Entrepreneur & Innovation Exchange
Published online at EIX.org on September 11 2026
DOI: 10.32617/1470-6aa3ff9b89e68

What Rural Entrepreneurs Can Learn From New Zealand's Economic Reinvention

Jamie D. Collins (Tarleton State University)

KEYWORDS: Entrepreneurship, rural entrepreneurship.

New Zealand's rural communities survived a brutal economic shakeup by adding value, embracing local identity and building businesses around assets they already had.

Rural entrepreneurs work from a different playbook than their urban counterparts. Advice built for cities, with their deep talent pools, dense networks, and anonymous markets, only goes so far in a place where customers are scarce, distances are long, and reputation is the currency that matters most. So where should a rural business owner, or anyone whose job is to help one, look for guidance actually written for that terrain?

I have spent years working that question from two vantage points -- one in Texas and one about 7,500 miles away -- and the answer shows up most clearly when the two are considered together.

I lived in New Zealand as a full-time faculty member at the University of Canterbury, where I held the Chair of Strategy, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship, and our family holds permanent residency there. My daughters are seventh-generation Texans and honorary Kiwis. I am writing this just after returning from the South Island, and what its rural people have done since 1984 is the closest thing rural America has to a survival manual written by people who share its constraints.

Two Regions, One Set of Constraints

The greater Cross Timbers region of Texas -- the belt of ranching and dairy country west of the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex -- shares no obvious connection with New Zealand's South Island. Yet the two run on nearly identical economic realities. The Cross Timbers is productive land with a sparse population, organized around livestock, feed, and the small towns that serve them. The South Island is that proposition at national scale: roughly 1.2 million people, most of them in Christchurch, and beyond the city limits a landscape of sheep and cattle stations, dairy operations, and service towns spaced an hour or more apart. Both feed distant urban economies that rarely think about them; both watch their young people drain toward cities; and both depend on businesses that are visible, community-embedded, and sized to what their markets will support.

People in the Flint Hills of Kansas, the Driftless region of Wisconsin, or the hill counties of eastern Kentucky all recognize this pattern. Commodity mixes and accents vary, but the structural problem holds steady: too few customers to hide behind; too much distance to move goods cheaply; a labor pool measured in dozens; and a reputation that reaches every customer you will ever have before you do.

The institutional similarity matters as much as the economic one. New Zealand is an English-speaking, common-law country settled in the 1800s largely by British farming families, with strong property rights and a rural temperament that prizes self-reliance and practicality. That streak runs deep, both in New Zealand and in rural Texas. When two places share that much institutional DNA, their differences become informative rather than noise, and the lessons are applicable to other rural settings built on similar foundations.

The Experiment the United States Never Ran

In 1984, facing a fiscal crisis, New Zealand's government eliminated essentially all farm subsidies. Price supports, fertilizer subsidies, and cheap loans disappeared within a couple of years, and rural New Zealand was left to sort itself out. Many predicted collapse. What followed instead was four decades of forced entrepreneurship. Farms diversified and climbed the value chain. Producers built farmer-owned cooperatives large enough to reach global markets on their own terms. Small towns quit waiting for help that was not coming.

Sheep farming absorbed the worst of the shock, which is exactly why its record is the one worth studying. Sheep meat and wool had been the most heavily supported products in the country, held up by guaranteed minimum payments that rewarded headcount over quality. The national flock hit 70 million in 1982, much of it on hill country that never should have carried that many animals. Today it sits near 23 million, and lamb export earnings did not fall with the headcount. Farmers on the Canterbury plains and down in Southland bred heavier, faster-finishing lambs, moved from frozen carcasses into chilled cuts for European and Asian supermarkets, and walked away from the bottom of the commodity market. The model they followed was built on raising fewer sheep and better sheep, while creating more value per animal. Any rural operator who has been told that the only path forward is to run high volumes of what they already run should consider this outcome for a minute.

For anyone working in rural entrepreneurship in the US, South Island's history is a gift. It is the closest thing we have to a controlled experiment in what rural communities do when self-reliance becomes the operating assumption rather than a slogan. Because the lessons emerged in a low-subsidy, market-driven setting among people culturally familiar to rural Americans, they translate more readily than European models built on heavy subsidies and central planning.

Identity as Economic Infrastructure

The most transferable lessons have almost nothing to do with farming. They concern what South Island towns did with their own identities, and this is the heart of the argument. Authentic local identity functions as infrastructure, alongside roads and broadband, rather than as marketing and promotion.

Gore, a farm-country town of about eight thousand, declared itself New Zealand's home of country music and built the annual NZ Gold Guitar Awards around the claim. Fifty years on, the festival anchors both the town's identity and its visitor economy. Oamaru converted its Victorian-era limestone downtown into a heritage precinct, then added a gloriously odd steampunk layer for good measure. Kaikoura, a fishing town in decline, rebuilt around whale watching through a company founded by local Maori families and became an international destination. Lake Tekapo, home to a few hundred people, built a year-round visitor economy on darkness, after the surrounding basin was designated an international dark sky reserve in 2012. In Queenstown, local entrepreneurs launched the world's first commercial bungee jumping operation from the Kawarau Gorge Bridge in 1988 -- and proved that lakes, rivers, and mountains could generate value as the setting for adventure, not just as scenery. None of these towns waited for a large employer to move there. Each built new enterprises around assets it already had.

American readers should recognize this approach, because rural America executes it constantly, often without calling it strategy. In Texas's Cross Timbers, Weatherford is the Cutting Horse Capital of the World, and its concentration of trainers and breeders pulls equine money into Parker County every week of the year. Glen Rose built a state park and a tourism economy around dinosaur tracks in the Paluxy riverbed. Stephenville claims the Cowboy Capital title and backs it with rodeo culture and a Texas music scene.

In other states, Bardstown, Kentucky did the same with bourbon, and Bentonville, Arkansas with mountain biking. Raw material of this kind sits in most rural counties already. What the South Island adds is a forty-year demonstration of how far the strategy compounds when a community commits to it across generations.

One caution is warranted, since the strategy is easy to botch. Identity plays fail when the identity is perceived as manufactured. Towns that hire a consultant, pick a theme with no roots in local history or local work, and hang banners downtown generally end up with little more than banners. Gore was already country music country. Kaikoura families already made their living from the sea. Amplifying something true is the mechanism; inventing something marketable is not. Rural residents can "smell the difference" from a mile away, and so can customers and visitors.

Takeaways

Merino growers of the South Island high country worked all of this out the hard way. Their wool moved through auction as an anonymous commodity, losing ground to synthetics year after year, and ramping up wool production was never going to fix that. Instead, growers attached their wool to named stations and auditable welfare and land-management standards, then signed long supply contracts directly with apparel brands that

EIX.org (2026)
DOI:
10.32617/1470-6aa3ff9b89e68

wanted provenance a customer could check. Jeremy Moon built Icebreaker on that arrangement starting in 1995, and a fiber most Americans associated with scratchy sweaters became technical outdoor clothing sold worldwide. The sheep did not change. What changed was the distance between grower and buyer, and a willingness to be held accountable for how the wool was produced.

For rural entrepreneurs

- Find the premium version of what you already produce instead of chasing volume you were never going to win. The post-1984 survivors on South Island did not add sheep; they added value per sheep.
- Shorten the distance between you and your buyer. Named origin and standards a customer can verify turn a commodity into something people will pay extra for.
- Band together when scale demands it, through cooperatives and shared marketing, without surrendering independence.
- Attach your business to an authentic local identity and then ride it hard. A barbecue joint in Texas, a boat builder in Maine, and a saddle maker in Montana all sit on the kind of cultural raw material Gore turned into fifty years of festival economics. If you act on one idea from this article, make it an honest inventory of what your community is genuinely known for, then build on that.
- Ranchers have always known that "you take care of the land and the land takes care of you." Sheep farmers on the other side of the world learned the equivalent lesson about their communities, under harder conditions than most American rural businesses have ever faced. Their experiences are worth studying and copying.

For policymakers and support organizations

- Back the community's identity play, and the cluster of businesses that fit it, rather than spreading assistance evenly across every storefront on the square. Kaikoura did not rescue one fishing business; it repositioned an entire town.
- Money spent building out an authentic identity is the highest-leverage line item in a rural development budget, not window dressing.
- Favor enabling investments: rural broadband, market access, and education that takes rural economies seriously. Those proved most valuable once New Zealand's rural communities had to stand on their own. (I am not arguing that the United States should abolish farm programs; that debate belongs to others.)
- Put rural-serving universities to work. The United States has an entire tier of land-grant and regional comprehensive institutions built for this purpose, and most are underused as engines of rural venture creation.
- Connect rural owners with peers in other rural regions (this is a point Bill Leaverton and I made in a recent EIX article (https://eiexchange.com/content/why-rural-entrepreneurs-need-a-different-business-playbook?utm_content=bottom_related)). A video call between an operator in west Texas and one in Southland costs nothing, and both sides would learn plenty.

For scholars

Hunt, Townsend, Korsgaard, and Naar (2021) challenged the field to study rural venturing on its own terms rather than as a lesser version of the urban kind. Comparative work between matched rural regions is one of the most direct ways to answer that challenge. South Island's natural experiment has been running since 1984, and other areas of the US can be compared against it: the Driftless, Canterbury plains, and eastern Washington's wheat country.

References

Collins, J. D., & Leaverton, B. (2026, July 21). Why rural entrepreneurs need a different business playbook. Entrepreneur & Innovation Exchange. https://eiexchange.com/content/why-rural-entrepreneurs-need-a-different-business-playbook

Hunt, R. A., Townsend, D. M., Korsgaard, S., & Naar, A. (2021). Urban farmers and cowboy coders: Reimagining rural venturing in the 21st century. Academy of Management Perspectives, 35(4), 660-681.

EIX.org (2026)
DOI: 10.32617/1470-6aa3ff9b89e68