

---

## 17. Responsible management: an Indigenous perspective

*Jason Paul Mika, Rick Colbourne and Shamika Almeida*

---

### INTRODUCTION

Capitalism's market-driven model of the firm combined with exponential scientific and technological advancement, have produced unprecedented global wealth (World Bank, 2018). There have been, however, unwelcome side-effects, namely the concentration of this wealth in a few countries and environmental degradation and impacts on human health (Barrow, 2006; Kiernan, 2018) which have necessitated alternative measures of human (UNDP, 2014) and environmental development (Costanza et al., 2017). Regardless of polarising moral postures about whether or not business has a responsibility to and can act against the cumulative effects of unabated negative externalities, managerialism is being nudged off its perch of presumed neutrality to one of being an active agent of change for a good and better world (Barrow, 2006; C. M. Hall, 2019). Tentative steps characterised as responsive management (doing more than the minimum to help others outside the firm) have given way to general acceptance of responsible management as mainstream managerial discourse (Crane et al., 2008). The world cannot seemingly wait for the Friedmanites (those who maintain profit maximisation is the sole, right and proper purpose of the firm) (Friedman, 1982) and the Bowenites (those who maintain firms have responsibilities beyond profit maximisation) (Bowen, 2013 [1953]) to come to a consensus over the rightness or otherwise of the firm's role in improving human and environmental conditions.

Responsible management, thus, represents an advancement in managerialism because it seeks to undo precarious environmental and human situations by modifying managerial concepts. Yet, responsible management may be limited as an alternative to established assumptions about the role of the capitalistic firm, with its status as the most efficient way to organise scarce resources seemingly preserved, provided this 'new way' can be shown to be more sustainable, responsible and ethical than earlier incarnations of itself. Moreover, we surmise that responsible management may not adequately account for an Indigenous perspective, which indicates responsible management has been an integral part of indigeneity, that is, Indigenous philosophy, identity and practice, for millennia. Importantly, Indigenous perspectives are far from uniform; their diversity originates from unique intergenerational relationships with the lands, waters and skies of their homelands.

This chapter offers an analysis of responsible management from the perspective of Canadian First Nation, Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Aotearoa New Zealand Māori managerial discourse. The chapter begins by describing Indigenous peoples, their world views and values. Second, we discuss elements of responsible management and critique the concept. Third, we compare Indigenous and non-Indigenous firms and outline an Indigenous view of responsible management. Fourth, we examine responsible management from an Indigenous perspective with examples from Australia, Aotearoa New Zealand and

Canada. Finally, we conclude by discussing implications for responsible management as a concept and practice.

## INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

The United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (2015) estimates that there are more than 370 million Indigenous people across 70 countries worldwide practising unique traditions and retaining social, cultural, economic and political characteristics that are distinct from those of the countries in which they live. Historically, Indigenous peoples have experienced colonisation, subjugation, integration and assimilation by merchants, traders, states and churches aimed at diminishing or eradicating Indigenous cultures, practices and identities (Russell, 2009). Colonisation has had the effect of depriving Indigenous peoples of their natural resources, undermining their cultures, languages and religions and delegitimising their social economies. Postcolonial governments exacerbate these consequences by advancing non-Indigenous interests over those of their Indigenous peoples (Russell, 2009). Consequently, Indigenous peoples experience poor health, discrimination, substandard education, loss of livelihoods and restricted access to economic opportunities (Dhir, 2015; UNDP, 2012).

Indigenous traditions, laws and customs are the practical application of Indigenous values grounded in their particular experience and world view (Bear, 2000). While Indigenous peoples do not share identical world views, most have in common a land-based, holistic and relational world view that is both spiritual and material. This world view is an expression of identity and culture that informs a community's values and activity (Kuokkanen, 2011; Wuttunee, 2004). Indigenous world views are founded on an active recognition of the interconnection, interrelationship and interdependency of people and the natural and spiritual realms. A relational world view positions Indigenous peoples as stewards of the land with a responsibility to ensure all of their interactions are sustaining and respectful. In this, they are obliged to care for, respect, conserve and promote the wellbeing of flora, fauna and people within their traditional territories (Colbourne, 2017a; Kuokkanen, 2011; Spiller et al., 2011; Walters & Takamura, 2015; Wuttunee, 2004).

Harris and Wasilewski (2004) position responsibility as one of a combination of four core values that form the basis of indigeneity, a dynamic alternative world view derived from Indigenous knowledge. As Harris and Wasilewski (2004) explain, first, "relationship is the kinship obligation", which is the notion that everything (all living and nonliving things) and everyone (human beings), is valued for their contribution (p. 492). Second, "responsibility is the community obligation", which manifests as an obligation for humans to care for all things, animate and inanimate, as kin (p. 492). Third, "reciprocity is the cyclical obligation", which arises in nature, life and relationships as dynamic and recurring (p. 493). And fourth, "redistribution is the sharing obligation" whose purpose is balancing and rebalancing relationships, in which generosity is highly valued (p. 493). Harris and Wasilewski (2004: 496) argue that these values are "manifestations of caring relationships", creating a dialogic space for Indigenous wisdom to have impact with a broader audience. This is the 4R's model of indigeneity. The four core values exist in a dynamically repetitive process of community continuity (Dostilio et al., 2012).

## RESPONSIBLE MANAGEMENT

Responsible management has emerged as a prescription for modifying managerialism (a belief in the manager's ability to organise and achieve shared purposes) in ways that improve societal, environmental and human outcomes of organisational activity. Three global initiatives demonstrate its discursive momentum: (1) the United Nations Global Compact, an invitation for firms worldwide to voluntarily align their activities toward 10 principles of human rights, labour rights, environment and anticorruption (United Nations, 2010); (2) the Principles for Responsible Management Education (PRME), which seek to guide educators on training future managers on principles of sustainable and inclusive economic development; and (3) guidance on how firms can respect and uphold Indigenous rights, in particular, the right to self-determination in social, economic and political development under the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (Katene & Taonui, 2018; United Nations, 2013).

Responsible management extends conventional ideas on the role of the manager and the management process to embrace a multiplicity of means and ends. Laasch and Conaway (2015: 25) define responsible management as an approach to management, which “assumes responsibility for the triple bottom-line (sustainability), stakeholder value (responsibility), and moral dilemmas (ethics)”. The ‘nirvana’ of this approach, therefore, is a firm which embraces, integrates and demonstrates *sustainability* (social, environmental and economic value are optimised), *responsibility* (overall stakeholder value, not just shareholder value, is optimised), and *ethicality* (ethical decision-making and moral excellence) (Laasch & Conaway, 2015). This approach requires firms and managers to pursue purposes greater than their own, to incorporate within the management process multiple forms of value creation, measurement and distribution, and to make decisions and achieve results that are not only efficient and effective, but are socially, environmentally and morally favourable. The role of the manager just got a little more interesting.

Responsible management involves adopting an interpersonal orientation toward action and interaction that promotes respect for and accountability to community and others (Hibbert & Cunliffe, 2015). Responsible management is about being connected, involved and engaged. It is about assembling and deploying teams, assuming long-term perspectives and configuring organisations with care (Mintzberg et al., 2002). It is about developing and managing firms that generate community prosperity through combining economic development with social generosity (Mintzberg et al., 2002). Responsible firms and managers are aware of their reciprocal nature and influence. When viewed from a managerialist perspective, reciprocity in Western discourse is considered a moral condition of the employment relationship couched in terms of organisational citizenship. Alvesson and Willmott (2012) describe collective responsibility as a “developed awareness of our social interconnectedness and, thus, a realization of how our collective responsibilities extend to our husbandry of the planet” (p. 22).

## RESPONSIBLE MANAGEMENT AND THE INDIGENOUS FIRM

We define responsible management as rationalising and operationalising Indigenous knowledge systems and lifeways within culturally, physically and spiritually embedded firms to achieve purposes of benefit to Indigenous peoples. For Indigenous firms and managers, this

may involve pursuing objectives that promote sustainability and reciprocity, being accountable to the community within which the venture is embedded (Colbourne, 2017a) and forming enterprises that attempt to mitigate Indigenous social issues and leverage global support (Gladu, 2016; Sengupta et al., 2015). Klemm Verbos et al. (2017) highlight the precarity of indigeneity with examples of intersections of Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in business where success is assessed by the degree to which there is a collision, coexistence or coincidence between Indigenous and non-Indigenous rights.

Indigenous firms are organisations predominantly owned by Indigenous peoples and may be managed by Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples for Indigenous purposes (Mika et al., 2019a; Mika & O'Sullivan, 2014). Indigenous firms induce and exhibit variation in organisational purpose, process and outcomes because of their embeddedness within Indigenous communities (see Table 17.1). First, Indigenous firms value activities and practices that benefit their communities because of their view of individuals and groups as socially interdependent. Second, Indigenous firms focus on organisational structures and processes that promote holistic capabilities and enable interdependence. Third, Indigenous firms value traditional knowledge and community participation alongside formal credentials. Finally, community participation and consensus building are encouraged through inclusion of elders, youth and other community members. Consequently, Indigenous values provide a basis for firms that are responsible for community and individual wellbeing.

## AUSTRALIAN ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDERS

Indigenous Australians have called Australia home for an estimated 40,000–60,000 years, or perhaps longer (Wood & Davidson, 2011). According to census data 2.8 per cent (649,200) of the population consist of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2016). The census specifically notes that 91 per cent are of Aboriginal origin, 5 per cent are Torres Strait Islander and 4 per cent are both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. Moreover, 25.5 per cent of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples live in the Northern Territory while the second highest number lives in New South Wales. The median age of Indigenous Australians is 23 years compared to 38 years for the non-Indigenous Australian population.

Indigenous communities demonstrate shared cultural beliefs and practices, a high commitment to responsibility and value community as family (Massola et al., 2017). Kinship or social relationships play an important role in the lives of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders. Familial obligations and filial responsibilities were perhaps more legitimately foregrounded in Aboriginal sociocultural contexts at the turn of the last century. For example, the inclusive definition of family was stressed by Aboriginals, with terms like 'sister', 'uncle' and 'cousin' describing a range of biological and nonbiological family relationships (Kiraly et al., 2015). They also show family obligations as imperative, where, for example, families had taken on the care of many children with the long stayers becoming brothers and sisters (Kiraly et al., 2015).

In Australia, Indigenous firms do show important social characteristics in developing and sustaining Indigenous communities across urban, regional and rural Australia (Kerins & Jordan, 2010). In this sense, Indigenous firms are embedded in Indigenous cultures, families and communities (Collins & Norman, 2018). Altman (2004) describes a hybrid Aboriginal

Table 17.1 *Dimensions of Indigenous and non-Indigenous firms*

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Indigenous firms</b>	<b>Non-Indigenous firms</b>
<b>Mission</b>	–Firms exist to serve communities –Employment, capacity, wellbeing	–Firms exist to serve shareholders –Efficiency, effectiveness, profits
<b>Moral imperative</b>	–Stewardship –Sacred trust with responsibilities to future generations –Job creation –Community-wellbeing	–Nation or international economic interests –Profit seeking precedes stewardship activities –Job creation –Shareholder wellbeing through wealth accumulation
<b>Value creation orientation</b>	–Value must benefit community –Wealth is shared or given away	–Value primarily benefits shareholders and managers –Wealth is accumulated
<b>Organisational structures and processes</b>	–Groups more important than individuals –Broadly defined job roles and fluidity in fulfilling task –Emphasis on inclusion, mutual support and interdependence	–Individual is paramount –Well-defined job and set of responsibilities –Emphasis on personal achievement and competition among individuals
<b>Strategy</b>	–Managing as facilitator –Delegates authority –Leads by personal characteristics –Exemplifies community values	–Managing as leader –Expresses wishes explicitly –Leads by power of position –Exemplifies corporate values
<b>Decision-making</b>	–Consensus decision-making –Reflective and participative –Promotes listening respectfully to all community members including elders and youth –Based on collective wisdom	–Hierarchical decision-making –Made through formal authority –Includes only those shareholders or stakeholder of importance to the organisation –Based on individual power, position in hierarchy and/or investment in the organisation
<b>Accountability</b>	–Community – elders, youth and community members –Ancestors through to seven generations forward	–Shareholders, stakeholders and partners –Present and next generation –Elders are rarely employees

Sources: Chapman et al. (1990), Colbourne (2017a), Mintzberg et al. (2002) and Verbos et al. (2011).

economy with an emphasis on unique obligations and how these can be applied to better serve the needs of local communities (McCormack & Barclay, 2013). Foley (2004) suggests entrepreneurship was firmly entrenched in Australia's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander society through trade and commerce long before British colonisation in the eighteenth century. The introduction and dominance of Western legal and economic systems not only eliminated Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples' traditional economies, but also destroyed their social systems. As such, Indigenous people remain at the margins with little political and social power (Pinto & Blue, 2017). Indigenous entrepreneurship is, however, shifting the focus of Indigenous firms beyond profit to quadruple bottom-line performance providing for alternative conceptualisations of the firm (Colbourne, 2017b; Dana & Anderson, 2007; Garry et al., 2017; Mika et al., 2018; Scrimgeour & Iremonger, 2004).

Hindle and Moroz (2010) define Indigenous entrepreneurship as activities “[...] focused on new venture creation or the pursuit of economic opportunity, or both for the purpose of diminishing Indigenous disadvantage through culturally viable and community acceptable wealth creation” (p. 372). Indigenous entrepreneurship differs from Western definitions because of the focus on overcoming disadvantage and culturally appropriate forms of wealth

(Dana, 2015). Altman (2001) and Altman and Pollack (2001) demonstrate how Indigenous peoples shape their own modernity and pursue culturally-defined goals to forge modernities compatible with Indigenous values. Managing Indigenous firms within Altman's (2001) hybrid economy requires integrated thinking and decision making. Elders should be engaged using yarning as an approach to assist in valuing stakeholder perspectives (Bodle et al., 2018). Yarning is more than a light exchange of words and pleasantries in casual conversation. A yarn is both a process and an exchange; it encompasses elements of respect, protocol and engagement in individuals' relationships with each other (Fredericks et al., 2011).

Bangara Dance Theatre is an Indigenous Australian organisation founded on the culture and history of the Indigenous Australian people and their connection to land and country. This inspires the company to create experiences that change society and to share the Indigenous culture and stories with diverse communities (Bangara Dance Theatre Australia Limited, 2019). Two performance indicators Bangara Dance Theatre strive to achieve, that reflect a responsible management approach, include: (1) the development of audiences that reflect the diversity of the company's marketplace; and (2) undertaking educational learning activities within schools and wider communities (Bangara Dance Theatre Australia Limited, 2018). In order to achieve these outcomes, the company has undertaken responsible and reciprocal strategies such as nurturing Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultural leaders and recruiting performers from the most disadvantaged communities. They also connect in meaningful ways with their community by providing opportunities for young Indigenous people to gather knowledge and be mentored by elders and experienced creative community members (Bangara Dance Theatre Australia Limited, 2018). It seems that Bangara Dance Theatre is building the capacity for Indigenous responsible management by engendering trust and networks among community groups and nurturing knowledge sharing through education and recruitment (Clarke & Oswald, 2010; Spencer et al., 2017).

## AOTEAROA NEW ZEALAND MĀORI

Māori are the Indigenous people of Aotearoa New Zealand, originally arriving around 1350 as Polynesian seafarers on ocean-going canoes (Best, 1934; Buck, 1958; King, 2003; Walker, 1990). In 2017, the Māori population in Aotearoa New Zealand stood at 734,200, around 15 per cent of total population of 4.79 million (Stats NZ, 2017). In pre-European Māori society (pre-1769), economic activity was founded upon principles of respect for the relationship between spiritual and physical realms, mutual responsibilities between the natural world and humanity and kin-based obligations for the survival and wellbeing of the tribe (Mika & O'Sullivan, 2014; Mika et al., 2019b; Waa & Love, 1997). From 1769, following the onset of colonial settlement, Māori adapted European knowledge to advance their tribal economies (Frederick & Henry, 2004; Schaniel, 1985). Growth in Māori tribal economies did not endure, with a rapid decline between 1850 and 1900 attributable to large-scale land confiscations and other legislative and commercial instruments (Hawkins, 1999; Petrie, 2002; Walker, 2004). In postcolonial Aotearoa New Zealand, Indigenous firms persist, operating according to cultural modalities and pluralities that synergise Māori and non-Māori values, principles and practices (Durie, 2011; Knox, 2005; Smith et al., 2015; Tinirau, 2017). Indigenous firms in Māori society are adapting non-Indigenous moulds in response to modern Māori aspirations (Mika et al., 2019a).



Using managerial functionalism as their framework, Mika and O’Sullivan (2014) developed a two-dimensional model of Māori management. On the horizontal axis, Māori management varies according to two variables – whakapapa (identity) and ārona (world view) of the manager. Māori organisation on the vertical axis is explained by mana (power and authority) and kaupapa (Māori-oriented purposes) of the organisation (Mika & O’Sullivan, 2014). The resulting matrix produces nine possible combinations, with the optimal Indigenous firm, one with the power and authority to implement Māori-defined purposes and managers with a Māori identity, tribal affiliation and cultural capabilities to implement such purposes. Responsible management within this model is defined as achieving Indigenous ends using Indigenous means within Indigenous firms, with non-Indigenous knowledge and practice inducing other gradations of Māori management. Dell (2017) takes this model further, proposing a disruptive Māori management theory she terms the Tapahi Block, consisting of macro-, meso- and micro-level factors that explain intertemporal and multilevel detachments between Māori people and Māori land. Responsible management in this view is about acknowledging and responding to systemic disruption of Indigenous peoples’ attachments to land by revisiting the past, reframing the present and reimagining the future (Dell, 2017).

Tūaropaki is a whānau (family) trust comprising around 2,000 owners of Māori land at the settlement of Mokai, 30 kilometres north-west of Taupō, Aotearoa New Zealand (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2011). Tūaropaki Trust was formed in 1952 by order of the Māori Land Court. The trust, comprising 2,708 hectares (6,691 acres) of pastoral land, was developed into a cattle and sheep farm with government assistance, until 1979 when management of the land was returned to its Indigenous owners (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2011). Tūaropaki has over the last 25 years diversified its business to include: Mokai 1, a geothermal power plant; an expansive greenhouse; interests in a communications satellite; a stake in Miraka, a Māori-owned dairy factory powered by Tūaropaki’s energy well; and a worm farm, which converts horticultural waste to fertiliser for its farms (Bargh, 2012; Mulligan et al., 2004). As an evolving Indigenous firm, owned and operated by trustees who descend from the hapū (subtribes) of Mōkai, Tūaropaki practises an Indigenous form of responsible management encoded by Māori values (or ‘ethical coordinates’) of mana (authority), utu (balance), kaitiakitanga (guardianship) and whakapapa (genealogy) (Bargh, 2012). As the trust’s late chairman Tūmanako Wereta explained, the success of Tūaropaki is due in equal part to aspiration, luck and divine intervention (Mika, 2009).

## CANADIAN FIRST NATIONS

Indigenous peoples are Canada’s First Peoples who lived across Canada for thousands of years and managed their lands and resources with their own forms of government, laws and traditions. They had complex societies with sophisticated practices for coordinating trade and commerce, building relationships, managing resources and expressing spirituality (Wilson & Henderson, 2014). In Canada, Indigenous peoples are formally recognised in the Constitution as *Aboriginal* and consist of three distinct groups: First Nations, Inuit and Métis in which each group is characterised by unique history and experiences, languages, cultural practices, spiritual beliefs and differing economic circumstances (National Aboriginal Economic Development Board, 2015; Preston, 2015). In 2016, there were 1,673,785 Aboriginal people

Table 17.2 Identification of Canadian Indigenous peoples (Aboriginal)

	Number	%
<b>Total Aboriginal Population</b>	1,673,785	100.0
<b>First Nations</b>	977,230	58.4
–Status and Non-Status		
–617 First Nation communities		
<b>Métis</b>	587,545	35.1
–mixed First Nation and European heritage		
<b>Inuit</b>	65,025	3.9
–inhabit the northern regions of Canada		
–settled land claims represent 33% of Canada’s land mass		
–Inuit Nunangat: 4 regions – Nunatsiavut (Labrador); Nunavik (Quebec); Nunavut; and the Inuvialuit Settlement Region (Northwest Territories)		
–53 communities		
Multiple Aboriginal Identities	21,310	1.3
Aboriginal Identities not included elsewhere	22,670	1.4

Sources: National Aboriginal Economic Development Board (2015: 6) and Statistics Canada (2019).

in Canada, accounting for 4.9 per cent of the total population (Statistics Canada, 2019) (see Table 17.2).

Indigenous cultures in Canada are diverse, reflecting a particular community’s world view and rooted in spiritual ceremonies and values that express their unique relationship with the land of their traditional territories. For Indigenous peoples in Canada, 2015 marked a turning point for healing and in their relationship with the Canadian government. First, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada concluded its proceedings and issued an historic report entitled *Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future*. The commission spent six years travelling to all parts of Canada hearing from Indigenous people who had been taken from their families as children and placed for much of their childhoods in residential schools (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015). The final report issued a total of ninety-four recommendations to redress Canada’s injustices against Indigenous peoples. In response, Indigenous knowledge keepers in Canada have been developing decolonisation frameworks grounded in Indigenous ways of knowing that frame Indigenous understandings of responsible management (Haas, 2017; Hall et al., 2015; Hatcher et al., 2009; Hill & Coleman, 2018; Iwama et al., 2009; Latulippe, 2015; Marsh et al., 2015; Morcom, 2017; Peltier, 2018).

Wampum are decorative beads made from various forms of shell used to capture the words and pledges made in its presence and serve as records and ceremonial markers of important events such as alliances, treaties, marriages, ceremonies and wars (Haas, 2017; Hill & Coleman, 2018; Morcom, 2017). The principles of the Two Row wampum are: (1) the two rows of purple beads represent the canoe (Hodinöhsö:ni’) and the boat (Dutch) that will travel side by side and neither will attempt to steer the other’s vessel with each Nation respecting each other; and (2), while the three rows of white wampum beads keep the two Nations separate, it also binds them to live in mutual friendship, peace and respect (see Figure 17.1).

Based on Mi’kmaq principles of Etuaptmumk and on the work and teachings of Mi’kmaq elder and knowledge holder, Albert Marshall, Two-Eyed Seeing brings together the strengths of Western, Eurocentric knowledges with Indigenous knowledges guided by the principle that Indigenous leaders bridge overlapping perspectives with each eye (Iwama et al., 2009;





Sources: Latulippe (2015: 8–9), Onondaga Nation (2019) and Turner (2006: 54).

Figure 17.1 Two row wampum

McGregor, 2018). Etuaptmuk is a way of being, seeing and living life that emphasises learning and valuing multiple perspectives and ways of knowing equally (Albert Marshall cited in Rowett, 2018). Two-Eyed Seeing is learning to see with the strengths of each knowledge system and together – one eye never subsumes the other (Martin, 2012). It stresses a weaving back and forth between separate but parallel ways of knowing (knowledge systems) each of which is important and necessary to generating ways of knowing that lead to greater wellbeing in the world (Bartlett et al., 2012: 209–210; Iwama et al., 2009; Luby et al., 2018; McGregor, 2018).

Indigenous Works (formerly the Aboriginal Human Resource Council) was established in 1998 as a not-for-profit organisation with a mandate to increase the engagement of Indigenous people in the Canadian economy. Kelly Lendsay and Craig Hall, the leaders of Indigenous Works, view partnerships as a fundamental first step in building mutual benefit through the development of inclusive engagement across sectors and thereby growth of Indigenous local economies and increased Indigenous participation in the mainstream economy (C. Hall, 2019; Lendsay, 2019). Indigenous Works has spent the last 20 years learning about the complex relationships between Indigenous firms and corporate Canada.

Two-Eyed Seeing grounded in the principle of Two Row Wampum is a method of responsible management practiced by Indigenous Works to create safe spaces for dialogue and action that are responsive to the needs of Indigenous peoples in Canada. Since its founding, Indigenous Works has led more than 150 projects widely recognised as innovative. It was the first Indigenous organisation in Canada to develop a web-based Indigenous job board, the 'Inclusion Network', which not only matched Indigenous job applicants and corporate Canada, but also produced metrics that brought precision to Indigenous talent acquisition. Indigenous Works developed a workplace inclusion model called the 'Inclusion Continuum' which provided an Indigenous perspective on what constitutes 'inclusion' and how to measure it. Indigenous Works developed systems for career planning made available to over 2,000 practitioners in remote Indigenous communities, providing the means for Indigenous youth to acquire the skills and competencies for viable career paths based on their innate talents and Indigenous teachings. Indigenous Works' partnership with Mitacs, a national not-for-profit organisation that funds innovative research, was initiated to increase and support Indigenous research collaborations (Mitacs, 2019). The purpose was to share ideas and strategise with Indigenous business leaders about research and innovation.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

One of the problems with the theory of responsible management is that it complicates a very uncomplicated model of the firm. Three essential ideas – rational man and his utilitarian ways, the simplicity of the market, and the managerialist as ultimate organiser and effector of profit – have given us everything we could have desired from planetary resources. In order to accomplish this great feat, however, economies, firms and managers have had to divorce themselves from reality, and simplify through abstraction, a model of the firm that is socially, culturally and physically disembedded (Peredo & McLean, 2013; Polanyi, 1944). In this view, people, land, water, air become tradeable commodities, valued more for their capacity to serve one's economic purpose rather than their intrinsic value. Pollution, poverty, hunger and disease are rationalised as someone else's problem; attending to such matters stands in the way of satisfying one's own needs. In this view, the firm exists within an ambit of neutrality, drawing upon the environment and giving back, without fully acknowledging its impact or its beneficence.

Responsible management is an attempt to dislodge this idea of managerialism and replace it with something more morally palatable yet just as effective. Three conditions seem to justify venturing toward responsible management from an Indigenous perspective. First, is an ambit of partiality, which assumes humanity is interconnected because of a common existence on earth. This resonates with Harris and Wasilewski's (2004) concept of relationship as kinship obligation. Second, is an ethic of care which assumes Indigenous firms should do more to help others, which relates to Harris and Wasilewski's (2004) conceptualisations of responsibility and reciprocity. Third, the assumption of human capability provides Indigenous firms with the efficacy to manage responsibly, in line with Indigenous values, needs and aspirations (Watene, 2016). In this respect, responsible management offers a serious challenge to the established order (profit maximising firms, managerialism, market-based exchange), which is unlikely to be easily moved because such change requires firms to share their wealth and capabilities for transformative outcomes of benefit to organisational non-members. An Indigenous view may illustrate why and how responsible management has been and can be achieved.

Indigenous firms exist within Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities, which in effect help to regulate firms and managerial activity (Marquis & Battilana, 2009; Ritsema et al., 2015). A community's collective orientation, intimated by its shared values, aspirations and objectives, for example, may facilitate or constrain an Indigenous firm's approach to entrepreneurship, innovation and enterprise development (Anderson, 2001; Anderson et al., 2006; Anderson et al., 2008; Dana & Anderson, 2011; Hindle, 2010; Lindsay, 2005). This may result in suppressing Indigenous firms which do not conform to their community's cultural norms, values and objectives (Colbourne, 2017a; Lindsay, 2005). Not all Indigenous communities, however, share the same values and objectives. Indigenous firms will be influenced by the interconnectedness of the relationships, governing institutions and values within which the firm and its management are embedded. An Indigenous community's socioeconomic orientation can be conceptualised as nestled within the environmental dimension within which each of the economic, social, spiritual and cultural dimensions influence Indigenous firms and responsible management (Morgan, 2006).

Indigenous firms, therefore, face difficult challenges in prioritising, balancing and blending social, economic, cultural and environmental value. An Indigenous firm's value creation strategy may not easily align with community needs or expectations, creating risks for the firm (Ebrahim et al., 2014). Indigenous cultures are often characterised as emphasising communal

wealth rather than individual wealth, which is characteristic of market economies (Cassidy, 2009). While non-Indigenous firms face similar tensions of conformity to community expectations (Murphy & Coombes, 2009: 332; Russo et al., 2015), Indigenous firms tend to be more dependent on community acceptance and support. The challenge for Indigenous firms is to ensure alignment between the economic value they create and the social needs of their communities (Ebrahim et al., 2014).

The examples of Indigenous firms in Australia, Aotearoa New Zealand and Canada highlight the diversity of indigeneity and the commonality of community embeddedness, which regulates and empowers firms to apply an Indigenous approach to responsible management. More than catering to the cultural performance expectations of its audiences, Bangara Dance Theatre, an Indigenous firm in Australia, is building capacity to sustain cultural traditions through engaging youth and elders in Indigenous communities. Tūaropaki, a family-owned farm trust on Māori land in rural Aotearoa aspired to create wealth in diverse ways, guided by a set of ethical coordinates and management that derive from ancestral knowledge. Through responsible leadership grounded in the principles of Two Row Wampum and Two-Eyed Seeing, Indigenous Works is creating safe spaces for dialogue and action that bridge Indigenous, academic, corporate, entrepreneurial and government communities, enabling future generations to preserve and regenerate Indigenous wellbeing.

Responsibility is an essential element of indigeneity. Responsibility in Indigenous terms articulates an interdependency between the spiritual realm to care for the living, for the living to respect those who have gone before; for the natural world to provide for humanity and for humanity to reciprocate care for the natural and spiritual worlds. This sense of responsibility for the wellbeing of communities is an important characteristic of Indigenous firms, an imperative of community embeddedness and Indigenous self-determination, where the emphasis is on the permanency of indigeneity. Responsible management is not new to Indigenous peoples but an Indigenous view of it is one that may assist non-Indigenous efforts at theorising, moralising and practising a different and better management than we have had.

## REFERENCES

- Altman, J. C. (2001). *Sustainable development options on Aboriginal land: The hybrid economy in the twenty-first century*. Retrieved on 29 December 2019 from [http://caep.cass.anu.edu.au/sites/default/files/docs/2001\\_DP226\\_0.pdf](http://caep.cass.anu.edu.au/sites/default/files/docs/2001_DP226_0.pdf).
- 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.
- Altman, J. C., & Pollack, D. (2001). The Indigenous land corporation: An analysis of its performance five years on. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 60(4), 67–79. 10.1111/1467-8500.00242.
- Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (2012). *Making Sense of Management: A Critical Introduction*. London: Sage.
- Anderson, R. (2001). Aboriginal people, economic development and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Aboriginal Economic Development*, 2(1), 33–42.
- Anderson, R., Honig, B., & Peredo, A. (2006). Communities in the global economy: Where social and Indigenous entrepreneurship meet. In D. Hjorth & C. Steyaert (Eds.), *Entrepreneurship as Social Change: A Third New Movements in Entrepreneurship Book* (pp. 56–78). Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Anderson, R., MacAulay, S. W., Kayseas, B., & Hindle, K. G. (2008). Indigenous communities, entrepreneurship, and economic development in the new economy. In G. Shockley, P. Frank, & R. Stough

- (Eds.), *Non-market Entrepreneurship: Interdisciplinary Approaches* (pp. 89–123). Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (2016). *Census: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population*. Retrieved on 29 December 2019 from <https://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/MediaReleasesByCatalogue/02D50FAA9987D6B7CA25814800087E03>.
- Bangarra Dance Theatre Australia Limited (2018). *Annual report*. Retrieved on 29 December 2019 from [https://issuu.com/bangarra/docs/bangarra\\_2018\\_annual\\_report-final\\_-\\_5e2d51f0289389](https://issuu.com/bangarra/docs/bangarra_2018_annual_report-final_-_5e2d51f0289389).
- Bangarra Dance Theatre Australia Limited (2019). *Our company*. Retrieved on 2 September 2019 from <https://www.bangarra.com.au/about/company/>.
- Bargh, M. (2012). Rethinking and re-shaping indigenous economies: Māori geothermal energy enterprises. *Journal of Enterprising Communities*, 6(3), 271–283. 10.1108/17506201211258423.
- Barrow, C. J. (2006). *Environmental Management for Sustainable Development* (2nd edn). New York: Routledge.
- Bartlett, C., Marshall, M., & Marshall, A. (2012). Two-eyed seeing and other lessons learned within a co-learning journey of bringing together indigenous and mainstream knowledges and ways of knowing. *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences*, 2(4), 331–340. 10.1007/s13412-012-0086-8.
- Bear, L. L. (2000). Jagged worldviews colliding. In M. Battiste (Ed.), *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision* (pp. 75–87). Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- Best, E. (1934). *The Maori as He Was: A Brief Account of Maori Life as It Was in Pre-European Days*. Wellington, New Zealand: Dominion Museum.
- Bodle, K., Brimble, M., Weaven, S., Frazer, L., & Blue, L. (2018). Critical success factors in managing sustainable Indigenous businesses in Australia. *Pacific Accounting*, 30(1), 35–51.
- Bowen, H. R. (2013 [1953]). *Social Responsibilities of the Businessman*. Iowa, IA: University of Iowa Press.
- Buck, P. (1958). *The Coming of the Maori* (2nd edn). Wellington, New Zealand: Maori Purposes Fund Board.
- Cassidy, J. (2009). *How Markets Fail: The Logic of Economic Calamities*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Chapman, I., McCaskill, D., & Newhouse, D. (1990). Management in contemporary Aboriginal organizations. *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies*, 11(2), 333–349.
- Clarke, P., & Oswald, K. (2010). Introduction: Why reflect collectively on capacities for change. *IDS Bulletin*, 41(3), 1–12. 10.1111/j.1759-5436.2010.00132.x.
- Colbourne, R. (2017a). Indigenous entrepreneurship and hybrid ventures. In A. Corbett & J. Katz (Eds.), *Perspectives and Approaches to Blended Value Entrepreneurship: Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence and Growth* (Vol. 19). Bingley: Emerald Publishing.
- Colbourne, R. (2017b). An understanding of Native American entrepreneurship. *Small Enterprise Research*, 24(1), 49–61. 10.1080/13215906.2017.1289856.
- Collins, J., & Norman, H. (2018). Indigenous entrepreneurship and indigenous employment in Australia. *Journal of Australian Political Economy*, 82(Summer), 149–170.
- Costanza, R., de Groot, R., Braat, L., Kubiszewski, I., Fioramonti, L., Sutton, P., Farber, S., & Grasso, M. (2017). Twenty years of ecosystem services: How far have we come and how far do we still need to go? *Ecosystem Services*, 28(2017), 1–16.
- Crane, A., McWilliams, A., Matten, D., Moon, J., & Siegel, D. S. (Eds.), (2008). *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Social Responsibility* (1st edn). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Dana, L.-P. (2015). Indigenous entrepreneurship: An emerging field of research. *International Journal of Business and Globalisation*, 14(2), 158–169.
- Dana, L.-P., & Anderson, R. (2011). Indigenous entrepreneurship as a function of cultural perceptions of opportunity. In L.-P. Dana (Ed.), *World Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship* (pp. 249–258). Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Dana, L.-P., & Anderson, R. B. (Eds.) (2007). *International Handbook of Research on Indigenous Entrepreneurship*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Dell, K. M. (2017). *Te hokinga ki te ūkaipō: Disrupted Māori management theory: Harmonising whānau conflict in the Māori land trust* (Doctor of Philosophy in management and international business), University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.

- Dhir, R. K. (2015). *Indigenous Peoples in the World of Work in Asia and the Pacific: A Status Report*. Geneva, Switzerland: International Labour Office.
- Dostilio, L. D., Harrison, B., Brackmann, S. M., Kliewer, B. W., Edwards, K. E., & Clayton, P. H. (2012). Reciprocity: Saying what we mean and meaning what we say. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 19(1), 17–33.
- Durie, M. K. (2011). *He kawa oranga: Māori achievement in the 21st Century* (Doctor of Philosophy), Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Ebrahim, A., Battilana, J., & Mair, J. (2014). The governance of social enterprises: Mission drift and accountability challenges in hybrid organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 34, 81–100. 10.1016/j.riob.2014.09.001.
- Foley, D. (2004). *Understanding indigenous entrepreneurship: A case study analysis* (thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy), University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.
- Frederick, H. H., & Henry, E. (2004). Innovation and entrepreneurship among Pākehā and Māori in New Zealand. In K. Stiles & C. Galbraith (Eds.), *Ethnic Entrepreneurship: Structure and Process* (pp. 115–140). Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science.
- Fredericks, B. L., Adams, K., Finlay, S. M., Fletcher, G., Andy, S., Briggs, L., & Hall, R. (2011). Engaging the practice of yarning in action research. *Action Learning and Action Research Journal*, 17(2), 7–19.
- Friedman, M. (1982). *Capitalism and Freedom* (2nd edn). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Garry, D. B., Shaker, A. Z., & Li, C. (2017). Examining entrepreneurship through indigenous lenses. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 10.1177/1042258717741129.
- Gladu, J. P. (2016). Economic equality must be part of indigenous reconciliation. *Aboriginal Policy Studies*, 1 August 2016. Retrieved on 23 November 2016 from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/rob-commentary/economic-equality-must-be-part-of-indigenous-reconciliation/article31215507/>.
- Haas, A. M. (2017). Wampum as hypertext: An American Indian intellectual tradition of multimedia theory and practice. *Studies in American Indian Literatures*, 19(4), 77–100.
- Hall, C. (2019, 8 August). Personal correspondence via email with Colbourne, R.
- Hall, C. M. (2019). Constructing sustainable tourism development: The 2030 agenda and the managerial ecology of sustainable tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2018.1560456>.
- Hall, L., Dell, C. A., Fornssler, B., Hopkins, C., Mushquash, C., & Rowan, M. (2015). Research as cultural renewal: Applying two-eyed seeing in a research project about cultural interventions in first nations addictions treatment. *International Indigenous Policy Journal*, 6(2), 1–15.
- Harris, L. D., & Wasilewski, J. (2004). Indigeneity, an alternative worldview: Four R's (relationship, responsibility, reciprocity, redistribution) vs. two P's (power and profit): Sharing the journey towards conscious evolution. *Systems Research and Behavioural Science*, 21(2004), 489–503.
- Hatcher, A., Bartlett, C., Marshall, A., & Marshall, M. (2009). Two-eyed seeing in the classroom environment: Concepts, approaches, and challenges. *Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education*, 9(3), 141–153.
- Hawkins, G. (1999). Maori and business: A proud history. *Tu Mai*, 12 April.
- Hibbert, P., & Cunliffe, A. (2015). Responsible management: Engaging moral reflexive practice through threshold concepts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 127, 177–188.
- Hill, R. W., & Coleman, D. (2018). The Two Row Wampum–Covenant Chain tradition as a guide for Indigenous–University research partnerships. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 19(5), 339–359.
- Hindle, K. (2010). How community context affects entrepreneurial process: A diagnostic framework. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 22(7–8), 599–647. 10.1080/08985626.2010.522057.
- Hindle, K., & Moroz, P. (2010). Indigenous entrepreneurship as a research field: Developing a definitional framework from the emerging canon. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship Management Journal*, 6(4), 357–385.
- Iwama, M., Marshall, M., Marshall, A., & Bartlett, C. (2009). Two-eyed seeing and the language of healing in community-based research. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 32(2), 3–23.



- Katene, S., & Taonui, R. (Eds.) (2018). *Conversations about indigenous rights: The UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Wellington, New Zealand: Massey University Press.
- Kerins, S., & Jordan, K. (2010). *Indigenous economic development through community-based enterprise*. Retrieved on 29 December 2019 from [https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/bitstream/1885/148991/1/TI2010\\_6\\_Kerins\\_Jordan\\_IEDP\\_0.pdf](https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/bitstream/1885/148991/1/TI2010_6_Kerins_Jordan_IEDP_0.pdf).
- Kiernan, G. (2018). *From education to employment: Megatrends affecting NZ's working environment*. Retrieved on 29 December 2019 from [https://static.infometrics.co.nz/Content/Infometrics\\_Megatrends\\_2018.pdf](https://static.infometrics.co.nz/Content/Infometrics_Megatrends_2018.pdf).
- King, M. (2003). *The Penguin History of New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- Kiraly, M., James, J., & Humphreys, C. (2015). 'It's a family responsibility': Family and cultural connection for Aboriginal children in kinship care. *Children Australia*, 40(1), 23–32.
- Klemm Verbos, A., Henry, E., & Peredo, A. M. (2017). *Indigenous Aspirations and Rights: The Case for Responsible Business and Management* (1st edn). London, UK: Routledge.
- Knox, C. (2005). *Whakapūmau te mauri: Values-based Māori organisations* (A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Māori Studies), Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Kuokkanen, R. (2011). Indigenous economies, theories of subsistence, and women: Exploring the social economy model for indigenous governance. *The American Indian Quarterly*, 35(2), 215–240.
- Laasch, O., & Conaway, R. (Eds.) (2015). *Principles of Responsible Management: Global Sustainability, Responsibility and Ethics*. Mason: Cengage.
- Latulippe, N. (2015). Bridging parallel rows: Epistemic difference and relational accountability in cross-cultural research. *The International Indigenous Policy Journal*, 6(2), 1–17. 10.18584/iipj.2015.6.2.7.
- Lindsay, K. (2019, 17 March). Personal communication, Mapping Researchers in Indigenous Research.
- Lindsay, N. J. (2005). Toward a cultural model of indigenous entrepreneurial attitude. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 5, 1.
- Luby, B., Arsenault, R., Burke, J., Graham, M., & Valenti, T. (2018). Treaty #3: A tool for empowering diverse scholars to engage in Indigenous research. In D. McGregor, J.-P. Restoule, & R. Johnston (Eds.), *Indigenous Research: Theories, Practices and Relationships* (pp. 200–218). Toronto, Canada: Canadian Scholars.
- Marquis, C., & Battilana, J. (2009). Acting globally but thinking locally? The enduring influence of local communities on organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 29, 283–302.
- Marsh, T. N., Cote-Meek, S., Toulouse, P., Najavits, L. M., & Young, N. L. (2015). The application of two-eyed seeing decolonizing methodology in qualitative and quantitative research for the treatment of intergenerational trauma and substance use disorders. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 14(5). 10.1177/1609406915618046.
- Martin, D. H. (2012). Two-eyed seeing: A framework for understanding indigenous and non-indigenous approaches to indigenous health research. *Canadian Journal of Nursing Research*, 44(2), 21–42.
- Massola, C., & Kral, I. (2017). Everyday watching and learning in an Indigenous Australian community. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 15, 31–43.
- McCormack, F., & Barclay, K. (2013). Insights on capitalism from Oceania. In F. McCormack, & K. Barclay (Eds.), *Engaging with Capitalism: Cases from Oceania* (Vol. 33, pp. 1–27). London: Emerald Group Publishing.
- McGregor, D. (2018). Indigenous research: Future directions. In D. McGregor, J.-P. Restoule, & R. Johnston (Eds.), *Indigenous Research: Theories, Practices and Relationships* (pp. 296–310). Toronto, Canada: Canadian Scholars.
- Mika, J. P. (2009). *Report on the Outcomes of the Tūhoe Economic Summit, Ohope, 17–18 July 2009*. Tāneatua, New Zealand: Tūhoe Fisheries Charitable Trust.
- Mika, J. P., Fahey, N., & Bensemman, J. (2019a). What counts as an Indigenous enterprise? Evidence from Aotearoa New Zealand. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 13(3), 372–390. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEC-12-2018-0102>.
- 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. 10.1017/jmo.2014.48.



- Mika, J. P., Smith, G. H., Gillies, A., & Wiremu, F. (2019b). Unfolding tensions within post-settlement governance and tribal economies in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 13(3), 296–318. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEC-12-2018-0104>.
- Mika, J. P., Warren, L., Foley, D., & Palmer, F. R. (2018). Perspectives on indigenous entrepreneurship, innovation and enterprise. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 23(6), 767–773. 10.1017/jmo.2018.4.
- Mintzberg, H., Simons, R., & Basu, K. (2002). Beyond selfishness. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, Fall, 67–74.
- Mitacs (2019). Mathematics of information technology and complex systems. Retrieved on 20 August 2019 from <https://www.mitacs.ca/en>.
- Morcom, L. A. (2017). Indigenous holistic education in philosophy and practice, with wampum as a case study. *Foro de Educación*, 15(23), 121–138. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14516/fde.572>.
- Morgan, K. (2006). Decision-support tools and the Indigenous paradigm. *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers – Engineering Sustainability*, 159(4), 169–177. 10.1680/ensu.2006.159.4.169.
- Mulligan, W., Mulligan, L., & Kimberley-Ward, N. (2004). *He mahi, he ritenga hei whakatinana i te tūrua pō 2004: Case studies: Māori organisations, business, governance & management practice*. Wellington, New Zealand: Te Puni Kōkiri and Federation of Māori Authorities.
- Murphy, P. J., & Coombes, S. M. (2009). A model of social entrepreneurial discovery. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 87(3), 325–336. 10.1007/s10551-008-9921-y.
- National Aboriginal Economic Development Board (2015). *The Aboriginal Economic Progress Report 2015*. Gatineau, Quebec: The National Aboriginal Economic Development Board. Retrieved on 29 December 2019 from <http://www.naedb-cndea.com/reports/NAEDB-progress-report-june-2015.pdf>.
- Onondaga Nation (2019). Two Row Wampum – Guswenta. Retrieved on 20 August 2019 from <https://www.onondaganation.org/culture/wampum/two-row-wampum-belt-guswenta/>.
- Peltier, C. (2018). An application of two-eyed seeing: Indigenous research methods with participatory action research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 17(1). 10.1177/1609406918812346.
- Peredo, A. M., & McLean, M. (2013). Indigenous development and the cultural captivity of entrepreneurship. *Business & Society*, 52(4), 592–620.
- Petrie, H. (2002). *Colonisation and the involution of the Māori economy*. Paper presented at the Session 24 XIII World Congress of Economic History, 20–28 July, 2002, Buenos Aires, Argentina. Retrieved on 29 December 2019 from <http://news.tangatawhenua.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/10/24Petrie75.pdf>.
- Pinto, L. E., & Blue, L. E. (2017). Aboriginal entrepreneurship financing in Canada: Walking the fine line between self-determination and colonization. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 9(1), 2–20.
- Polanyi, K. (1944). *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time* (1st edn). New York: Farrar & Rinehart.
- Preston, J. (2015). Canada. In C. Mikkelsen & S. Stidsen (Eds.), *The Indigenous World 2015* (pp. 48–57). Copenhagen, Denmark: The International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA).
- Ritsema, R., Dawson, J., Jorgensen, M., & Macdougall, B. (2015). “Steering our own ship?” An assessment of self-determination and self-governance for community development in Nunavut. *Northern Review* (41), 157–180.
- Rowett, J. L. (2018). Etuaptmuk: A research approach and way of being. *Antistasis*, 8(1), 54–62.
- Russell, G. (2009). *The Indigenous Peoples’ Declaration*. Paper presented at the AGAPE Consultation on Poverty, Wealth and Ecology in Asia and the Pacific, Chiang Mai, Thailand.
- Russo, M. V., Earle, A. G., Lahneman, B. A., & Tilleman, S. G. (2015). *Geography, Personal Values, and Hybrid Companies*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Proceedings, Vancouver, BC, Canada.
- Schaniel, W. C. (1985). *The Maori and the economic frontier: An economic history of the Maori of New Zealand, 1769–1840* (Dissertation presented for the Doctor of Philosophy in Economics), University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.
- Scrimgeour, F., & Iremonger, C. (2004). *Maori sustainable economic development in New Zealand: Indigenous practices for the quadruple bottom line*. Hamilton, New Zealand: University of Waikato.
- Sengupta, U., Vieta, M., & McMurtry, J. J. (2015). Indigenous communities and social enterprise in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Nonprofit and Social Economy Research*, 6(1), 104–123.

- Smith, G. H., Tinirau, R. S., Gillies, A., & Warriner, V. C. A. (2015). *He mangōpare amohia: Strategies for Māori economic development*. Whakatāne, New Zealand: Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangī.
- Spencer, R., Brueckner, M., Wise, G., & Marika, B. (2017). Capacity development and Indigenous social enterprise: The case of the Rirratjingu clan in northeast Arnhem Land. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 23(6), 839–856. 10.1017/jmo.2017.74.
- Spiller, C., Pio, E., Erakovic, L., & Henare, M. (2011). Wise up: Creating organizational wisdom through an ethic of Kaitiakitanga. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 104(2), 223–235. 10.1007/s10551-011-0905-y.
- Statistics Canada (2019). Aboriginal peoples in Canada: Key results from the 2016 Census. Retrieved on 31 August 2019 from <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/171025/dq171025a-eng.htm?indid=14430-1&indgeo=0>.
- Stats NZ (2017). Māori population estimates: At 30 June 2017. Retrieved on 29 December 2019 from [https://www.stats.govt.nz/information-releases/maori-population-estimates-at-30-june-2017?gclid=CjwKCAjwzdLrBRBiEiwAEHrAYo32bZJO54ntYfix3Rcymh5SnipveaJSAUqb0RfixdpYI45yLewHzuBoC0iQQAvD\\_BwE](https://www.stats.govt.nz/information-releases/maori-population-estimates-at-30-june-2017?gclid=CjwKCAjwzdLrBRBiEiwAEHrAYo32bZJO54ntYfix3Rcymh5SnipveaJSAUqb0RfixdpYI45yLewHzuBoC0iQQAvD_BwE).
- Te Puni Kōkiri (2011). *Case studies: Tuaropaki Trust*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.
- Tinirau, R. S. (2017). *Te Kura i Awarua: Understanding, valuing and practising tikanga in Māori businesses and organisations* (Doctor of Philosophy), Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (2015). *Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future: Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. Canada: Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.
- Turner, D. (2006). *This is Not a Peace Pipe: Towards a Critical Indigenous Philosophy*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- UNDP (2012). *Indigenous Voices in the Asia Pacific: Identifying the Information and Communication Needs of Indigenous Peoples*. Bangkok, Thailand: Asia-Pacific Regional Centre United Nations Development Programme.
- UNDP (2014). *Human Development Report 2014: Sustaining Human Progress: Reducing Vulnerabilities and Building Resilience*. New York: United Nations Development Programme.
- United Nations (2010). *UN Global Compact Management Model: Framework for implementation*. Retrieved on 29 December 2019 from [https://www.unglobalcompact.org/docs/news\\_events/9.1\\_news\\_archives/2010\\_06\\_17/UN\\_Global\\_Compact\\_Management\\_Model.pdf](https://www.unglobalcompact.org/docs/news_events/9.1_news_archives/2010_06_17/UN_Global_Compact_Management_Model.pdf).
- United Nations (2013). *A business reference guide: United Nations declaration on the rights of Indigenous peoples*. Retrieved on 29 December 2019 from [https://www.unglobalcompact.org/docs/issues\\_doc/human\\_rights/IndigenousPeoples/BusinessGuide.pdf](https://www.unglobalcompact.org/docs/issues_doc/human_rights/IndigenousPeoples/BusinessGuide.pdf).
- United Nations (2015). *Indigenous Peoples, Indigenous Voices: Who are Indigenous Peoples*. New York, NY, United States: United Nations.
- Verbos, A. K., Gladstone, J. S., & Kennedy, D. M. (2011). Native American Values and management education: Envisioning an inclusive virtuous circle. *Journal of Management Education*, 35(1), 10–26.
- Waa, P., & Love, M. (1997). The pre-European Maori economy. In J. Deeks & P. Enderwick (Eds.), *Business and New Zealand Society* (pp. 15–32). Auckland, New Zealand: Longman Paul.
- Walker, R. (1990). *Ka whawhai tonu matou: Struggle Without End*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- Walker, R. (2004). *Ka whawhai tonu matou: Struggle Without End* (2nd edn). Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- Walters, F., & Takamura, J. (2015). The decolonized quadruple bottom line: A framework for developing indigenous innovation. *Wicazo Sa Review*, 30(2), 77–99.
- Watene, K. (2016). Valuing nature: Māori philosophy and the capability approach. *Oxford Development Studies*, 44(3), 287–296. 10.1080/13600818.2015.1124077.
- Wilson, K., & Henderson, J. (2014). *First Peoples: A Guide for Newcomers*. Retrieved on 29 December 2019 from <https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/First-Peoples-A-Guide-for-Newcomers.pdf>.
- Wood, G. J., & Davidson, M. J. (2011). A review of male and female Australian indigenous entrepreneurs: Disadvantaged past–promising future? *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 26(4), 311–326.
- World Bank (2018). World Bank national accounts data, and OECD national accounts data files: GDP (current US\$). Retrieved on 29 December 2019 from <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=IW&view=chart>.

Wuttunee, W. (2004). *Living Rhythms: Lessons in Aboriginal Economic Resilience and Vision* (Vol. 37). Montreal, QC, Canada: McGill-Queen's Press.