DECOLONIZING THE BUSINESS SCHOOL: RECONSTRUCTING THE ENTREPRENEURSHIP CLASSROOM THROUGH INDIGENIZING PEDAGOGY AND LEARNING

CHRISTINE WOODS
KIRI DELL
BRIGID CARROLL
University of Auckland

Decolonization is an ongoing process of addressing power imbalances and knowledge hierarchies that require critical self-reflection from those teaching in business schools today (Joy & Poonamallee, 2013; Smith, 2012). As educators, if we are to take decolonizing seriously, we must create space for Indigenous Peoples to reconnect and engage with their own knowledge systems and ways of knowing. We present a teaching and learning case in entrepreneurship that explores an indigenizing process that makes visible Indigenous knowledge frameworks, practices and language in a business school classroom. Drawing on the suggestions from extant literature that research examining business school education should include micro-level studies, we examine the use of a virtual learning platform by Indigenous students engaged in entrepreneurship education. Three specific questions are addressed: (a) What might indigenizing look like? (b) How is learning created that supports active indigenizing practices? and (c) What is the role of the business school educator in the indigenizing journey? In answering these questions, we explore how Indigenous knowledge and wisdom can thrive alongside Western knowledge in a decolonized business school, and, in so doing, be part of the wider movement of decolonization of academia and society.

Kia rangona te mātauraga Māori i roto i te whare ākoranga pakihi. Me tuwheratia e nga kaiako he wāhanga kia rongohia nga ākonga. Me wetewetehia ngā herenga o te ao Pākeha. Ma tēnei, ka puāwai ngā whakaaro Māori.*

The challenges of addressing the legacy of colonization are gaining increased attention from management scholars, including researchers publishing in this journal (Abreu-Pederzini & Suárez-Barraza, 2020; Darley & Luethge, 2019; Kothiyal, Bell, & Clarke, 2018). Scholars have recognized the presence of power imbalances and knowledge hierarchies and

---

* Tēnei whakarapopoto hei tauawhi te whakatinana, te whakakite i Te Reo Māori horapa ki te ao.

argued that processes leading to colonization are still present today, perpetrating a form of intellectual colonization (Banerjee & Prasad, 2008; Jack & Westwood, 2011; Joy & Poonamallee, 2013). Specifically, knowledge that forms the core of the curriculum in Western business schools tends to suppress or deny alternative knowledge(s) from women, minorities, and Indigenous Peoples (Joy & Poonamallee, 2013).

Intellectual colonization is acutely felt by Indigenous students and scholars. Most are expected to leave their indigeneity "at the gates of the academy" (Kuokkanen, 2007: 2) as universities have "marginalized, ignored, erased, segregated and minimised Indigenous peoples, worldviews, and pedagogies" (Sasakamoose & Pete, 2015: 3). Decolonization is an interconnected process of deconstructing colonial ideologies and associated power structures *and* creating space for Indigenous ways of knowing, being, and doing (Fellner, 2018). Indigenizing is therefore an important part

of the decolonizing process, focused on restoring the Indigenous voice as dominant colonial narratives are challenged and removed so that Indigenous students, teachers, and researchers see themselves and their communities at the center of the academy, not relegated to the periphery (Smith & Smith, 2018).

As with other parts of the academy, Indigenous contexts are almost uniformly unacknowledged by mainstream theories of entrepreneurship and the teaching of entrepreneurship in business schools (Bruton, Zahra, & Cai, 2018; Dana, 2015). Thus, while there is widespread recognition of the importance of entrepreneurship education (EE) given its role in economic growth, social change, and future progress (see also Rauch & Hulsink, 2015; Zahra, Newey, & Shaver, 2011), the curriculum does not speak to issues, challenges, and possibilities encountered by Indigenous communities given the U.S.-centric, Western model on which the curriculum is founded. Not just in entrepreneurship studies, but in all disciplines is the issue of "what matters and for whom-specifically" (Hindle & Moroz, 2010: 361). While Indigenous Peoples and educators have started to challenge the homogenous nature of the curriculum, calls from within the academic mainstream have also been made to broaden the nature, scope, and variety of entrepreneurship "beyond the dominant U.S. model" (Bruton et al., 2018: 358) to explore the rich variety of entrepreneurship found globally and make "greater use of indigenous theoretical foundations, not simply transplanting the U.S. model and theory to other settings" (Bruton et al., 2018: 353).

We use entrepreneurship as a case study of indigenizing the curriculum: the creation of an Indigenous educational experience drawing on Indigenous knowledge frameworks, practices, and language. We argue that Indigenous pedagogies are foundational when developing and designing business school curricula for Indigenous students; these pedagogies validate existing knowledge and can produce new knowledge for both educator and student. We follow the suggestion by Pettigrew and Starkey (2016) that research exploring business school education should include micro-level studies that explore a diversity of practices, contexts, and cultures where business school educators and communities interface. We examine an entrepreneurship course offered to Māori students completing a postgraduate qualification in Māori Development at the University of Auckland Business School. Māori have a long history of entrepreneurial activity that enabled both settlement in

Aotearoa New Zealand and support of early settlers (Petrie, 2006). We highlight a specific pedagogical framework found in Māoridom—*ako*. We describe our study, outlining our research setting and the specific micro-level interactions that serve to answer the research questions that explore the practices and spaces of Indigenous EE in a business school setting.

Specifically, we examine how three classes of Indigenous (Māori) adult students worked together on a virtual learning platform to understand entrepreneurship and explore its relevance for their culture and community. We aim to answer the following three research questions:

1. What might indigenizing look like?
2. How might learning be created that supports active indigenizing practices in the business school?
3. What is the role of the business school educator in the indigenizing journey?

We begin by first exploring the broader decolonizing call in regard to business schools, before providing a more detailed understanding of indigenization. Our specific entrepreneurship case study and research setting are discussed before we detail the methodology used that provides the Indigenous learning practices and ways of knowing articulated in our findings. Our discussion addresses each of the research questions, providing a model of how to indigenize the entrepreneurship classroom.

DECOLONIZING THE BUSINESS SCHOOL

Framing this inquiry to decolonize the business school is a broader call within the academy to address the legacy of colonialism through "intellectual decolonization" (Moosavi, 2020: 1; see also Mbembe, 2016). This call is built on "histories of resistance" that have confronted colonialism for generations, challenging "the highly selective narrative of traditional academia" whereby Western knowledge is understood as universal knowledge (Pimblott, 2020: 211, 213; see also Smith, 2012). Contemporary debates regarding intellectual decolonization have seen mounting pressure to decolonize the curriculum and make visible those who have been excluded and engage with diverse experiences, epistemologies, and approaches to learning (Mbembe, 2016; Pimblott, 2020).

A specific challenge for business school educators and students alike in the decolonizing journey is to allow space in the curriculum to "see their own

privilege" (Fotaki & Prasad, 2015: 570) and to reflect on the problematic nature of the "taken-for-granted" assumptions that underpin neoclassical economics and in turn neoliberal capitalism. These include the primacy of individualism, self-interest, and the pursuit of wealth creation through profit maximization and economic growth. As we argue below, nowhere is this better typified than in entrepreneurship courses that "lionize the lone hero entrepreneur" who is "tacitly assumed to be male and white and dis-embedded of the social context" (Fotaki & Prasad, 2015: 565). A curriculum based on this neoliberal ideology dominates Western forms of education, a path to "the American Way," first exported to Europe just after the World War II and then to countries in Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean, the first being India in 1959 (Joy & Poonamallee, 2013). The business school model has been uncritically transferred directly from the "US center" to "the periphery," with little to no adaptation to take account of unique contextual dynamics (Abreu-Pederzini & Suárez-Barraza, 2020; Darley & Luethge, 2019; Fotaki & Prasad, 2015; Frenkel, 2008; Joy & Poonamallee, 2013; Kothiyal et al., 2018).

Various suggestions have been made regarding how educators can respond to the challenges of continuing intellectual colonization. These include broadening the curriculum to account for context in textbooks and case studies, and the use of experiential and participatory teaching methods (Joy & Poonamallee, 2013; Fotaki & Prasad, 2015). At an institutional level, developing minority and Indigenous PhD programs, opening conferences to decolonized learning, and linguistic diversity in publication are all encouraged (Kothiyal et al., 2018). We note, however, that these appear to offer largely pedagogically technical answers to what are in fact larger political and cultural issues. The focus still remains on the concerns and experience of the center and their attempts to "add on" the knowledge and experience of those at the periphery, rather than to recenter the curriculum to validate knowledge systems other than the dominant Western worldview. While calls have been made "to refrain from being the expert" (Joy & Poonamallee, 2013: 410), the center still determines who and what is deemed expert knowledge. More critically, we note that these answers assume that Western institutions and educators hold the decolonizing power and mandate. While not wanting to disincentive such entities from both being reflective and active in recognizing and dismantling colonizing dimensions of education, we do wish to draw attention to the invisibility of those at the periphery, and especially Indigenous Peoples

yet again. Such invisibility points to the need for both context and process to be reimagined and reworked in the classroom. To do this, those at the periphery need to be given the opportunity to engage with knowledge systems that are specific to their own cultural contexts.

Indigenizing the curriculum is one such opportunity. We define Indigenizing as a process that "expands the academy's still-narrow conceptions of knowledge to include Indigenous perspectives in transformative ways" (Gaudry & Lorenz, 2018: 218; see also Kuokkanen, 2007; Sasakamoose & Pete, 2015; Smith & Smith, 2018). As stated above, the process of decolonization is one that makes explicit colonial domination and the hierarchies of power and privilege that have perpetuated harm to Indigenous people across multiple generations, and continues today. Through this acknowledgment, space is created for the academy to honor and engage with Indigenous ways of knowing, being, and doing. With Indigenous knowledge at the center, Western frameworks, tools, and techniques can then be drawn on to help advance Indigenous communities where and when appropriate (Fellner, 2018; Smith, 2012).

In exploring Indigenizing as a process, Gaudry and Lorenz (2018) outlined the following: (a) Indigenous inclusion, (b) reconciliation indigenization, and (c) decolonial indigenization. Indigenous inclusion is a starting point for universities seeking to engage with Indigenous communities: here the academy maintains its existing structures while building awareness and understanding with Indigenous students and faculty. Educators are still working to "resist being steamrolled by globally recognized 'best practices' or policies" (Seremani & Clegg, 2016: 181), and must constantly work to create space in the curriculum for Indigenous educators and staff to see themselves and the experiences of their community. The add-on suggestions above would sit here. Reconciliation indigenization sees universities advocate for an increased presence of Indigeneity in the academy. Common ground is built between Indigenous and Western ideals that seeks a reconciliation between Western-derived knowledge and Indigenous knowledge, a back-and-forth dialogue between worldviews. Decolonial indigenization sees the university fundamentally transformed with educational sovereignty regained and control of programs returned to Indigenous peoples, be they faculty or communities. Gaudry and Lorenz (2018: 224) noted the ambitious reach of decolonial indigenization, but added that its articulation "is an important step in realizing more

transformative aspirations" held by Indigenous communities.

In summary, an indigenizing process

> turns the academy and its classroom into sacred spaces, sites where Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars interact, share experiences, take risks, explore alternative modes of interpretation and participate in a shared agenda, coming together in a spirit of hope, love and shared community. (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008: 16)

We now turn to discuss our specific illustration of this process, and in so doing provide a micro-instance of indigenizing within the broader movement of the decolonization of academia and society.

INDIGENIZING ENTREPRENEURSHIP: A CASE STUDY ILLUSTRATION

We begin by positioning case study in this inquiry as "not a methodological choice but a choice of what is to be studied" (Stake, 2005: 443), and, in our context, a choice to study a distinctive teaching and learning course orientated toward indigenizing processes. Thomas (2011: 512) argued that such a choice means that a case study is characterized by "parameters of particularity [that] are set by spatial, temporal, personal, organizational, or other factors." Consequently, we do include here substantive sections on our specific "parameters of particularity," especially the Māori program and teaching and learning contexts for the course that is the focus of our case study. In selecting one case study site we are aiming for a case study illustration that is intensive, with "detail, richness, completeness, and … depth" (Flyvbjerg, 2011: 301).

This case study is directed by phronesis and abduction, where we understand phonesis as practical knowledge and abduction as inference or "everyday generalisation" (Thomas, 2011: 577). The combination of both begins with a "mystery" or surprise, and proceeds through inquiry into provisional exploration. The mystery in our empirical material was learning practices that seemed to defy Western frameworks; the inquiry is the identification and naming of those practices using a decolonizing framework, and the provisional exploration has resulted in a provisional mapping of student-led indigenizing activity. A case study directed by phronesis and abduction "thus offers an example from which one's experience, one's phronesis, enables one to gather insight or understand a problem" (Thomas, 2011: 578). What we are aiming for from this case study is "concrete, context-dependent knowledge" (Flyvbjerg, 2011: 302). Such

knowledge is not generalizable in the positivist sense of the word but exemplary, meaning that while the knowledge is embedded in one distinctive context it is "malleable and interpretable in the context of [other] experience" (Thomas, 2010: 11). Thus, we aim to speak into other contexts undergoing decolonizing processes and requiring indigenizing activity. We start this case study, therefore, by outlining EE and Indigenous entrepreneurship, before turning to our specific teaching and learning context.

Historical Overview of Entrepreneurship Education in Business Schools

The academic foundations of EE were formed in the United States (Bruton et al., 2018) with the first course in entrepreneurship offered at Harvard Business School in 1947 (Katz, 2003; Nabi, Liñán, Fayolle, Krueger, & Walmsley, 2017). Writing in the first academic journal focused on entrepreneurship, *American Journal of Small Business* (later renamed *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*), leading entrepreneurship educator Jeff Timmons (1978) noted that more than 100 universities offered courses in entrepreneurship. Combined with the publication of entrepreneurship textbooks and the recent formation of an Academy of Management interest group, EE was seeing significant academic growth. From the 1980s onwards this growth continued, with the field developing and maturing (Fayolle, 2008; Katz, 2003; Pittaway & Cope, 2007). By 2016, this growth had been realized: EE programs were offered at more than 3,000 institutions, with an increasing number of academic publications, including 11 entrepreneurship journals deemed medium- and high-ranking by the Association of Business Schools (Harvey, Kelly, Morris, & Rowlinson, 2010; Morris & Liguori, 2016).

Initially, EE was focused on educating "about" entrepreneurship: students were taught about the history, principles, and practices of entrepreneurship, with a focus on opportunity recognition and new venture creation (Pache & Chowdhury, 2012). As EE has matured, the focus has shifted to include educating "for" entrepreneurship: providing students with the skills and behaviors characteristic of entrepreneurial individuals. Broadly speaking, EE is "oriented specially at business creation and growth and more generally comprises a teaching model … to encourage enterprising individuals through the development of entrepreneurial competencies," including those present in the entrepreneurial mindset (Nabi, et al., 2017: 457; see also Patzelt, Williams, & Shepherd, 2013).

However, while EE has proliferated, there is no consensus on the best way to teach entrepreneurship (Fayolle, 2008; Kuratko, 2005; Pache & Chowdhury, 2012).

Critiques of EE have included the argument that programs have been built on a foundation epitomizing individuality, autonomy, and a need for achievement where self-actualization underpins action. Material wealth is the measure of success. Given this foundation, educators often fail or struggle to acknowledge and take account of social, cultural, economic, and spiritual differences that are found in diverse settings (Bae, Qian, Miao, & Fiet, 2014; Bruton et al., 2018; González-López, Pérez-López, & Rodríguez-Ariza, 2018; Nabi et al., 2017). The emergence of academic research in social and community entrepreneurship and associated education programs has gone some way to address these limitations (Haugh, 2007; Pache & Chowdhury, 2012; Peredo & Chrisman, 2006; Yunxia, Rooney, & Phillips, 2016). However, some have argued that the underlying worldview of entrepreneurship, be it social or commercial, does not transfer to different cultural contexts. Peredo and McLean (2010: 592) viewed this as "the cultural captivity of entrepreneurship": mainstream theories of entrepreneurship that are firmly rooted in a neoliberal, capitalist ideology (Dana, 2015) are incompatible with the community, place-based context of opportunity that emerges from Indigenous peoples who have suffered, and are still suffering, the effects of colonization.

The Emergence of Indigenous Entrepreneurship as a Field

To address this cultural captivity, Indigenous entrepreneurship is developing as a distinct disciplinary field emerging from mainstream entrepreneurship scholarship and Indigenous development literature (Hindle & Moroz, 2010; Peredo & Anderson, 2006; Tapsell & Woods, 2010). In answering the question regarding "what matters and for whom-specifically" (Hindle & Moroz, 2010: 361), the importance of community and their associated cultural, social, and spiritual values must be given prominence. Compared to the focus on the individual entrepreneur and gain in the form of profit, "the multiple aspects of community strongly affect any Indigenous entrepreneurship process" (Hindle & Moroz, 2010: 372). As entrepreneurship educators and scholars, we cannot therefore take entrepreneurship and simply add a prefix of "Indigenous"—or in our specific context, "Māori"—and expect to engage with the

knowledge and experience of these communities (Woods, 2011). EE epitomizes this situation, with the invisibility perhaps more keenly experienced given the successful historical engagement in entrepreneurial activity by Indigenous communities (Peredo & McLean, 2010; Petrie, 2006; Tapsell & Woods, 2010).

Within EE there have been calls to explore different pedagogical methods, as well as the context-specificity of EE (Nabi et al., 2017; Pittaway & Cope, 2007). We believe that Indigenous pedagogies can enrich business disciplinary topics. Pettigrew and Starkey (2016: 659) called for models of practice "based on working relationships and networks with user communities, based on notions of exchange beneficial to all parties and adopting a process of co-production between these parties." Others have noted the need to engage with a variety of stakeholders to be "cocreators of valued management knowledge, theory and practice" (Anderson, Hibbert, Mason, & Rivers, 2018: 425).

Case Study Context

Our case draws from one specific Indigenous community: Māori, the Indigenous Peoples of Aotearoa New Zealand. According to the 2018 national census, Māori comprise 16.5% of ethnicities in New Zealand, representing the second largest ethnic group in the country after European New Zealanders—or *Pākehā*, the Māori term for this group (Statistics New Zealand, 2018). At the time of British settlement, material wealth for Māori was vested in natural resources such as land, waterways, flora, and fauna. As a result of colonization, the associated challenges of war, acts of parliament, land sales, and confiscations, Māori were systematically alienated from their economic livelihood and were left "bereft of their land, language, culture and mana" (Henry, 2007: 547; see also Kawharu, 1977). However, while there are ongoing issues of significant inequality between Māori and non-Māori across all socioeconomic indicators, there has been a burgeoning resurgence in the Māori economy over the past three decades. Following a period of economic redress by the Crown (through the Aotearoa New Zealand Government) to tribal communities, and the reemergence of entrepreneurial activities by Māori enterprise, the Māori economy has grown significantly, valued at NZ$50 billion in assets—an increase of NZ$20bn over the past decade (Hitchcock, 2019). This growth is testament to the determination and resolve of this community in the face of discrimination, disenfranchisement, and the trauma of colonization. Despite increasing interactions of the two

cultures, many Maori institutions and the values that underpin them still remain quite distinct from their *Pākehā* counterparts.

Māori business school education. The Post Graduate Diploma in Business in Māori Development is a dedicated Māori-centered study program taught at the University of Auckland Business School. Aimed at mature Māori students in the workforce, the first cohort started in 1993 as a direct response to requests from local Māori communities for business education. It was an opportunity to "cast the net" into communities where access to tertiary education had been limited. The program was designed to provide leaders engaged in Māori business development with a range of traditional, current, and future-orientated, practical business and management skills, and was considered an international "first" in terms of its attempts to reach out to Indigenous Peoples. The program now has graduates throughout Aotearoa New Zealand and internationally.

Running over two years (part time), the program comprises eight courses including: Accounting, Governance & Management, Legal studies, Marketing, Māori Entrepreneurship, Māori Society, Quantitative Analysis, and Strategic Planning. Each paper is taught over a 10-week quarter one evening a week. The cohort is mostly Māori, with some Pasifika students.[1] Entry requires a minimum of two years' work experience at middle-management level, or an undergraduate degree from a recognized university or equivalent professional level qualification. The students tend to come from a range of backgrounds that include community organizations, tribal institutions, and corporate management. This means that a range of students come from Māori-centric-styled management while some are situated in more Western-dominated management styles. The staff vary from year to year, with half the courses taught by Māori academics, the others by *Pākehā* (non-Māori). The Māori entrepreneurship course we describe below was cotaught by an Indigenous Māori educator and a non-Indigenous *Pākehā* educator; both coauthored this article.

Course: Te Whakapakari Huanga Māori: Māori entrepreneurship. Our challenge as educators designing and teaching this course was to engage fully in the historical, social, and cultural context of Māori entrepreneurship, and in so doing not merely "tack on"

---

[1] Pasifika describes people living in Aotearoa New Zealand who have migrated from the Pacific Islands or who identify with the Pacific Islands because of ancestry or heritage.

Māori to the Western canon of entrepreneurship (Woods, 2011). To do this we engaged with *ako*, a Māori pedagogy, simultaneously defined as teaching and learning. Reciprocal learning is central to this approach (Pere, 1994), and "the teacher does not have to be the fountain of all knowledge" (Bishop, 2008: 443). Indeed, the teacher can (and should) often be the learner. The role of the teacher is "to create contexts for learning where the students can enter the learning conversation": student learning is understood as "knowledge-in-action," rather than "learning about" as is more common in the transmission model of learning (Bishop, 2008: 443).

Central to this pedagogy is the concept of *whakapapa*: a Māori value system promoting belonging through relationships, enhancing connections between people and places and acknowledgment of the interconnected nature of the world. In contrast to Western education where the individual is the sole entity of success, *ako* is knowledge that seeks the wider interests of the collective group. Knowledge, from this epistemological position, tries to locate phenomena by connecting it to previous or existing knowledge. As Māori scholars Durie and Hermansson, (1990: 5) have confirmed, the "direction of Māori thought and feeling attempts to find meaning in bigger pictures and higher-order relationships." *Whakapapa* places a lens on the world that organizes, interprets, and explains all phenomena as having a source, connected through relationships.

In keeping with a "back and forward dialogue" between Western and Indigenous knowledge, this course includes both mainstream, Indigenous, and Māori perspectives on entrepreneurship. Learning outcomes for the course focus on students engaging with academic theory and practice via case studies and the evaluation of opportunities from both a cultural and commercial perspective. Commercial viability is explored using mainstream frameworks such as the Timmons model (Timmons & Spinelli, 2007) and Business Model Canvas (Blank, 2013), and supporting financial statements such as break-even analysis. Associated readings are presented that outline the theoretical thinking behind such frameworks and the role of the entrepreneur and the entrepreneurial process. Scholarship that provides a Māori perspective for exploring entrepreneurship is presented at the start of the course. This includes culturally relevant narratives of entrepreneurship (Keelan & Woods, 2006), the role of the Māori entrepreneurial teams (Henare, Lythberg, Nicolson, & Woods, 2017), and a Māori framework for innovation (Kawharu, Tapsell, & Woods, 2017; Tapsell & Woods, 2010).

Case study data. Students are tasked with writing a series of entries that record how they make sense of what is presented during a course. In particular, students can explore their response to contradictions, challenges, and insights regarding the curriculum and their own values, beliefs, and experiences (O'Connell & Dyment, 2011). This case drew from three years of class blogging encompassing a total of 76 students. We liken blogging to reflective learning journals, which are commonly used in management education (Dyer & Hurd, 2016; Gray, 2007). Blogging offers a similar opportunity, with the marked difference that the reflections are shared, given that ownership of the blog is collective (Duarte, 2015; Olofsson, Ola Lindberg, & Eiliv Hauge, 2011; Philip & Nicholls, 2009) and hosted on a virtual learning platform to facilitate shared learning between students. The use of digital technologies like blogging is increasingly being used by Indigenous communities as part of the wider decolonizing movement (Keegan & Sciascia, 2018; Rodan & Mummery, 2018). Reasons for this include the opportunity to engage with others in their community, participate in global Indigenous issues, and provide opportunities for self-representation not present in mainstream media.

In keeping with an *ako* approach, this platform creates a space for shared online conversations, where students can engage with peers to work through challenges in a culturally appropriate way. This online version of the assessment is optional and students can complete an individual reflective journal if so wish.[2] Between six to 10 entries are expected during the 10-week course, plus at least six responses to posts by other students. While there is no maximum word limit, it is expected that each post will be at least 250 words. Response lengths can vary. In total, 454 posts from three cohorts of students are analyzed in this paper: 26 students in 2016, 26 in 2017, and 24 in 2018.

Decolonizing as a Methodology

To align with the lived context of our students, we honored the call to decolonize, with indigenizing providing one answer to this call. Fortunately, as scholars from Aotearoa New Zealand we were able to draw on the seminal work of Māori scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith. With over 20,000 Google scholar citations, *Decolonizing Methodologies* (2012) has provided a foundational guide to indigenizing research for the Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholar alike from

around the globe, with the publication of the first edition in 1999 described as a "watershed moment in Indigenous scholarship" (Louie, Poitras Pratt, Hanson, & Ottmann, 2017: 22). And while this work serves as a guiding framework for Indigenous research specifically, we believe it offers a way of indigenizing pedagogical practice in the business school by engaging with and validating Indigenous experiences, knowledges, and epistemologies. Smith (2012: ix) argued that a decolonizing methodology puts the attention on "the context in which research problems are conceptualized and designed," with an understanding of "research as an institution of knowledge that is embedded in a global system of imperialism and power." A journey of decolonizing demands a high degree of vigilance, reflexivity, and humility from researchers and, while we have endeavored to live to such values, our work together exposed many moments where the two non-Indigenous authors were faced with the need to recognize our own colonial assumptions, cultural differences, and researcher privilege. Thus, establishing our methodological approach entailed crossing backward and forward to both Indigenous and Western methods, weaving between the two non-Indigenous and the Indigenous Māori authors, where strengths of each methodological body of knowledge was allowed to come forward, and be tried, tested, debated, accepted, or retired if necessary.

We now turn briefly to outline our initial approach to the data. As outlined above, we had access to three years of postings from 76 students associated with the course. We transferred these to a Word document, which enabled us to work with hundreds of postings. We adopted a content analysis approach in categorizing each posting as a learning practice. Such analysis was initially informed by conversational framework developed by Diana Laurillard (2002, 2012). Laurillard framed learning as a conversation between teacher and students, with iterative movement between the teacher's conceptualization and students' understanding. The conversational framework involved a host of learning practices, including acquiring, inquiring, producing, practicing, discussing, and collaborating. These learning practices were initially used to code each posting. The advantages of Laurillard's conversational framework was its focus on collaborative learning, where teachers or educators and students share responsibility, and cocraft the process and output. This, we believed, would align with the *ako* pedagogy with its focus on peer learning. Some of the learning practices were present, which meant that initial application seemed promising. However, the array of

---

[2] In the three years examined, only one student provided an individual reflective journal.

practices evident in our posting extended well beyond those mentioned in the Laurillard framework. Any posting that could not be coded according to this framework was placed in a separate file and given a provisional title, such as "narration of myth" or "identity work." On completion of this initial coding all learning practices—from both the framework and the separate file—were listed from frequent to infrequent. To our surprise, the practices not mentioned in the Laurillard framework clustered at the top of the "frequent" end of the list.

Our initial attempts to work with the empirical material illustrated a number of the "procedure traps" that Smith (2012), drawing on the work of Stuart Hall (1992), identified. The first is the tendency "to characterize and classify societies into categories," and the second is condensing "complex images of other societies through a system of representation" (Smith, 2012: 44). Our "fall" into such traps was a critical point in our movement toward a decolonizing methodology. Our critical reflection quickly led to the realization that we had used a Western framework that, regardless of its contemporary nature and initial compatibility, was constructed on exclusively Western philosophical understandings of learning. More specifically, we saw that, despite our best intentions, our analysis was "embedded in the multiple layers of imperial and colonial practices" and reliant on "systems of classification, representation and evaluation" that were not responsive to the richness and wealth of learning practices evident in the actual empirical material (Smith, 2012: 2).

Consequently, we turned to Smith's (2012) 25 Indigenous projects agenda. These include projects that reclaim, remember, restore, and celebrate lost histories and cultural practices. Denzin and Lincoln (2008: 16) stated that these projects "embody a pedagogy of hope and freedom" whereby Indigenous knowledge and cultural practices are central to transforming communities and addressing the pedagogies of colonization that are present in the academy. Indigenous educators use these practices in the classroom to reflect Indigenous values and orientations (Louie et al., 2017). We reanalyzed all the empirical material and were able to name the practices (what Smith [2012] called projects) originally stored in the separate file and rename many of the other postings from the framework file. When we placed the practices in a second frequency list; the 14 practices presented in the Findings section emerged as the most frequent and we engaged with these as learning practices used by students to make sense of this course.

FINDINGS: LEARNING PRACTICES AND WAYS OF KNOWING

While each of these practices can stand alone, common themes emerged that we clustered together into four ways of knowing: conceptual, cultural, political, and relational. Clustering is never an exact science, but we constructed the clusters on the following logic:

- Conceptual ways of knowing: Practices related to formulating concepts, abstractions, or intellectual constructs such as definitions or theory.
- Cultural ways of knowing: Practices centrally evoking Indigenous or Māori myths, legends, stories, rituals, and values.
- Political ways of knowing: Practices related to creating alternative and emancipatory frames and actions for past, present, and future.
- Relational ways of knowing: Practices evoking connection or the state of being in relation to others, land, nature, and artifacts.

We discuss each of these and the associated practices in turn below. Please note that we have used names of native Aotearoa New Zealand birds in place of student names.

Conceptual Ways of Knowing

Conceptual ways of knowing reflect a space where students redefine and retheorize entrepreneurship from a Māori worldview. Under an *ako* pedagogy students ascribe new language, understandings, and constructions on imported Western entrepreneurship constructs. The students engaged in a powerful reworking of the entrepreneurship concept and discourse through three practices, as presented in Table 1: theory-making, reframing, and naming.

The Theory-Making column shows a "conversation" among three blog participants where they "play" theoretically with entrepreneurship as resistance, protest, and protection, creating alternative schools of Māori entrepreneurship theory that redirect entrepreneurship to have more relevance for current Indigenous realities. Kōtare shows a more overt challenge to Western conceptual thinking where the predilection for categorizing ("urban Māori," "social entrepreneur") is critiqued as a form of "societal labeling" that is "imposed." The writer opens up the possibility of

TABLE 1
Conceptual Ways of Knowing

Theory-Making	Reframing Kōtare	Naming Piwaiwaka
A: Is my behavior entrepreneurial, have I gone rogue or am I merely bucking the status quo? B: From what you described I think you have makings of a great protestor, I mean protector. Coming up with creative ways to say "*anei*, this is how it should be done" or shouldn't it? C: I do believe we have discovered two more Māori entrepreneurship theories … 1) entrepreneurs gone rogue & 2) entrepreneurial protestors	Reflecting on our essay and what I believe constitutes a Māori entrepreneur, I reached a point where I actually thought it necessary to delve in to what it means to be Māori. I do not self-identify as an urban Māori. A closer lens over the labeling of an entrepreneur—we have the likes of a social entrepreneur, an indigenous entrepreneur, a Māori entrepreneur, and a kaupapa Māori entrepreneur, all which are subject to societal labeling. So in light of the term "urban Māori", by whose frameworks are we defined when examining what is it is to be a Māori entrepreneur? Is it by self-identification or by yet another label imposed on us?	Entrepreneurship. We used to say this at school… "on to it" many years ago, and recently I hear "cracked it". I cannot help thinking of all the other terms we use when we are dancing around or on the fringes of entrepreneurial thought. We just do not use this word on a day to day basis. Due to the difficulties in its definition and lack of clarity I guess that is predictable that in terms of application…it is probably is safer to avoid using it? I know I will not be using it outside of this class, and if I am it will be because I am discussing this class!

reframing both Māori and entrepreneur through querying "whose frameworks" structure the very act of defining such terms. Piwaiwaka rejects the use of the word "entrepreneurship" (except in association with this university course) so as to better invite other names "we use when dancing around or on the fringes of entrepreneurial thought."

Through engaging with conceptual ways of knowing, students rework entrepreneurship for a Māori world. They claim the right to rename, reframe, and retheorize the disciplinary constructs developed with Western scholarship, but speak to practices that predate colonization.

Cultural Ways of Knowing

Cultural ways of knowing captures the adoption and acceptance of a changing world, and represents how Māori incorporate this change into their reality. The representing strand combines Western and Māori perspectives through four practices: testimonies, storytelling, remembering, and connecting. A common pedagogical tool used by Māori involves blending mythical narratives with new phenomena to gain understandings of a dynamic and changing world (Lee, 2009). Such myths and narratives in the Māori world are a source of pride, identity, and courage for their communities. Previous knowledge about ancestors, mythical stories, and cultural narratives are drawn from, and re-presented by, the

storyteller(s) to bring new knowledge about a topic. The four practices include revitalizing and rejuvenating, envisioning, creating, and discovering the beauty of our Māori knowledge (see Table 2).

In these examples, the trickster stories of Maui are used to recreate entrepreneurship from a Māori perspective. For those unfamiliar with the stories, Maui is a Pacific hero whose endeavors and adventures include taming the sun; catching the fish Te Ika a Maui, the North Island of Aotearoa New Zealand; and discovering fire. Maui represents opportunity, creative pursuits, and innovative behavior, making him an iconic entrepreneur who Māori identify with to see themselves as entrepreneurial. Data samples reveal how students re-present foundational Indigenous narratives and heroic myths (in this case, Maui legends) through, as Kiwi writes "the lens of entrepreneurship." Through ancestral narratives, a construct like entrepreneurship is claimed by these students. The re-representing provides a platform for Māori to engage both theoretically and practically with the entrepreneurship construct. Tui reveals the difference between claiming a construct as an origin narrative, as opposed to "borrowing" a construct from other narratives. Through the Maui legends, entrepreneurship is accepted and invited into her reality. Maui allows the students to link themselves to entrepreneurship, because, as Tui informs us, it is "in our DNA, our whakapapa (ancestry) and our narratives." She further informs us that the challenge

TABLE 2
Cultural Ways of Knowing

Revitalizing and Rejuvenating Tui	Envisioning Pūkeko
Māori Are Entrepreneurial! Something I believe as Māori we have possessed long before Maui slowed down Tamatera... I think it is expressed in our DNA, our whakapapa and our narratives however the challenges has been to pull the narratives out from the land of mythology, mainstream media and colonization. The challenge internally I have is to then take this definition and rewrite my own scripts in recognizing the value of aku tipuna.	The point is, that Maui, the demi-god provides us mere mortals a starting point and god-like standards, (and I'm speaking of the positive ones here) that would force us to move from our comfort zone into a different zone. If in our humaness we measure ourselves against the "higher standards" and fall short, wouldn't that set us up to fall above our norm? And is that a bad thing? Just thinking...
Creating **Kiwi**	**Discovering the Beauty of our Knowledge** **Riroriro**
I fully understand the benefits of using traditional stories to inspire one's thinking and possibilities and how in turn that can develop the Māori entrepreneur. And even more so our tamariki. Young people are in a natural phase of creativity and thinking and like I was, are drawn to stories and narratives like that of Maui. Using these stories to not only identify the entrepreneurial behaviors Maui exhibited, but to understand how we might interpret some of those behaviors through the lens of an entrepreneur. As Maui did when it came to the sun racing across the sky, he asked the question why? And not being content with status quo, devised a thorough plan that utilized new technologies to achieve his goal.	Firstly, for me is that it is acknowledging our ancestor Maui and incorporating it with entrepreneurship has augmented his memory and mana, but that is only my opinion. The placing of a traditional story at the center of inquiry into indigenous entrepreneurship is a genius. With their analysis, while breaking each component into distinct divisions, with an explanation concerning the way of life today, is also a positive and genius way of getting Māori like me to see it more clearly.

(for Indigenous People) has been finding a space "to pull out these narratives that enables a personal and collective rewriting." Riroriro reveals how the pedagogy of utilizing mythical and historical narratives is "a positive and genius way of getting Māori like me to see … more clearly."

Once claimed, entrepreneurship is given the ability here to catalyze new futures. Pūkeko sees a "starting point" and "god-like standards" to aspire to that help move past the status quo and "comfort" into "a different zone"; that is, "above our norm." Kiwi articulates a "natural phase of creativity" inspired by an ancient figure who harnesses the sun to help his people flourish on earth. There is a sense of disruptive innovation in this excerpt, with a desire to move beyond "the status quo" and adopt "new technologies." The representing strand is connected by positivity, life, energy, and possibility.

Political Ways of Knowing

Political ways of knowing refers to student attempts to draw from the past, from a time when Māori society was untainted by colonization, to make authentic assessments of the relevance of concepts such as entrepreneurship. Three practices form this strand—representing, critical rereading, and intervening—as summarized in Table 3.

Kākāpō challenges typical notions of individual, profit-seeking entrepreneurial behavior to reinterpret entrepreneurship as resistance. He creates an image of historical resistance fighters as astute entrepreneurs, early adopters of new technologies, and quick adapters of change. In this picture, entrepreneurial traits are "innate," given their "phenomenal rate" of "seeing an opportunity and exploiting it."

Karoro revises the metanarrative of history from an Indigenous perspective to maintain authentic Indigenous practices, stating: "Indigenous persons want to participate in the current capitalist society, by adopting the economic method of organizing, but they aspire to retain their social method of organizing." Takahē represents such participation in the intervening practice, where he initiates a venture of "talking pou" (signposts and markers that tell the cultural origins and signs of a space), which ultimately requires the coming together of digital, virtual, tribal, and commercial partners around culture and ancestry to operationalize. His entrepreneurial role becomes one of facilitator, intermediary, and catalyst.

Relational Ways of Knowing

Relational ways of knowing asserts a Māori identity within the entrepreneurship discipline that cannot be adequately captured by logical-deductive learning formats but rather requires narrative forms that speak to interrelation and complexity, as the four practices reflect. Fundamental constructs such as self, identity, and psyche are not held "within" any

TABLE 3
Political Ways of Knowing

Representing Kākāpō	Critical Rereading Karoro	Intervening Takahē
I too often marvel at the vision of our tūpuna and their ability to forecast opportunity. Hongi Hika, Hone Heke, Te Ruki Kawiti, Patuone and so on. In the early to mid-1800s Māori were building businesses and trading at a phenomenal rate due to their ability to learn and utilize new tools and technologies. This coupled with their innate entrepreneurial characteristics and knowledge of the resources around them ensured Māori were great business people with an eye for not only spotting opportunity but capitalising on that. As Hongi did. Seeing an opportunity and exploiting it. What a genius, what a visionary.	For indigenous populations to preserve their indigenous frameworks, and remain authentic to their values, participation in the global economy has to be on their terms. As yet, it is opaque whether it is possible for indigenous entrepreneurs to effectively participate at the intersection between the indigenous and Western world. Primarily, a homogenous group of persons established the current capitalist society; these persons have a shared economic and social method of organizing. Indigenous persons want to participate in the current capitalist society, by adopting the economic method of organizing, but they aspire to retain their social method of organizing.	It started as a simple idea. Sharing my own culture through "Talking Pou". I've seen a talking monument on Bribie Island, when on holiday, and the idea haunted me. It was a simple beautiful wooden monument, with a button to press and when pressed, you could hear the history of the place. It became complicated, when I had to decide on the best digital platform. Finally, I got to recognize the complexity of the business environment. I create environments that allow patterns to emerge; I increase levels of interaction and communication; I use methods that can help generate ideas and co-creation of value.

single individual but "between" humans, objects, and spaces or places (see Table 4).

The students in the relational ways of knowing strand are wrestling with identity work. Such identity work marks the ceaseless questioning of who we are individually, relationally, and collectively. It is not a question that can be answered from solely a "philosophical and academic" place, as one post states.

TABLE 4
Relational Ways of Knowing

Testimonies Tiotio	Storytelling Putangitangi
As is true for many Māori, I was the first in my whānau to go to university. I was blessed with having a supportive working-class parents who instilled in my sister and I that we would go onto higher education. I acknowledge that I have white-passing privilege. The point being, for a fair-skinned Māori kid, it is hard to know where you fit in the world sometimes. But also, I want to acknowledge that I was bereft of the more insidious racial discrimination that is too often inflicted on our people. I wanted to share this backstory because it helps to illustrate that the world of academia was alien to both of my parents, and later, burgeoning with adolescence, I had no familial or institutional knowledge to call upon as I started university.	So we went for a spot of fishing on our boat one day. Had an assortment of bait, different size hooks, sinkers, fishing line, rods & reels—everything was primed to catch the big one. Within half an hour I got a strong tug on my rod. For a moment there I toyed with my line but it didn't seem to give. This to and fro lasted 15 minutes. I figured whatever I had caught grabbed my bait and made a dash for the rocks. I felt it go from tense to release and quickly reeled in my line to re-bait, and guess what I found ... a huge octopus tentacle snagged on my keeper hook. Just goes to show, if its got the smarts and figures out how to make good of an opportunity, even an octopus can be an entrepreneur.
Remembering Ruru	**Connecting Kawau**
When I thought of Entrepreneurship—I tried to be philosophical and academic. However, I felt the need to reflect on my childhood. Remembering my Australian mother, bringing up 5 Māori children on her own. I would follow and watch her, so thoughtfully make our piu piu for the local kapa haka group. Firstly, cutting the harakeke with the local Māori women, scraping the moka so cautiously and burying the finished product in the mud. What has this to do with entrepreneurship you say—well it's part of the journey of realization, connection and the resilience one acquires to navigate the racial divides to stand strong in both worlds.	I used to hunt with my Dad from kindergarten age and not on a truck, we were on a horse. His love and respect for Kuia and Kaumatua is strong, just like mine. He has a connection to the land and sea, which is also my downfall. With all his busyness and away all the time, I always said I'll never be like Dad. Well well well ... looks like I ended up like him without even noticing. The governance of a marae and the goings-on that happen there. How you need to manage yourself and the way you react to a last-minute occurrence. I am starting to realize that I was surrounded and brought up around all the good stuff that can be amalgamated and utilized to help turn me into a MĀORI ENTREPRENEUR.

TABLE 5
Understanding Entrepreneurship from a Māori worldview

Māori Pedagogy	Ways of Knowing	Learning Practices	Outcomes or Purposes of Learning Practices
Ako to teach and to learn	Conceptual ways of knowing	Theory-making Reframing Naming	Redefinition Retheorization Relanguaging Reconstruction Recalibration (between indigenizing knowledge and Western discipline constructs)
	Cultural ways of knowing	Revitalizing and rejuvenating Envisioning Creating Discovering beauty of our knowledge	Identification Collective sharing (of knowledge) Representation Retelling or restorying Blending of (indigenizing knowledge and Western phenomena)
	Political ways of knowing	Representing Critical rereading Intervening	Resistance Challenge Emancipation Reimagination Enactment Self-determination
	Relational ways of knowing	Testimonies Storytelling Remembering Connecting	Recognition Identity work Self-positioning Relationship-building Feeling or emotion work Context-embedding Claiming of being-in-the-world

The extent of identity work across these blogs reflects that entrepreneurship, where it was claimed at all, tended to be claimed as a form of relational "being," of connection, rather than individual "doing."

The four practices presented in Table 4 position entrepreneurship in relation to bodies, spaces, artifacts, and others. They reject the classic Western individualistic, psychological, and cognitive meta-narrative, with its tendencies to isolate, internalize, and privilege phenomena. Testimonies and storytelling are related practices but are differentiated by the formality of the former and colloquialism of the latter. Testimonials are a form of witnessing considered both as evidential and as a form of collective memory (Smith, 2012: 145). They are generally delivered as monologues within ritualistic contexts. The excerpt we have here is of course online, but has something of the testimonial style and intent. While an excerpt from a much longer posting, Tiotio talks about his background, childhood, parental influence, and education. Testimonials often reference pain and loss, which can cross both the individual and collective; this blogger talks about the identity struggles of being a "fair-skinned Māori kid" and not knowing "where you fit in the world." Contrast this with the casual, lighter storytelling excerpt of unexpectedly catching an octopus tentacle and the recognition that an "octopus can be an entrepreneur" as it gives up a tentacle for the consumption of bait. Remembering and connecting share the narrative logic of both testimonies and storytelling. Remembering connects new concepts—in this case, entrepreneurship—to embodied moments in space and time. In the remembering excerpt, entrepreneurship is deeply embedded in memories of childhood and an Australian mother who learns how to prepare her daughter for *Kapa haka* (Māori cultural performances) through "realization, connection and … resilience." Likewise the connecting excerpt references the blogger in relation to his dad, his grandparents (*Kuia* and *Kaumatua*), childhood activities (hunting), and love of "land and sea." He sees such connections as forming an abundant resource for entrepreneurship.

DISCUSSION

At this point in the paper we wish to return to our three research questions on the nature of indigenizing,

the learning that supports indigenizing, and the role of the business school educator in indigenizing. While we have engaged deeply with one case study and specific Indigenous frameworks, we hope to speak to a more generalized universal Indigenous experience, and, most of all, the decolonized business school regardless of location.

The four ways of knowing empirically derived from the data speak to our first research question to offer what indigenizing might look like in the classroom. It is important to "show" indigenizing in action and not simply "tell," for both non-Indigenous and Indigenous Peoples alike. Non-Indigenous educators need to acknowledge the sheer depth, complexity, expansiveness, and power of Indigenous ways of knowing, and engage with this knowledge in dialogue with established Western knowledge(s). Indigenous Peoples need to see their ways of knowing validated, legitimized, and articulated in academic outlets, such as this journal, that seek to test, challenge, and pioneer management education and learning into the future. We are also aware that many Indigenous students, both in Aotearoa New Zealand and globally, have been disconnected from their knowledge frameworks and may have limited access to their own pedagogies, language, and culture. Indigenizing any curriculum will be a massive challenge when so many Indigenous communities come from successfully colonized spaces. Table 5 summarizes the process we engaged with students to understand entrepreneurship from a Maori worldview. Representing indigenizing in action visibly, as we do here, marks an attempt to invite and encourage other such forums and spaces everywhere. The four ways of knowing provide a possible cartography for such attempts, and we outline the contribution each makes below.

Conceptual ways of knowing involve practices of theory-making by the student at a conceptual level. This involves claiming the right to rename, reframe, and retheorize the constructs that have largely grown within the province of Western scholarship and its academic and economic structures. The theoretical challenge is how to reinterpret entrepreneurship within a knowledge system that honors social methods of organizing and practicing entrepreneurship not found in the capitalist market economy or in our theoretical conversations in the academy.

Political ways of knowing reflect a critical and emancipatory engagement with knowledge structures. The learning practices here center on countering the colonial perspective: learning practices go further than simply revising interpretations of the Indigenous Peoples within history to articulating the metanarrative of history from an Indigenous perspective. Political ways of knowing include intervening, critical rereading and representing, carving out space to address the colonization narratives that are dark and divisive, and challenging and resisting the oppression and separation of people from land, language, and culture. Political challenges exist for all Indigenous Peoples, and the political ways of knowing vary depending on the historical context of colonization.

Cultural and relational ways of knowing both speak to the questioning of who Indigenous Peoples are individually, relationally, and collectively. Entrepreneurship, where it was claimed at all, tended to be claimed as a form of relational "being," of connection, rather than individual "doing." Identity work is an inevitable part of the indigenizing process and speaks to cultural ways of knowing. Cultural ways of knowing provide hope and promise through revitalization and (re)discovering cultural knowledge. They draw on an intrinsically relational worldview that overwhelmingly rejects the entitative. People are always in relation to others, artifacts, and contexts; individuals are defined in relation to collectives, ancestry, and land. Such a web of relationality cannot be adequately captured by logical-deductive learning formats but rather requires narrative forms that speak to interrelation and complexity.

In summary, the indigenized entrepreneurship classroom sees a privileging of Indigenous voices and ways of knowing. Engaging with Indigenous entrepreneurship in the decolonized classroom allows students "to express an indigenous spirit, experience or world view" that honours their experience and understanding of entrepreneurship (Smith, 2012: 152). The four ways of knowing confirm that entrepreneurship should not be captive to Western notions of opportunity recognition and new venture creation. Indigenous histories of innovation and trading and the associated cultural practices need to inform both the study and practice of entrepreneurship.

How such learning might be created (our second research question) and the role of the educator (our third research question) is far from simple, however. There are insights and strategies for both that our empirical study offers. Turning first to the how of indigenizing, our example points to the importance of learning spaces and forums where indigenizing processes can be invited, nurtured, protected, and sustained. The virtual learning platform assessment described here is an illustrative example. Such a

space and forum can engage tangibly with issues of whose voice is being represented, where an Indigenous voice can even inhabit a decolonized institution, classroom, and program, and how such a voice can be located at the center of learning (as opposed to being "tacked on" to the voice of the mainstream curriculum). The virtual learning platform engages students in the activity of writing, encouraging students "to use language in ways that capture the messages, nuances and flavour of Indigenous lives" (Smith, 2012: 151). Different mediums are used by Indigenous peoples to express their stories in their own words, including poetry, fiction, nonfiction, plays, and songs. To this we can add the digital medium of blogging: "Blogging … can create a space where First Nations People can play, explore, create, debate, rant and vent, satirise and philosophise the world in which we live" (Aboriginal blogger Watego, as cited in Rodan & Mummery, 2018: 26).

The above is possible given that the posts to the virtual learning platform were not bound by the academic traditions of writing essays, reports, or case studies: references were not needed and links to oral traditions were encouraged. Conversations were built by students through post and response in a virtual space that connected with the specifics of Māori knowledge and the theoretical content of the course. These conversations were shared, acknowledging the collective benefit and coconstruction of knowledge, "demystifying knowledge and information and speaking in plain terms" (Smith, 2012:162). Students engaged with each other to question, clarify, and elaborate their understanding of Māori entrepreneurship as distinct from mainstream entrepreneurship. Metaphorically, each post was a thread of knowledge woven together by students into a collective basket of knowledge. Students were also invited to share this platform with family and friends, who could read the posts and share in the learning experienced from the course. The platform remains online after the course has ended, so that knowledge from one cohort of students can be shared with the next. In essence, then, creating learning that supports indigenizing practices revolves around cocrafting spaces, forums, formats, and assessments that free students from Western learning conventions, norms, and strictures and opens up resistance, dissent, holism, play, and connection. Turning back to the decolonizing example at the heart of this inquiry, at a minimum such learning requires spaces and dialogue where students can (a) accept or reject offered theories, (b) deconstruct and recreate their own theories, (c) experiment with different mediums of expression, (d) practice Indigenous ways or processes of discussing and sharing dialogue, and (e) be allowed to examine their histories and traditions to find their own heroes and exemplars.

The role of the educator in indigenizing is both simple and, given the institutional and pedagogical power of the academic voice, hugely demanding. First, the educator needs to allow the student to engage with their own Indigenous frameworks; the prime role of the educator is to create the space for them to do that. While this does involve normative educator activity such as creating course outlines, organizing access to learning technologies, and setting writing assessments, the mindset underpinning such activity will be challenging for many given that such a mindset is one of stepping back and "bystanding," rather than taking charge and leading learning. The "educator as a bystander" becomes a learner of Indigenous ways. Their role is not to engage with Indigenous knowledge directly—once they have created the space for it to happen, their role is to get out of the way of its development and momentum. In the entrepreneurship course from which the empirical material was drawn, the Indigenous educator entered the blog infrequently, and only in support of student statements or out of a genuine curiosity and seeking further learning. The non-Indigenous educator did not enter the blog at all but did consistently acknowledge its power and her own learning from it in face-to-face spaces with students. Both consequently stepped into the *ako* space of teacher as learner, but in different ways. Such reflexive bystanding enables educators, both non-Indigenous and Indigenous, to begin to be able to allow the trauma associated with colonization to be voiced, and to support movement toward the healing that needs to take place.

We conclude by acknowledging the challenge faced by Indigenous students in navigating the work of the academy, engaging with Western knowledge, and being active in the decolonizing we have outlined. We draw on an Indigenous metaphor to describe this process, two-eyed seeing, to help us draw together the different strands of this inquiry: the decolonized business school, Indigenous ways of knowing, the role of the educator, and the indigenizing experience.

> Two-eyed seeing is a gift of multiple perspective treasured by many aboriginal peoples and … refers to learning to see from one eye with the strength of Indigenous knowledge and ways of knowing, and from the other eye with the strength of Western

knowledges and ways of knowing, and to use both these eyes together, for the benefit of all. (Bartlett, Marshall, & Marshall, 2012: 335)

The image of weaving is consistent with the "back-and-forth dialogue" discussed earlier, and the need to recognize Indigenous knowledge as a distinct and whole knowledge system that is equal alongside the Western canon and able to challenge the cultural captivity of entrepreneurship (Jack & Westwood, 2011; Peredo & McLean, 2010; Smith, 2012). Māori have been deft, agile, and successful entrepreneurs from before the start of their shared history with *Pākehā* settlers (Petrie, 2006). While the academic version of entrepreneurship is predominantly Western-derived, given the opportunity students readily connected entrepreneurship to a Māori worldview. Māori *whānau* (family) and community, and their associated cultural, social, and spiritual values, thus find their place alongside or within entrepreneurial mindset, opportunity, and commercial resilience. The combing of Western understanding and practices of entrepreneurship and the rediscovery of Indigenous knowledge and ways of learning offer an initial invitation for change and transformation in the learning space with the hope that this will, in time, extend to Indigenous communities themselves.

We believe we have designed a template that other educators can use to indigenize their classrooms. In the indigenized classroom, the educator works to deliberately place Indigenous voices and knowledge at the center, where space is created for relevant, Indigenous-focused learning. Key to this process is engagement with Indigenous pedagogy (Smith, Tuck, & Wang, 2018) and refraining from being the expert. This will allow space for their own knowing to come from the Indigenous students. The virtual learning platform created an opportunity for students to use digital technology to engage with the knowledge of their fellow students and the material presented in the course. The use of blogging and the virtual platform provided an example of how technology can decolonize the classroom through the operationalized transference of "expert power" from the "all-knowing expert teacher" to the student working virtually in collaboration with other Indigenous students. This transfer allowed the students to make connections to and form relationships with the concepts offered from their own worldview. The students engaged with, discarded, and incorporated relevant knowledge into their lived realities. In this way, a blending or synergy between Western academic knowledge and Indigenous worldviews emerged, as

seen from the micro interactions presented in the virtual platform conversation.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

If we understand colonization as a process of systematic separation and disconnection, then decolonization, and the particular process of indigenizing, is about connection and reconnection. It requires a constant reflecting inwards on how imposed values, concepts, and practices constantly remove and separate Indigenous Peoples from existing, acting, and living as Indigenous. Indigenizing in the classroom is about creating space for Indigenous Peoples to reconnect with their own knowledge systems: creating educational spaces to engage with and regenerate Indigenous ways of knowing. Drawing on *ako* and associated Indigenous concepts provides insight into the data, giving explanation to, and deeper meaning behind, the student digital interactions, and frames our example within a decolonized learning space in Indigenous, rather than in Western, terms. The articulation of Māori ways of knowing adds richness and new insights that speak to the lived experience of the students. The four ways of knowing and associated practices offer an opportunity to reframe both the teaching and learning experience in the classroom.

We of course are not seeking a total rejection of Western research, theory, and knowledge. Rather, the "interconnected restoration" (John, 2019: 8) of Indigenous Peoples to their cultures, languages, and knowledge systems is central to reshaping the academy (Smith, 2012). Each learning practice discussed provides space for the students to connect or reconnect with Indigenous ways of knowing and to engage with the particular business discipline of entrepreneurship. The indigenizing journey unsettles and disrupts separate expert educator roles. Indigenous pedagogies give voice to a learning dynamic where teaching and learning become interchangeable between educators, students, and the spaces, objects, and others in their worlds. This reverses colonized power over Indigenous voices. The learning practices and their application can go some way to mapping learning, where Indigenous knowledge and wisdom can find a place alongside Western knowledge in the decolonized business school as part of Indigenous inclusion and reconciliation.

Finally, it does not escape our notice that the process of writing this article demanded two-eyed seeing from us as authors, researchers, and teachers—initially

in striving to construct a space where our students could truly engage and connect with the material. We sought to honor voice and silence as an intentional coteaching dynamic, while recognizing the richness and sophistication our students invested into the discipline. Finally, the opportunity to reach for an Indigenous methodology when we met the limits of our Western research repertoire further enabled the voice of the Indigenous author to maintain the cultural values central to this research. Such a process is a testament to the enrichment indigenizing brings not just our Indigenous students but all business school stakeholders and the wider academy.

REFERENCES

Abreu-Pederzini, G. D., & Suárez-Barraza, M. F. 2020. Just let us be: Domination, the postcolonial condition, and the global field of business schools. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 19: 40–58.

Anderson, L., Hibbert, P., Mason, K., & Rivers, C. 2018. Management education in turbulent times. *Journal of Management Education*, 42: 423–440.

Bae, T. J., Qian, S., Miao, C., & Fiet, J. O. 2014. The relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions: A meta-analytic review. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 38: 217–254.

Banerjee, S., & Prasad, A. 2008. Introduction to the special issue on "Critical reflections on management and organizations: A postcolonial perspective." *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, 4: 90–98.

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: 331–340.

Bishop, R. 2008. Te Kotahitanga: Kaupapa Māori in mainstream classrooms. In N. Denzin, Y. Lincoln, & L. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies*: 439–458. Thousand Oaks, CA.: SAGE Publications.

Blank, S. 2013. Why the lean start-up changes everything. *Harvard Business Review*, 91: 63–72.

Bruton, G. D., Zahra, S. A., & Cai, L. 2018. Examining entrepreneurship through Indigenous lenses. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 42: 351–361.

Dana, L. 2015. Indigenous entrepreneurship: An emerging field of research. *International Journal of Business and Globalisation*, 14: 158–169.

Darley, W. K., & Luethge, D. J. 2019. Management and business education in Africa: A post-colonial perspective of international accreditation. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 18: 99–111.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. 2008. Introduction: Critical methodologies and Indigenous inquiry. In **N. Denzin, Y. Lincoln, & L. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies***. Thousand Oaks, CA.: SAGE Publications.

Duarte, P. 2015. The use of a group blog to actively support learning activities. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 16: 103–117.

Durie, M., & Hermansson, G. 1990. Counselling Maori people in New Zealand [Aotearoa]. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling*, 13: 107–118.

Dyer, S. L., & Hurd, F. 2016. "What's going on?" Developing reflexivity in the management classroom: From surface to deep learning and everything in between. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 15: 287–303.

Fayolle, A. 2008. Entrepreneurship education at a crossroads: Towards a more mature teaching field. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 16: 325–337.

Fellner, K. D. 2018. Embodying decoloniality: Indigenizing curriculum and pedagogy. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 62: 283–293.

Flyvbjerg, B. 2011. Qualitative case studies. In N. Denzin,& Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed.): 301–316., Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.

Fotaki, M., & Prasad, A. 2015. Questioning neoliberal capitalism and economic inequality in business schools. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 14: 556–575.

Frenkel, M. 2008. The multinational corporation as a third space: Rethinking international management discourse on knowledge transfer through Homi Bhabha. *Academy of Management Review*, 33: 924–942.

Gaudry, A., & Lorenz, D. 2018. Indigenization as inclusion, reconciliation, and decolonization: Navigating the different visions for indigenizing the Canadian Academy. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 14: 218–227.

González-López, M. J., Pérez-López, M. C., & Rodríguez-Ariza, L. 2018. Clearing the hurdles in the entrepreneurial race: The role of resilience in entrepreneurship education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 18: 457–483.

Gray, D. 2007. Facilitating management learning: Developing critical reflection through reflective tools. *Management in Education*, 38: 495–517.

Hall, S. 1992. The west and the rest: Discourse and power. In B. Gieben, & S. Hall (Eds.), *Formations of modernity*: 276–320. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press and Open University.

Harvey, C., Kelly, A., Morris, H., & Rowlinson, M. 2010. *The Association of Business Schools academic*

quality guide version 4. Retrieved from https://www.kimep.kz/files/downloads/The_Association_of_Business_Schools.pdf

Haugh, H. 2007. Community-led social venture creation. ***Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice***, 31: 161–182.

Henare, M., Lythberg, B., Nicolson, A., & Woods, C. 2017. Te Ohu Umanga Māori: Temporality and intent in the Māori entrepreneurial team. In C. Ben-Hafaïedh, & T. Cooney (Eds.), **Research handbook on entrepreneurial teams: Theory and practice**: 208–230. Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar.

Henry, E. 2007. Kaupapa Māori entrepreneurship. In L. Dana, & R. Anderson (Eds.), ***International handbook of research on Indigenous entrepreneurship***: 536–548. Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar.

Hindle, K., & Moroz, P. 2010. Indigenous entrepreneurship as a research field: Developing a definitional framework from the emerging canon. ***The International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal***, 6: 357–385.

Hitchcock, J. 2019, March. The $50 billion Māori economy is nowhere big enough. ***The Spinoff***. Retrieved from https://thespinoff.co.nz/atea/05-03-2019/the-50-billion-maori-economy-is-nowhere-big-enough/

Jack, G., & Westwood, R. 2011. Colonialism and postcolonialism. In M. Tadajeski, P. Maclaran, E. Parsons, & M. Parker (Eds.), ***Key concepts in critical management studies***, 46–49. Thousand Oaks, CA.: SAGE Publications.

John, K. D. 2019. Animals. In D. Ford (Ed.), *Keywords in radical philosophy and education*: 7–18. Boston, MA: Brill | Sense.

Joy, S., & Poonamallee, L. 2013. Cross-cultural teaching in globalized management classrooms: Time to move from functionalist to postcolonial approaches? ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 12: 396–413.

Katz, J. A. 2003. The chronology and intellectural trajectory of American entrepreneurship education: 1876–1999. ***Journal of Business Venturing***, 18: 283–300.

Kawharu, H. 1977. ***Maori land tenure: Studies of a changing institution***. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

Kawharu, M., Tapsell, P., & Woods, C. 2017. Indigenous entrepreneurship in Aotearoa New Zealand: The takarangi framework of resilience and innovation. ***Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy***, 11: 20–38.

Keegan, T., & Sciascia, A. 2018. Hangarau me te Māori: Māori and technology. In G. Leoni, L. Paterson, M. Ratima, M. Reilly, P. Rewi, & S. Duncan (Eds.), ***Te Kōparapara: An Introduction to the Māori World***: 359–371. Auckland, N.Z.: Auckland University Press.

Keelan, J., & Woods, C. 2006. Mauipreneur: Understanding Māori entrepreneurship. **International Indigenous Journal of Entrepreneurship, Advancement, Strategy and Education,** vol. 2: 1–20.

Kothiyal, N., Bell, E., & Clarke, C. 2018. Moving beyond mimicry: Developing hybrid spaces in Indian business schools. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 17: 137–154.

Kuokkanen, R. 2007. **Reshaping the university: Responsibility, *Indigenous* epistemes, and the logic of the gift.** Vancouver, Canada: UBC Press.

Kuratko, D. F. 2005. The emergence of entrepreneurship education: Development, trends, and challenges. ***Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice***, 29: 577–597.

Laurillard, D. 2002. ***Rethinking university teaching: A conversational framework for the effective use of learning technologies*** (2nd ed.). London, U.K.: Routledge.

Laurillard, D. 2012. ***Teaching as a design science: Building pedagogical patterns for learning and technology***. Routledge.

Lee, J. 2009. Decolonising Maori narratives: Purakau as a method. ***MAI Review***, 2: 1–12.

Louie, D. W., Poitras-Pratt, Y., Hanson, A. J., & Ottmann, J. 2017. Applying indigenizing principles of decolonizing methodologies in university classrooms. ***Canadian Journal of Higher Education***, 47: 16–33.

Mbembe, A. 2016. Decolonizing the university: New directions. ***Arts and Humanities in Higher Education***, 15: 29–45.

Moosavi, L. 2020. The decolonial bandwagon and the dangers of intellectual decolonisation. ***International Review of Sociology***, 30: 1–23.

Morris, M., & Liguori, E. 2016. Preface: Teaching reason and the unreasonable. In M. Morris, & R. Liguori (Eds.), **Annals of entrepreneurship education and pedagogy**: xiv–xxii. Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar.

Nabi, G., Liñán, F., Fayolle, A., Krueger, N., & Walmsley, A. 2017. The impact of entrepreneurship education in higher education: A systematic review and research agenda. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 16: 277–299.

O'Connell, T., & Dyment, J. 2011. The case of reflective journal: Is the jury still out? ***Reflective Practice***, 12: 47–59.

Olofsson, A. D., Ola Lindberg, J., & Eiliv Hauge, T. 2011. Blogs and the design of reflective peer-to-peer technology-enhanced learning and formative assessment. ***Campus-Wide Information Systems***, 28: 183–194.

Pache, A.-C., & Chowdhury, I. 2012. Social entrepreneurs as institutionally embedded entrepreneurs: Toward a new model of social entrepreneurship education.

Academy of Management Learning & Education, 11: 494–510.

Patzelt, H., Williams, T. A., & Shepherd, D. A. 2013. Overcoming the walls that constrain us: The role of entrepreneurship education programs in prison. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 13: 587–620.

Pere, R. R. 1994. *Ako: Concepts and learning in the Maori tradition*. Wellington, N.Z.: Te Kohanga Reo National Trust Board.

Peredo, A., & Chrisman, J. 2006. Toward a theory of community-based enterprise. *Academy of Management Review*, 31: 309–328.

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

Peredo, A. M., & McLean, M. 2010. Indigenous development and the cultural captivity of entrepreneurship. *Business & Society*, 52: 592–620.

Petrie, H. 2006. *Chiefs of industry: Māori tribal enterprise in early colonial New Zealand*. Auckland, N.Z.: Auckland University Press.

Pettigrew, A., & Starkey, K. 2016. From the guest editors: The legitimacy and impact of business schools—Key issues and a research agenda. **Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 15: 649–664.

Philip, R., & Nicholls, J. 2009. Group blogs: Documenting collaborative drama processes. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 25: 683–699.

Pimblott, K. 2020. Decolonising the university: The origins and meaning of a movement. *The Political Quarterly*, 91: 210–216.

Pittaway, L., & Cope, J. 2007. Entrepreneurship education: A systematic review of the evidence. *International Small Business Journal*, 25: 479–510.

Rauch, A., & Hulsink, W. 2015. Putting entrepreneurship education where the intention to acts lies: An investigation in to the impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial behaviour. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 14: 187–204.

Rodan, D., & Mummery, J. 2018. *Activism and digital culture in Australia*. London, U.K.: Rowman & Littlefield International.

Sasakamoose, J., & Pete, S. M. 2015. Towards indigenizing university policy. **Education Matters: The Journal of Teaching and Learning***, 3. https://journalhosting.ucalgary.ca/index.php/em/article/view/62922

Seremani, T. W., & Clegg, S. 2016. Postcolonialism, organization, and management theory: The role of "epistemological third spaces." *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 25: 171–183.

Smith, G. H., & Smith, L. T. 2018. Doing Indigenous work: Decolonizing and transforming the academy. In E. A. McKinley & L. T. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of Indigenous education*: 1074–1101. Singapore: Springer.

Smith, L. 2012. *Decolonising methodologies* (2nd ed.). London, U.K.: Zed.

Smith, L. T., Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. 2018. *Indigenous and Decolonizing Studies in Education: Mapping the Long View*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Stake, R. E. 2005. Qualitative case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.): 443–466. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Statistics New Zealand. 2018. *Māori ethnic group*. Retrieved from https://www.stats.govt.nz/tools/2018-census-ethnic-group-summaries/m%C4%81ori

Tapsell, P., & Woods, C. 2010. Social entrepreneurship and innovation: Self-organisation in an Indigenous context. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 22: 535–556.

Thomas, G. 2010. The case: Generalisation, theory and phronesis in case study. *Oxford Review of Education*, 37: 21–35.

Thomas, G. 2011. A typology for the case study in social science following a review of definition, discourse, and structure. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 17: 511–521.

Timmons, J., & Spinelli, S. 2007. *New venture creation: Entrepreneurship for the 21st century* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Timmons, J. A. 1978. Characteristics and role demands of entrepreneurship. *American Journal of Small Business*, 3: 5–17.

Woods, C. 2011. Reflections on pedagogy: A journey of collaboration. *Journal of Management Education*, 35: 154–167.

Yunxia, Z., Rooney, D., & Phillips, N. 2016. Practice-based wisdom theory for integrating institutional logics: A New model for social entrepreneurship learning and education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 15: 607–625.

Zahra, S. A., Newey, L. R., & Shaver, J. M. 2011. Academic advisory boards' contributions to education and learning: Lessons From entrepreneurship centers. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10: 113–129.

───────────⋀⋀───────────

Christine Woods (cr.woods@auckland.ac.nz) is a professor in entrepreneurship in the University of Auckland Business School. She teaches entrepreneurship at the undergraduate and master's level and Māori entrepreneurship, a component of the Postgraduate Diploma in Māori Business. Her research interests include entrepreneurship education, Māori entrepreneurship,

SME and family business, social entrepreneurship, and decolonization.

Kiri Dell (Ngāti Porou; k.dell@auckland.ac.nz) is a lecturer at the University of Auckland Business School. She teaches in Māori entrepreneurship and Māori economy at the postgraduate level, and Māori land issues at undergraduate level. Her research areas are in Indigenous economic development with a particular focus in Māori land. She explores research from a lens of Indigenous knowledge and methodologies.

Brigid Carroll (b.carroll@auckland.ac.nz) is a professor at the University of Auckland Business School, and holds the Fletcher Building Employee Education Fund Chair in Leadership. She teaches in the area of leadership, organizational theory, and qualitative research methods. Ongoing research themes revolve around identity work, power and resistance, leadership development, distributed and collective leadership and discursive and narrative approaches.

————ᐱᐱ————