires burning (Mead, 2003). Dell and Houkamau (2016: 9) state that fire keeping, recognises the importance of maintaining 'cultural diversity, knowledge systems, customs, and identities that belong to the Māori people'. Fire keeping enhances what it means to be a Māori entrepreneur and do business in a Māori way, creating value directly benefitting indigenous communities. In contrast, the metaphoric notion of keeping the fire alight refers to the nurturing, preservation, and protection of the cultural and spiritual aspects that constitute the heart and soul of indigenous communities.

These authors connect the concept to a range of initiatives in Aotearoa, New Zealand, including for example, Hinepreneur, a collaboration by Māori Woman's Development Incorporated (MWDI), the Global Indigenous Woman's Leadership and Development programme, and RP Enterprises, that builds, through a cultural lens, the capacity of Māori woman to create personal and whānau wealth (MWDI, 2015). In addition, Māori specific entrepreneurial programmes and competitions such as Dig My Idea (ATEED, 2015), Māori hi-tech awards (New Zealand Hi-Tech Trust, 2015), and Whiua ki te Ao (Velocity & Centre for Innovation and Entrepreneurship, 2017), focus on encouraging Māori to develop ideas with global potential. Moreover, Māori-specific innovation and entrepreneurship roles within public and private institutions are emancipating and empowering Māori entrepreneurs to participate in their external environments (Mika, 2015). Some of these include, the Māori economy team within Callaghan Innovation ('Callaghan looks to boost Māori economy', 2013), the Māori business team within New Zealand Trade and Enterprise (NZTE, 2015), and the Māori economic unit within the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE, 2017), among others. While good progress is being made, overall the uptake of such programmes remains low (Mika, 2015).

We find entrepreneurial identity has fundamental implications for Māori entrepreneurship as well as policies intended to assist Māori entrepreneurs. Identifying as Māori and as a Māori entrepreneur are choices Māori are entitled to make as tangata whenua, the indigenous people of Aotearoa. In identifying as a Māori entrepreneur, one is opting into the Māori economy wherein their commercial activity is counted as contributing to this economy. The act of self-identifying as a Māori entrepreneur also implies an affinity with a Māori world view, which shapes entrepreneurial identity and practice. Some in this category will identify instead as Māori in business, which separates ethnic affiliation as Māori from the nature of the entrepreneurial activity they undertake (Mika, Bensemann, & Fahey, 2016). Not all Māori who are 'entrepreneurial', however, will identify as a Māori entrepreneur, exercising as is their right to self-select their identity. They are in effect opting out of the Māori economy. This group may be sizeable, but few studies have examined this segment, that is, those who opt out of identifying as Māori entrepreneurs, and indeed, as Māori enterprises.

Māori entrepreneurial identity gives policy makers some sense of the scope, scale, and modes of enterprise assistance that are likely to work for Māori entrepreneurs and the basis for doing so. When asked what works, Māori entrepreneurs consistently identify three expectations of providers: cultural competency (knowledge of the Māori language, culture and history and the ability to use it); relational competency (relationships with Māori entrepreneurs that are *mana*-enhancing for both provider and entrepreneur); and technical competency (the capacity to deliver promised technical assistance) (Mika, 2015). Three steps providers can take to satisfy these expectations are: first, identify who among their clients are Māori entrepreneurs by asking clients to self-identify as Māori; second, ask the client (i.e., the Māori entrepreneur) what their business needs are and their preferred way of working with the provider; and third, develop the cultural capacity to interact with Māori entrepreneurs in ways that are authentic, appropriate and effective.

CONCLUSION

Māori entrepreneurship will be key in future to supporting the needs of the Māori community and realising the full, unique, potential of the Māori community in an increasingly global and digital world. Māori entrepreneurs must behave in ways that are perceived as legitimate to the Māori community and also to Aotearoa, New Zealand, society overall. For an entrepreneur to practice in a legitimate manner in Aotearoa, New Zealand, they must take account of both Māori cultural values and wider societal values in the construction of their entrepreneurial identity. In taking a fluid perspective on identity, we take account of Bargh's (2012) caution against oversimplification of complex economic and social

contexts through legitimising any one identity construct. Foley (2006), for example in Australia, suggests that the focus on community-based enterprise can render invisible urban entrepreneurs.

Thus, in this paper we have demonstrated the different discourses that shape the construction of a Māori entrepreneurial identity: the challenges of indigeneity; Māori cultural values and aspirations; the wider enterprise discourse of 'Western' economies; and the subtle and pervasive notion of TPS. In taking a social constructionist approach to Māori entrepreneurial identity, we recognise the fluidity of the construct (Leitch & Harrison, 2016) in a country context that is shaped by intertwined discourses around what it means to be an entrepreneur, as Māori and as a New Zealander, of a particular context and place (Gill & Larson, 2014). Our contribution is in showing how better understanding of entrepreneurial identity can enable provision of focussed aid for Māori entrepreneurs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We acknowledge support from Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga – New Zealand's Māori Centre of Research Excellence (NPM) for the project Entrepreneurial ecosystem efficacy for Indigenous entrepreneurs.

References

- Acs, Z. J., & Szerb, L. (2006). Entrepreneurship, economic growth and public policy. *Small Business Economics*, 28, 109–122. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-006-9012-3>.
- Ahmad, N., & Hoffman, A. (2007). *A framework for addressing and measuring entrepreneurship*. Paris, France: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Allen, J. (2011). *Te hoko ki tāwahi a ngāi Māori: Māori export competitiveness*. Wellington, New Zealand: Te Puni Kōkiri and New Zealand Institute of Economic Research.
- Alvesson, M., Lee Ashcraft, K., & Thomas, R. (2008). Identity matters: Reflections on the construction of identity scholarship in organization studies. *Organization*, 15(1), 5–28.
- Anderson, A. R., & Smith, R. (2007). The moral space in entrepreneurship: An exploration of ethical imperatives and the moral legitimacy of being enterprising. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 19(6), 479–497.
- Anderson, A. R., & Warren, L. (2011). The entrepreneur as hero and jester: Enacting the entrepreneurial discourse. *International Small Business Journal*, 29(6), 589–609.
- Anderson, R. B., & Giberson, R. J. (2003). Aboriginal entrepreneurship and economic development in Canada: Thoughts on current theory and practice. In C. H. Stiles & C. S. Galbraith (Eds.), *Ethnic entrepreneurship: Structure and process* (pp. 141–167). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Audretsch, D. B., Grilo, I., & Thurik, A. R. (Eds.) (2007). *Handbook of research on entrepreneurship policy*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- ATEED (2015). Retrieved December 13, 2017, from <https://idealog.co.nz/tech/2017/05/check-out-digmyidea-maori-innovation-challenge-finalists>.
- Bargh, M. (2012). The triumph of Māori entrepreneurs or diverse economies? *Aboriginal Policy Studies*, 1(3), 53–69.
- Battisti, M., & Gillies, A. (2009). *Maori businesses: Current issues and business assistance needs*. Wellington, New Zealand: Poutama Trust, New Zealand Centre for SME Research and Te Au Rangahau (Māori Business Research Centre).
- Black, T., Bean, D., Collings, W., & Nuku, W. (Eds.) (2012). *Conversations on mātauranga Māori*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Qualifications Authority.
- Berglund, K. (2006). Discursive diversity in fashioning entrepreneurial identity. In D. Hjorth, & C. Steyaert (Eds.), *Entrepreneurship as social change – A third movements in entrepreneurship book* (pp. 231–250). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Boje, D., & Smith, R. (2010). Re-storying and visualizing the changing entrepreneurial identities of Bill Gates and Richard Branson. *Culture and Organization*, 16(4), 307–331.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). New York, NY: Greenwood Press.
- Brenkert, G. G. (2009). Innovation, rule breaking and the ethics of entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(5), 448–464.

- Bromgard, G., Trafimow, D., & Linn, C. (2014). Janteloven and the expression of pride in Norway and the United States. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 154*(5), 375–378.
- Brown, A. D. (2015). Identity and identity work in organisations. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 17*(1), 20–40.
- Bureau, S., & Zander, I. (2014). Entrepreneurship as an art of subversion. *Scandinavian Journal of Management, 30*(1), 124–133.
- Chakrabarti, O. (2006). *Indigenous peoples, indigenous voices: Who are indigenous peoples?* New York, NY: United Nations Permanent forum on indigenous issues.
- Chu, E. (2007). Spiritual capitalism: The achievement of flow in entrepreneurial enterprises. *Journal of Human Values, 13*(1), 61–77. <https://doi.org/10.1177/097168580601300107>.
- Cohen, L., & Musson, G. (2000). Entrepreneurial identities: Reflections from two case studies. *Organization, 7*(1), 31–48.
- De Clercq, D., & Voronov, M. (2009). Toward a practice perspective of entrepreneurship entrepreneurial legitimacy as habitus. *International Small Business Journal, 27*(4), 395–419.
- Dell, K., & Houkamau, C. A. (2016). *Fire Keepers and fire seekers: A dual entrepreneurial strategy for developing indigenous economies in a globalized world*. Paper presented at the ANZAM Conference, 6–8 December 2016, QUT, Brisbane, Australia.
- Doern, R., & Goss, D. (2012). From barriers to barring: Why emotion matters for entrepreneurial development. *International Small Business Journal, 31*(5), 496–519.
- Down, S. (2006). *Narratives of enterprise: Crafting entrepreneurial self-identity in a small firm*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Down, S., & Reveley, J. (2004). Generational encounters and the social formation of entrepreneurial identity: ‘Young guns’ and ‘old farts’. *Organization, 11*(2), 233–250.
- Down, S., & Warren, L. (2008). Constructing narratives of enterprise: Clichés and entrepreneurial self-identity. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research, 14*(1), 4–23.
- Downing, S. (2005). The social construction of entrepreneurship: Narrative and dramatic processes in the coproduction of organizations and identities. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 29*(2), 185–204.
- Du Gay, P. (2004). Against ‘Enterprise’(but not against ‘enterprise’, for that would make no sense). *Organization, 11*(1), 37–57.
- Durie, M. (2011). *Ngā tini whetū: Navigating Māori futures*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.
- Firkin, P. (2001). *Entrepreneurial capital: A resource-based conceptualisation of the entrepreneurial process* (Working Paper No. 7, Labour Market Dynamics Research Programme). Auckland, New Zealand: Massey University.
- Foley, D. (2006). *Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs: Not all community organisations, not all in the outback* (Discussion paper no. 279/2006). Canberra, Australia: Australian National University Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research.
- Fortunato, M. (2014). Supporting rural entrepreneurship: A review of conceptual developments from research to practice. *Community Development, 45*(4), 387–408.
- Gill, R., & Larson, G. S. (2014). Making the ideal (local) entrepreneur: Place and the regional development of high-tech entrepreneurial identity. *Human Relations, 67*(5), 519–542.
- Gillies, A., Tinirau, R. S., & Mako, N. (2007). Whakawhanaungatanga – Extending the networking concept. *He Pukenga Kōrero: A Journal of Māori Studies, Raumati (Summer), 8*(2), 29–37.
- Goffman, E. (1978). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Greene, F. J., & Storey, D. J. (2010). Entrepreneurship and small business policy: Evaluating its role and purpose. In D. Coen, W. Grant, & G. Wilson (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of business and government*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- 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.
- Hamilton, E. (2014). Entrepreneurial narrative identity and gender: A double epistemological shift. *Journal of Small Business Management, 52*(4), 703–712.
- Hanita, J., Te Kanawa, R., & Rihia, J. (2016). *Māui rau: Adapting in a changing world*. Auckland, New Zealand: KPMG.
- Harmsworth, G. R. (2005). Report on incorporation of traditional values/tikanga into contemporary Maori business organisations and process. Landcare Research, prepared for Mana Taiao.

- Harmsworth, G. R. (2009). Sustainability and Māori business. In B. Frame, R. Gordon, & C. Mortimer (Eds.), *Hatched: The capacity for sustainable development* (pp. 95–108). Christchurch, New Zealand: Landcare Research (Manaaki Whenua).
- Harmsworth, G. R., & Tahi, M. (2008). *Indigenous branding: Examples from Aotearoa New Zealand*. Paper presented at the FIBEA – Fostering indigenous business & entrepreneurship in the Americas conference, 22–25 July 2008, Manaus, Brazil.
- Havemann, P. (Ed.) (1999). *Indigenous peoples' rights in Australia, Canada and New Zealand* (1st ed.), New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hindle, K., & Moroz, P. (2010). Indigenous entrepreneurship as a research field: Developing a definitional framework from the emerging canon. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 6(4), 357–385.
- Howard, B. R. (2003). *Indigenous peoples and the state: The struggle for native rights*. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press.
- Hugo, G. (2006). An Australian diaspora? *International Migration*, 44(1), 105–133.
- Hustedde, R. (2007). What's culture got to do with it? Strategies for strengthening an entrepreneurial culture. In N. Walzer (Ed.), *Entrepreneurship and local economic development* (pp. 39–58). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Hytti, U. (2005). New meanings for entrepreneurs: From risk-taking heroes to safe-seeking professionals. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 18(6), 594–611.
- Johannisson, B., & Nilsson, A. (1989). Community entrepreneurship – Networking for local development. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 1(1), 3–19.
- Jones, R., Latham, J., & Betta, M. (2008). Narrative construction of the social entrepreneurial identity. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*, 14(5), 330–345.
- Joyce, S., & Parata, H. (2014). Kiwi curiosity at heart of science engagement [Press release]. Retrieved December 13, 2017, from <https://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/kiwi-curiosity-heart-science-engagement>.
- Keelan, T. J. (2010). The Māuipreneur. *Te Kaharoa*, 3(1), 109–125.
- Keelan, T.J.E. (2009). MĀUI: ancestor hero, role model, entrepreneur and model of entrepreneurship (Doctoral dissertation, ResearchSpace@ Auckland).
- King, M. (Ed.) (1975). *Te ao hurihuri: The world moves on: Aspects of Māoritanga*. Wellington, New Zealand: Hicks Smith & Sons.
- Kirkwood, J. (2007). Tall Poppy syndrome: Implications for entrepreneurship in New Zealand. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 13(4), 366–382.
- Kjellander, B., Nordqvist, M., & Welter, F. (2012). Identity dynamics in the family business context: A novel('s) perspective. In A. Carsrud, & M. Brännback (Eds.), *Understanding Family Businesses* (pp. 39–53). New York, NY: Springer.
- Knox, P., Agnew, J. A., & McCarthy, L. (2014). *The geography of the world economy* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Leitch, C. M., & Harrison, R. T. (2016). Identity, identity formation and identity work in entrepreneurship: conceptual developments and empirical applications. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 28(3–4), 177–190.
- Lewis, K. V. (2015). Enacting entrepreneurship and leadership: A longitudinal exploration of gendered identity work. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 53(3), 662–682.
- Light, I. H., & Gold, S. J. (2000). *Ethnic economies*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Lounsbury, M., & Glynn, M. A. (2001). Cultural entrepreneurship: Stories, legitimacy, and the acquisition of resources. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(6–7), 545–564.
- Mandisodza, A. N., Jost, J. T., & Unzueta, M. M. (2006). “Tall Poppies” and “American Dreams” reactions to rich and poor in Australia and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 37(6), 659–668.
- Maritz, A., & Beaver, B. (2011). The New Zealand lifestyle entrepreneur. Human Capital: Regional Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research. Retrieved 27 September 2011, from http://www.swinburne.edu.au/lib/ir/onlineconferences/age2006/maritz_741.pdf.
- Mason, C., & Brown, R. (2014). *Entrepreneurial ecosystems and growth oriented entrepreneurship*. A background paper prepared for the OECD LEED and Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs Workshop, The Hague, the Netherlands, Retrieved 7 November 2013, from <https://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/Entrepreneurial-ecosystems.pdf>.

- MBIE (2017). Retrieved December 13, 2017, from <http://www.mbie.govt.nz/info-services/infrastructure-growth/maori-economic-development>.
- MWDI (2015). MWDI Hinepreneur. Retrieved December 13, 2017, from <http://www.mwdi.co.nz/news/mwdi-hinepreneur/>.
- McKeever, E., Anderson, A. R., & Jack, S. (2014). Entrepreneurship and mutuality: Social capital in processes and practices. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 26(5–6), 453–477.
- Mead, H. M. (2003). *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori values*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.
- Mika, J. P. (2015). *The role of publicly funded enterprise assistance in Māori entrepreneurship in Aotearoa New Zealand*. PhD thesis. Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Mika, J. P. (2016). What is Māori innovation: To snare the sun, and then some... Idealog. Retrieved December 13, 2017, from <https://www.callaghaninnovation.govt.nz/blog/what-m%C4%81ori-innovation-snare-sun-and-then-some>.
- Mika, J. P., Bensemam, J., & Fahey, N. (2016). What is a Māori business: A study in the identity of indigenous enterprise. In L. Bradley (Ed.), *Under new management: Innovating for sustainable and just futures* 30th ANZAM Conference, 5–7 December 2016, QUT. Brisbane, Australia: ANZAM.
- Mika, J. P., & O'Sullivan, J. G. (2014). A Māori approach to management: Contrasting traditional and modern Māori management practices in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 20(5), 648–670. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2014.48>.
- Mikaere, A. (2000). *Māori and self-determination in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Working Paper No. 5/2000. Hamilton, New Zealand: University of Waikato.
- Mills, C., & Pawson, K. (2006). Enterprising talk: A case of self construction. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 12(6), 328–344.
- Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment (2014). *A nation of curious minds: He whenua hihiri i te mahara: A national strategic plan for science in society*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment. Retrieved from <http://www.curiousminds.nz/assets/Uploads/science-in-society-plan-PDF.pdf>.
- Ministry of Justice (2001). *He hinatore ki te ao Māori: A glimpse into the Māori world*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Justice.
- Morgan, P., & Mulligan, W. (2006). *Hei Whakamarama i ngā āhuatanga o te tūrua pō: Investigating key Māori business characteristics for future measures*. Thinking paper. Wellington, New Zealand: Te Puni Kōkiri.
- Mouly, V. S., & Sankaran, J. K. (2002). The enactment of envy within organizations insights from a New Zealand academic department. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 38(1), 36–56.
- Nana, G. (2013). *Estimates of Māori economy exports*. Wellington, New Zealand: Te Puni Kōkiri and BERL.
- Nana, G., Khan, M., & Schulze, H. (2015). *Te ohanga Māori 2013: Māori economy report 2013*. Wellington, New Zealand: Te Puni Kōkiri.
- Navis, C., & Glynn, M. A. (2011). Legitimate distinctiveness and the entrepreneurial identity: Influence on investor judgments of new venture plausibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(3), 479–499.
- New Zealand Government (2015). The business growth agenda – Towards 2025. Retrieved December 13, 2017, from <http://www.mbie.govt.nz/info-services/business/business-growth-agenda/pdf-and-image-library/towards-2025/mb13078-1139-bga-report-00-intro-09sept-v9-fa-web.PDF>.
- New Zealand Hi-Tech Trust (2015). Retrieved December 13, 2017, from <http://www.hitech.org.nz/>.
- Nicolson, L., & Anderson, A. R. (2005). News and nuances of the entrepreneurial myth and metaphor: Linguistic games in entrepreneurial sense-making and sense-giving. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(2), 152–172.
- NZIER (2003). *Māori economic development: Te ohanga whanaketanga Māori*. Wellington, New Zealand: Te Puni Kōkiri.
- NZTE (2015). Retrieved December 13, 2012, from <https://www.nzte.govt.nz/about/media-releases/nzte-powers-up-m%C4%81ori-business-team>.
- OECD (2010). *Issues paper 1: Innovative SMEs and entrepreneurship for job creation and growth*. Paper presented at the Bologna + 10 high-level meeting on lessons from the global crisis and the way forward to job creation and growth, 17–18 November 2010, Paris, France.
- O'Sullivan, J. G., & Dana, T. (2008). Redefining Māori economic development. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 35(5), 364–379.
- Packer, M. (2014). Mimetic theory: Toward a New Zealand application. *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 44(4), 152–162.
- Parker, B. (2000). *Māori in the New Zealand economy* (2nd ed.). Wellington, New Zealand: Te Puni Kōkiri.

- Peeters, B. (2004). Tall poppies and egalitarianism in Australian discourse: From key word to cultural value. *English World-Wide*, 25(1), 1–25.
- 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.
- Perren, L., & Dannreuther, C. (2013). Political signification of the entrepreneur: Temporal analysis of constructs, agency and reification. *International Small Business Journal*, 31(6), 603–628.
- Pihama, L., & Penchira, M. (2005). Building baseline data on Maori, whanau development and Maori realising their potential: Literature review: Innovation and enterprise. Final report prepared for Te Puni Kokiri. Auckland, New Zealand: University of Auckland.
- Pio, E., Tipuna, K., Rasheed, A., & Parker, L. (2013). Te wero-the challenge: Reimagining universities from an indigenous world view. *Higher Education*, 66(3), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-013-9673-1>.
- Puketapu, B. T. T. (2000). *Māori organisation and contemporary Māori development: Strengthening the conceptual plait*. PhD thesis. Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Rangihau, J. T. R. A. (1992). Being Māori. In M. King (Ed.), *Te ao hurihuri: Aspects of Māoritanga* (1st ed., pp. 183–190). Auckland, New Zealand: Reed.
- Reihana, F., Sisley, M., & Modlik, H. (2007). Māori entrepreneurial activity in Aotearoa New Zealand. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 4(5), 636–653.
- Reveley, J., & Down, S. (2009). Stigmatization and self-presentation in Australian entrepreneurial identity formation. In D. Hjorth., & C. Steyaert (Eds.), *The politics and aesthetics of entrepreneurship* (pp. 162–179). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Royal, T. A. C. (2005). *An organic arising: An interpretation of tikanga based upon the Māori creation traditions*. Paper presented at the Tikanga Rangahau Mātauranga Tuku Iho: Traditional knowledge and research ethics conference, 10–12 June 2004, Wellington, New Zealand: Te Papa Tongarewa.
- Scott, S. (2016). Politeness as collective facework: The case of Swedish Jante Law. *Studies in Symbolic Interaction* ISSN 0163-2396, in press.
- Shepherd, D., & Haynie, J.M. (2009). Family business, identity conflict, and an expedited entrepreneurial process: A process of resolving identity conflict. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(6), 1245.
- Smallbone, D. (Ed.) (2010). *Entrepreneurship and public policy* (Vol. 1). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples* (1st ed.). London, UK: Zed Books.
- Spiller, C. (2010). *How Māori tourism businesses create authentic and sustainable well-being*. PhD thesis. University of Auckland: Auckland, New Zealand.
- Statistics New Zealand (2016). *Māori population estimates: Mean year ended 31 December 2015 – Tables*. Wellington, New Zealand: Statistics New Zealand.
- Storey, D. J. (1994). *Understanding the small business sector*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Sveningsson, S., & Alvesson, M. (2003). Managing managerial identities: Organizational fragmentation, discourse and identity struggle. *Human Relations*, 56(10), 1163–1193.
- 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.
- Trevor-Roberts, E., Ashkanasy, N. M., & Kennedy, J. C. (2003). The egalitarian leader: A comparison of leadership in Australia and New Zealand. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 20(4), 517–540.
- Velocity and Centre for Innovation and Entrepreneurship (2017). Retrieved December 13, 2017, from <http://www.cie.auckland.ac.nz/programmes/velocity>.
- Verter, B. (2003). Spiritual capital: Theorizing religion with Bourdieu against Bourdieu. *Sociological Theory*, 21(2), 150–174.
- Walker, D. T. W., Mika, J. P., & Palmer, F. R. (2017). *Mā wai hei kaitiaki matihiko mā tātau? Who shall be our digital guardian as indigenous entrepreneurs?* Paper presented at the Creative disruption: Managing in a digital age: 31st Annual Australian and New Zealand Academy of Management Conference, 5–8 December 2017, RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia.
- Warren, L. (2004). Negotiating entrepreneurial identity: Communities of practice and changing discourses. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 5(2), 25–37.
- Warren, L., & Smith, R. (2015). Rule-breaking and legitimacy: A failure of artful navigation? *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 21(2), 243–262.

- Warriner, V. C. A. (1999). *Is there a role for Māori cultural values in Māori exporting businesses?* A research report presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Masters of Business Studies, Massey University, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Watson, T. J. (2009). Entrepreneurial action, identity work and the use of multiple discursive resources: The case of a rapidly changing family business. *International Small Business Journal*, 27(3), 251–274.
- Welter, F. (2011). Contextualizing entrepreneurship – Conceptual challenges and ways forward. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(1), 165–184.
- Wieland, S. M. B. (2010). “Ideal selves as resources for the situated practice of identity”. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 24(4), 503–528.
- Williams Middleton, K. L. (2013). Becoming entrepreneurial: Gaining legitimacy in the nascent phase. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 19(4), 404–424.
- Yates, A. (2009). *Contemporary Māori business practices: A literature review*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Massey University, School of Management, Te Au Rangahu (Māori Business Research Centre).
- Ybema, S., Keenoy, T., Osrick, C., Beverungen, A., Ellis, N., & Sabelis, I. (2009). Articulating identities. *Human Relations*, 62(3), 299–322.
- Zapalska, A., Perry, G., & Dabb, H. (2003). Māori entrepreneurship in the contemporary business environment. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 8(3), 219–235.