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ABSTRACT

This thesis takes the position that firm performance is derived from the value embodied by combinations of distinct socio-cultural resources and capabilities. In particular, this thesis explores practice in the context of Māori business to understand the mutual influences between economic exchange and social-cultural structures in terms of achieving improved firm performance. I begin by suggesting that much of the knowledge development and community practice in organisational analysis is subsumed within a Kuhnian conventionalism, which is not useful to gaining a deeper understanding of firm performance. I argue that what is required is an approach that emphasises the contextual development of society and organisation (embodied by social and cultural relations).

This brings to the fore the pragmatist epistemology of practical knowledge, an approach to research and analysis of organisations that is at the heart of this research. Practical knowledge connects to the pragmatic orientation of Indigenous logics in this instance kaupapa Māori, which draws us to a perspective of knowledge that is experiential, contextual, diverse and inclusive. The effectiveness of a practical knowledge perspective by means of its pragmatic epistemology allows us to understand Māori businesses operating within a distinctive frame of socio-economic rationality providing a broader utility leading to culturally constituted forms of practice. It was through this lens that I engaged with the proposition regarding firm performance prompting us to look at the field of leadership (habitus), exchange (inter-capital exchange) and relationships (field) in particular.

A major emphasis was a search for an appropriate method that would provide an avenue of authentic engagement with the cultural context embodied by kaupapa Māori. In terms of empirical investigation this thesis advances the utility of narrative as an expository technique and interpretive device that accords full recognition of Māori socio-cultural systems of relationships, historic circumstances and current practices. Conducted over three years (December 2004 and June 2006), the fieldwork component involved multiple strands of narrative in the form of dialogue, stories,
metaphors, documentation and experiences of myself, other individuals and Māori economic development hui, or gathering.

A key finding of this thesis is that kaupapa Māori as expressed through business practice offers a practical utility in relation to the capability of and potential outcomes for improved firm performance. I argue that there are unique characteristics of Māori business practice, which are grounded in the epistemological stance of kaupapa Māori in combination with Western philosophies and techniques of organisation that contribute to the performance of Māori businesses. In addition, I argue that it offers a view of the organisation as something beyond a disembodied system of market exchange and recognises the embeddedness of social processes in each culture will bring specific cultural nuances to the formulation of what constitutes organisational success. Finally, I suggest that kaupapa Māori research, grounded by the epistemological and ontological assumptions of an Indigenous paradigm provides opportunities for gaining greater insight into the dynamics of organisation and management research.
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# GLOSSARY

## List of Māori Terms

*used but not explained in the text*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aroha</td>
<td>Love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atua</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karakia</td>
<td>Prayer, incantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kia ora</td>
<td>Hello, thank you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahi</td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manaakitanga</td>
<td>Hosting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marae</td>
<td>Meeting area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mātauranga Māori</td>
<td>Māori knowledge, Māori epistemology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mihi mihi</td>
<td>Greeting, a form of introduction and a way to establish connections between ourselves and our whānau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga</td>
<td>National Institute of Research Excellence for Māori Development and Advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noa</td>
<td>Free from tapu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāua</td>
<td>Shellfish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poutama</td>
<td>Literally means steps pattern, however I am referring to the Poutama Trust a Māori Trust that provides an investment service to the micro-small Māori business sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raupatu</td>
<td>Seize or confiscate land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangata whenua</td>
<td>Local people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamariki</td>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taonga</td>
<td>Treasure, property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapu</td>
<td>Sacredness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tautoko</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Puni Kōkiri</td>
<td>Ministry of Māori Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Reo</td>
<td>Māori language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiki</td>
<td>Neck pendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tūpuna</td>
<td>Ancestors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakatau</td>
<td>Informal welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenua</td>
<td>Ground, land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Iwi (Māori tribal confederation)
* noted in this thesis (Appendix A - New Zealand Map of Tribal iwi)

Ngā Puhi
Ngāi Tahu
Ngāti Manawa
Ngāti Raukawa
Ngāti Tūwharetoa
Ngāti Whakaue
Ngāti Whare
Tainui
Te Arawa
Te Āti Awa
Tūhoe

List of Karakia (Incantation)

Whakapapa of Creation - page xiii

The term whakapapa is used to describe both the recitation in proper order of genealogies, and also to name the genealogies. The visualisation is of building layer by layer upon the past towards the present, and on into the future. Whakapapa includes not just the genealogies but the many spiritual, mythological and human stories that act as metaphor for the act of Creation and for the evolution of the Universe and all living creatures within it. The whakapapa of creation depicts the sequential recital of the various names for the three states of this evolution:

- **Te Kore**: energy, potential, the void, nothingness.
- **Te Pō**: form, the dark, the night.
- **Te Ao Mārama**: emergence, light and reality, dwelling place of humans.

Walker (1990) provides a succinct account of the mythological origins of Māori society as laid out in three major myth cycles, beginning with the creation myth of Ranginui, the sky father, and Papatūānuku, the earth mother. The second sequence of myths deals with the adventures of the demi-god Maui, who fished up the land and brought many benefits into the world for humankind. The third series of myths deals with the life of Tāwhaki, the model of an aristocratic and heroic figure.

The central characters in the myths are gods, their progeny and their human descendants. The stories are narrated in prose form, with the notion of an evolutionary sequence conveyed by the storyteller linking the main characters through the traditional method of genealogical recital. Inherent in the genealogy of earth and sky, the gods and their human descendants is the notion of evolution and progression.
Ranginui and Papatūānuku prevented light from reaching the world because of their close embrace. Their offspring lived in a world of darkness and ignorance between the bodies of their parents. Overtime they plotted against their parents in order to let light into the world. It is said that some of the sons decided that their situation could be remedied only if they separated their parents, so that Ranginui would be pushed up to become the sky and Papatūānuku remain as their Earth. They set about their task. It was their son Tane who finally rendered them apart by resting his shoulders upon Papatūānuku and thrusting his legs upwards and pushing Ranginui to the sky. By this deed Tane, of many names, came also to be known as Tāne-te-toko-o-te-rangi, Tane the prop of the heavens. By this separation of Rangi and Papa the world of light, of existence, the third state of creation, came into being.


Baskets of Knowledge – page 57

The basket of knowledge deal with the three interconnected realms which reflect the worldview of the Māori. The kete, or basket has power as a symbol for a container of knowledge and wisdom. This is an ancient symbolism contained in the story of how mankind obtained the three kete of knowledge from Io, the supreme spiritual power.

Marsden (2003) recalls the legend of how Tāne, after he had successfully organised the revolt that separated his parents Rangi (Father Heaven) and Papa (Mother Earth) and having concluded the various purification rites, wended his way through the heavens until he arrived at the penultimate heaven. He was again sanctified by Rehua the ‘Priest God’ of exorcism and purification who then allowed Tāne entrance into the twelfth heaven, the abode of Io. There he received the three Baskets of Knowledge together with two small stones – Hukatai (Seafoam) was white and the other predominantly red coloured stone was Rehutai (Seaspray).

He descended to the seventh heaven where his brothers had completed the Whare Wānanga (House of Learning or Wisdom). After more intense purification rites to remove the intense tapu (sacredness, restriction) ingested from his association with the intense sacredness of Io, Tane entered the Whare Wānanga named, Wharekura. Here he deposited the three Baskets of Knowledge named Tuauri, Aronui and Tuaatea above the taumata, noted as the seat of authority where the seers and sages sat, then deposited the stones Hukutai and Rehutai, one on either side of the rear ridge pole.

Prologue

This thesis engages with a specific ideology associated with framing research in the context of Indigenous Māori organisations in Aotearoa and Te Wai Pounamu, herein referred to as New Zealand. Māori are tangata whenua, described here as the people of the land referring to their status as first nation peoples of New Zealand. Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992: 107) argue that it “is the field which is primary and must be the focus of the research operations,” therefore this prologue presents the Indigenous Māori worldview or cultural field as the field of engagement for this research. Herein I use the terminology of kaupapa Māori, described here as the Indigenous Māori field of practice that takes for granted the validity and legitimacy of Māori knowledge (Smith, 1997; Smith, 1999a).

Me mātou ki te whetu i mua i te kōkiri o te haere

Before you set forth on a voyage be sure you know the stars

This whakatauakī, or proverb reminds intending voyagers of the necessity to be well prepared before they set off for distant lands. The role of this prologue is to map the direction for the intended voyage of this thesis. Given the intention to explore business practice, in the Māori context, I use narrative inquiry as a method that allows us to include the socio-cultural systems of relationships, historic circumstances and current practices (Bruner, 1990; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Flyvbjerg, 2001; Polkinghorne, 1988) of Māori business. Narrative stories and metaphors are the repository of our collective wisdom about the world and so this prologue presents the ‘plot’ of this thesis. The plot is an integral element of narrative that expounds the ‘intelligible whole’ (Ricoeur, 1980) that exists as a key mediating structure for our encounters with reality. An underlying premise of this thesis is that the notion of practical knowledge connects to the pragmatic orientation of Indigenous logics.

1 Aotearoa, is noted here as the North Island of New Zealand and Te Wai Pounamu, is referred to as the South Island of New Zealand.
Hence, this thesis argues that we can learn a great deal from a perspective of knowledge that is experiential, contextual, diverse and inclusive.

_Capturing the Context of Kaupapa Māori_

Given the agenda of this research, it is important that at the outset I locate kaupapa Māori as the orienting mechanism and focal point of this research. At an abstract level, I use the terminology of kaupapa Māori, a Māori worldview and Māoritanga as the embodiment of the experience of living a Māori culturally informed life. Each are terms that have been used to describe the validity and legitimacy of Māori knowledge and practice; to support the revival and maintenance of Māori language and culture; to express the corporate view that Māori hold about ultimate reality and meaning; and, to consolidate the struggle for tino rangatiratanga, depicted here as Māori self-determination (Bishop, 1996; Marsden, 2003; Royal, 2002; Smith, 1997; Smith, 1999a, 1999b). Importantly, all represent the consciousness of experience as embodied by Māori culture:

_It is important to remember that Māoritanga is a thing of the heart not the head. For that reason analysis is necessary only to make explicit what the Māori understands implicitly in his daily living, feeling, acting and deciding (Marsden, 2003: 2)._  

It is from this logic that I argue that kaupapa Māori operates as a paradigm founded on a matrix of beliefs that form and uphold a worldview where the natural, spiritual and social worlds are interrelated and interconnected. According to Henare (2001) a Māori worldview is a traditionalist religious worldview in which the spiritual dimension is pre-eminent in Māori social order. He describes it as a theory of vitalism that includes a philosophy of tapu, noted here as the potentiality for power; mana, referred to as a religious power, authority and ancestral efficacy; mauri, rendered here as a unique power, a life essence, a life force, a vital principle; wairua, depicted as a spirit akin to a soul and all things in creation have one); and hau described as a complex totalising system of gift exchange beginning with the gods, creation and social relationships.
Until Europeans arrived in Aotearoa, Māori lived in a world where only they and their ancestors existed (Salmond, 1997). The ‘Whakapapa of Creation’ below describes the origins of the universe:

Ko Te Kore (the void, energy, nothingness, potential)
Te Kore-te-whiwhia (the void in which nothing is possessed)
Te Kore-te-rawea (the void in which nothing is felt)
Te Kore-i-ai (the void with nothing in union)
Te Kore-te-wiwia (the space without boundaries)
Na Te Kore Te Pō (from the void the night)

Te Pō-nui (the great night)
Te Pō-roa (the long night)
Te Pō-uriuri (the deep night)
Te Pō-kerekere (the intense night)
Te Pō-tiwhatiwha (the dark night)
Te Pō-te-kitea (the night in which nothing is seen)
Te Pō-tangotango (the intensely dark night)
Te Pō-whawha (the night of feeling)
Te Pō-namunamu-ki-taiao (the night of seeking the passage to the world)
Te Pō-tahuri-atu (the night of restless turning)
Te Pō-tahuri-mai-ki-taiao (the night of turning towards the revealed world)

Ki te Whai-ao (to the glimmer of dawn)
Ki te Ao-mārama (to the bright light of day)

Tihei mauri-ora (there is life)

It is from this cosmological recitation, that all aspects of exchange and relations for Māori are given meaning. As Geertz (1973:2000) suggests it is clusters of sacred symbols, woven into some semblance of order, which make up systems of belief that mediate knowledge for a society. Practice is governed by tradition, custom and social norms dictated by genealogical connection to their ancestors, the environment and each other. Māori divided the phenomenological world into sets of existence: Te Kore, which is described as the void or energy out of which the universe came forth; Te Pō, which is the form, the dark, night), and Te Ao Mārama; (emergence, light and reality, dwelling place of humans) (Walker, 1990). This was, and is, central to Māori understanding of the world and their position in it.

Appendix B presents a précis of a cosmology drawn from the whare wānanga of Ngā Puhi, noted here as the tribal house of learning for the tribe of Ngā Puhi, which refers to the elements necessary for the creation of the world (Royal, 1998). It situates the
Māori world by distinctive means of whakapapa, which is depicted as a mental construct that denotes a genealogical connection between all living things and a means of encoding and recording the organisation of knowledge (Barlow, 1994; Roberts et al., 2004). I acknowledge that there are many different kinds of cosmological whakapapa evident throughout iwi or Māori tribal groups. However each represents a metaphorical creation of the world, the psyche of the human beings and the philosophical orientation of mātauranga Māori, or Māori knowledge (Royal, 1998).

My articulation of the Māori worldview weaves together both Māori and Anglo-American influences, spanning over a thousand years of pre-European contact and nearly two centuries since. In their migration and settlement Māori maintained and developed further specific cultural myths, norms, protocols, cultural traditions, kinship systems, economics, politics and social processes that shaped the organisation of Māori lives. These principles inform practices that remain cultural features of social life in Māori communities and organisations and are central to the Indigenous paradigm at the centre of this research.

The Sleeping Taniwha

For Māori, as with many Indigenous peoples, colonisation or contact with ‘civilised’ man was an ‘epiphanal’ moment, fundamentally different from anything that had gone on before and culturally devastating (Sahlins, 1999). Petrie (2006) presents an account of Māori commercial focus during early contact with, and preceding colonisation by the British. Indeed, she identifies a process of involution wherein the economic, social, and political changes that occurred during this period led to the decline of the

---

2 The Polynesian ancestors of the Māori people sailed to New Zealand from Samoa and Tonga, beginning around AD 200. Arriving in New Zealand was the end of a series of long voyages of discovery and settlement of islands in the Great Ocean of Kiwa, making their way progressively eastwards to the Marquesas by AD 300, swinging north to Hawai about AD 600 and then east to Easter Island. New Zealand was the last to be settled, and the first canoe migrants from eastern Polynesia reached New Zealand shores between AD 800 and AD 900 (Walker, 1990).
Māori economy, which had initially been a thriving system of exchange. This thesis does not make colonisation a central concern, rather the focus is on understanding the dynamics of Māori business practice derived as they are from social practices and systems of exchange distinctive to Indigenous Māori ways of knowing and knowledge.

To more accurately reflect the experience of this research I found myself searching for a metaphor to narrativise the research landscape. Māori have used, and continue to use, narrative forms such as allegory to explain theories and pass on knowledge for generations. Narrative creates a metaphysical gestalt of integrated patterns (Roberts et al., 2004), that resonates with Māori methodology of knowledge sharing and dissemination. Māori myths are set in the remote past and embody Māori beliefs about the creation of the universe and the genesis of gods and of men, natural phenomena, the weather, the stars and the moon, the fish that swim in the sea, the birds that fly in the forest, and the forests themselves. Mid-way through my fieldwork, I came across a particular statement:

**Delia**

The whole climate that this country is in I think affects the ability of the Māori businesses to succeed at the moment …. someone described it as the ‘Taniwha’ just waking up.

What **Delia** is referring to is the often-quoted metaphor ‘The Sleeping Taniwha’ used in the tourism industry to describe the increasing strength and vitalisation of Māori tourism in New Zealand.3 I have taken as the title of this thesis to reflect kaupapa Māori in terms of business and economics. I use it in the sense of emergence, consolidation and mobilisation of not only the Māori economy, but also of the social and cultural dynamics of the Māori world, in which Māori business practice plays an important role.

---

3 In Māori mythology, Taniwha are described as powerful creatures that are associated with tribal groups and were viewed as the embodiment of either guardianship or punishment of humans (Marsden, 2003).
CHAPTER ONE: THE LANDSCAPE AS NARRATIVE

This thesis is the product of both my personal and academic experiences. Conducted over three years (December 2004 to June 2006), it is research that represents the synthesis of multiple strands of narrative. That is, narrative involving the collection of stories, metaphors and experiences of myself, other individuals and collectivities operating in the context of Māori business. At the forefront I position myself as an Indigenous Māori woman and researcher claiming genealogical, cultural, political and social sets of experiences. Closely influenced by those experiences, my approach to organisational research and practice responds to the renaissance in research requiring multiple or unique paradigmatic approaches to understanding specific phenomenon (Alvesson & Willmott, 1992; Denzin & Lincoln, 2008; Schultz & Hatch, 1996; Wicks & Freeman, 1998). In addition, my disciplinary interests are in the constitutive practices of organisational decision-makers regarding the management and control of resources and capabilities.

It is the weaving together of these different strands of thought and experience which has brought me to the area of concern for this research. The logic governing this thesis is that improved and superior firm performance is not only a factor of economic action. It is also the product of historical development, deeply rooted in the collective understandings of social organisation and cultural practices (Araujo & Easton, 1996, 1999; Granovetter, 1985; Smart, 1993; Zald, 1993), in particular, increasing focus on socio-cultural values as facilitators of positive firm performance and sustainable advantages (Harrison & Huntington, 2000; Hofstede, 2001; Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). It is from within this milieu that the guiding premise for this research emerges:

- Firm performance is not merely an outcome of economic activity, but is also a corollary of the value derived from combinations of distinct socio-cultural resources and capabilities.

However, for a long time I struggled in my attempts to connect this understanding, tempered as it is in a broader sense of what I’ve identified as mainstream organisational practice, to an
Indigenous Māori conception of business practice. Finally I realised I didn’t have to. It is the centrality of experience, both personal and in the field, with which I engage, that anchors this thesis in an expression of business practice informed by kaupapa Māori. Kaupapa Māori, described here is the Indigenous Māori field of practice that takes for granted the validity and legitimacy of Māori knowledge and practice (Smith, 1997; Smith, 1999a), is the orienting mechanism for Māori business practice.

Importantly, it is not the intention of this thesis to proclaim the traditional or contemporary, Indigenous or mainstream as being the objective for any organisation to aspire to. They do not need to be antithetical to one another as the orthodoxy of social science would have it (Bourdieu, Chamboredon, & Passeron, 1991; Flyvbjerg, 2001; Giddens, 1982). My intention is gain deeper insight into how a Māori cultural context informs business practice and to challenge the concepts of an organisational practice founded on Western philosophical traditions governed by conscious and rational thought. Therefore, I am not claiming universality in my conceptualisation of an Indigenous paradigm, rather my intention is to illustrate through difference a culturally specific alternative approach to research practice.

In this introduction I outline the parameters of the research landscape. At an abstract level, I draw from the orientation and philosophical cohabitation of both kaupapa Māori and practical knowledge, which necessarily situates an Indigenous paradigm in a complex opposition to and emergence from the dominant Western paradigm (Chapter Two and Three). An Indigenous paradigm provides a powerful and productive conceptualisation and empirical analysis of Māori business practice that responds to the notions of cultural authenticity, power and the ways in which the knowledge of and about Indigenous peoples, their culture, customs, history and life, is collected (Prasad, 2003; Said, 1993; Smith, 1999a; Te Awekotuku, 1991). I then go on to locate the research problem connecting the constructs of Indigenous and organisational practice, outlining the theoretical questions that guide this research. Section II, presents issues associated with the way I oriented my sense of Self to this research and how this influenced the process and representation of this thesis. Finally in this chapter, I present an overview of the thesis structure.
I. The Research Landscape

Reality is no longer understood as truth to be interpreted but as mutually evolving (Heshusius, 1994: 18).

During the early stages of formulating my research approach I felt swamped by the complexity of the research processes and phenomenon embedded as they are in a discursive landscape of the Māori worldview. I struggled for a long time to find an approach that would support my intention of examining practice within the context of the Māori business cultural field. In the end it found me. It wasn’t until I was engaged with the field, not as interloper, but as a member, that I started to listen with my ‘other set of ears’ and hear the rich narrative of practice that I believe holds a more accurate expression of ‘mutually evolving’ Māori business practice.

This ‘mutuality’ is depicted by Giddens’ (1982) notion of ‘double hermeneutics’ which is grounded in the understanding that what is identified as ‘meaningful’ in the social world is determined by those who produce and reproduce it in their activities. This research perspective has gained a stronger cadence in organisational research (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000; Berg, 2001; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Flyvbjerg, 2001). Importantly, this process involves the mutual construction of knowledge, captured by Bourdieu’s notion of ‘epistemic reflexivity’, wherein the activities, understandings and self-interpretations of the researchers are taken as being a constituent part of the research context (Bourdieu, 1999; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Giddens, 1982; Johnson & Duberley, 2003). Research inquiry is shaped by the socially constructed nature of reality, highlighting the intimate relationship between researcher, research participants, phenomenon studied, and the situational constraints in which the process of inquiry is embedded (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003).

This section presents the ‘rules of the game’ and sets the direction of the research (Bourdieu, 1977; Bourdieu, Chamboredon, & Passeron, 1991). I emphasise the interpretive approach to understanding how social experience is created and given meaning, particularly given the specific Indigenous Māori context. In this section I first introduce the discursive framework underpinning my conception of an Indigenous paradigm. I then explain my adoption of
narrative as a research strategy, to make sense of experience by casting it in narrative form, and identify the research problem at the heart of this thesis.

A. Theorising for an Indigenous Paradigm

I argue for the development of an alternate philosophic orientation to that which is currently endorsed by mainstream organisational research theory and practice. I’m not suggesting an Indigenous paradigm needs to be positioned in an adversarial way in research and practice, rather that my efforts in theorising for an Indigenous paradigm reflect my personal and scholarly negotiation of two worldviews in which I am embedded as an Indigenous academic. Chapter Two and Three present my development of an Indigenous paradigm with a focus on the pragmatic process of social interaction, drawing from an epistemology which is relational and experiential. That is a practical knowledge which connects us to the socially conditioned nature of all inquiry and interpretation. This perspective situates itself in contrast to the dominant logic guiding organisational analysis, raising questions regarding the political, economic, social, and cultural elements of context and power that surround the construction of an Indigenous paradigm.

Locating ‘the’ Indigenous and ‘the’ Western

It is important to outline the notion of Indigeneity as the descriptor for cultural identity of first nation(s) peoples in specific geographic landscapes; and the term Western as a descriptor for the industrialised Western nations, which are dominated by Anglo-American culture, thought and practice. In using the term ‘Indigenous’ I avoid reinforcing the idea of an homogenous field called Indigenous knowledge packaged neatly as a unique and traditional socio-cultural heritage (Stillitoe, 1998). That is not to ignore the many experiences that Indigenous communities share, for example, the effect of colonisation, new technologies, globalisation and racism, which have influenced the worldviews and identities of Indigenous peoples (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008; Sahlins, 1999; Said, 1993; Smith, 1999a). However, while Indigenous communities may share similar cultural characteristics in their worldviews, this thesis positions the perspective of kaupapa Māori, or an Indigenous Māori worldview as central.
In using the term Western or mainstream I am describing the more dominant form of practice and knowledge associated with Anglo-American or Western oriented perspectives. Most often associated with capitalism, a mainstream perspective is individualistic and prioritises tangible economic concerns. In relation to organisation and management thought, much of the research in organisation studies is centred on the theory of knowledge known as the scientific paradigm of positivism which is derived from empiricism (Tsoukas & Cummings, 1997; Zald, 1993). Empiricism is a stance which positions Western theory as a constellation of complex and inter-related practices that seek to maintain Western hegemony not only economically and politically, but also militarily, culturally and ideologically (Prasad, 2003).

In positioning the notions of Indigenous and Western as fields of cultural practice, we are drawn into the long running debate over the structuring of reality in terms of binary oppositions (Barcham, 2000; Bourdieu, 1977). A dichotomy that creates sets of homogenous characteristics under each banner. This discourse is central to Orientalism which, as Said (Said, 1979) argued, describes the strange or alien (the Orient, the East, the Other, ‘them’) as being separate from and in opposition to the familiar (The Occident, Europe, The West, ‘us’). Orientalism produces a juxtaposition of two opposed, essentialised entities (Carrier, 1992), for example, European and non-European, ‘developed’ and ‘developing’ societies, capitalist and pre-capitalist economies, white and non-white, and the coloniser and the colonised.

The ‘Other’ is commonly depicted as the poor, uncivilised, backwards, needing redemption society, whilst the ‘Us’ is cast in the role of saviour, charitable, modern, civilised society (Said, 1993). However, the processes of ‘Orientalisation of the Other’ and ‘Occidentalisation of the modern West’ do not exist independently of each other (Carrier, 1992; Said, 1993). The relationship is embodied within dialectical processes that illustrate not only a Western imposition of a reified identity on some alien set of people, but also the imposition of an identity created in dialectical opposition to another identity, that of the West. Each actor’s character and identity is understood in reified essentialised terms, and each defined by its difference from the other element of the opposed pair (Carrier, 1992).

Therein lies a key problem, whereby the colonised ‘Other’ is often constituted within the regimes of representation of the imperialist centre. Not only does the dominant culture project
an essentialised set of defining characteristics, attributes values and identity onto the
subordinated culture, but in rendering their own cultural identity a subordinated people
projects their own essentialised set of defining characteristics, attributes, values and identity
(Carrier, 1992; Khazzoom, 2003). It is the fact that one group, primarily the dominant
culture, has the ability to classify another (and influence how the Other classifies itself and
the West) that makes Orientalism and Occidentalism an exercise in power, and this form of
power is linked to the monopolisation of resources and group conflict (Khazzoom, 2003).

A consequence of this binary positioning between Indigenous and Western has been modes
of knowledge that are grounded in the preordained superiority of Western oriented criteria for
authority, representation and accountability. Indigenous peoples have been distanced from the
construction, validation and legitimation of Indigenous knowledge (Bishop, 1996; Denzin &
Lincoln, 2008). A result of which is an artificial representation of cultural practices
(Bourdieu, 1977), or ‘epistemic coloniality’ where institutionalised theory is deemed to be
speaking for Indigenous peoples, but which is in fact a weak translation of traditional
distancing’ in reference to how Western traditions of knowledge distance themselves from
Indigenous cultures. A process which operates by ignoring contextual cultural diversity, and
providing parameters for the essentialised distinctions between people largely of one cultural
and religious background and people of another (King, 1991; Said, 1993; Sen, 2006).

Certainly, with regards to research involving Indigenous communities, the vital element
missing from organisational research and practice is the void created in the absence of
Indigenous historical, cultural or spiritual foundations (Bishop, 1996; Henry & Pene, 1999;
Smith, 1999a). This has produced a body of existing organisation research dominated by
knowledge based on Western scientific discourse ignoring the rationale of traditional
Indigenous based knowledge. A consequence of which has classified societies, through a
system of representation that allowed for the comparison and evaluation of these societies,
ignoring that there are multiple traditions of knowledge and knowing:

Research is implicated in the production of Western knowledge, in the nature of academic work, in the
production of theories which have dehumanised Māori and in practices which have continued to
privilege Western ways of knowing, while denying the validity for Māori of Māori knowledge,
language and culture (Smith, 1999a: 183).
The response by Indigenous peoples to this form of symbolic violence has led to significant intellectual movements challenging Western cultural hegemony (Sen, 2006) and is an underlying tension of this research that is an important dimension in the construction of an Indigenous paradigm. However, my contention that an Indigenous paradigm is dependent on a complex opposition to and emergence from the dominant Western paradigm does not subscribe to a ‘them’ and ‘us’ relationship. Such an approach draws us into an antagonistic stance which is not useful and, I believe, results in the marginalisation of Indigenous knowledge. Rather this thesis highlights the relationship between ‘the’ Indigenous and ‘the’ Western. It does so by constructing a position from which an Indigenous paradigm is and of itself a domain of knowledge that operates independently to, but also concurrently with other domains of knowledge associated with Western paradigms.

My approach is in keeping with the Bourdieuian approach which makes explicit domains of practice and inquiry. Bourdieu conceptualises ‘field’ as a relational configuration of objective and subjective forces that is simultaneously a space of power negotiation, conflict and competition (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) providing a boundary of concern within which I position this thesis. A field is described as a ‘relational configuration’ consisting of sets of objective, historical relations between positions anchored in certain forms of capital (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). As such the field is a critical mediation between the practices of those agents who partake of it and the surrounding social and economic conditions.

In my representation of the kaupapa Māori as a cultural field, I view it as a social microcosm which is itself a part of the wider social cosmos (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). The notion of cultural fields is appropriate as it also takes into account the existence of multiple fields in society which are embedded within and interact with each other. Thus, I cannot ignore the engagement between what constitutes the Māori cultural field with other cultural fields. In this case primarily the cultural field that exemplifies Western political, social and economic practices and therefore the dynamics of the cultural field reflects the embeddedness of Māori practice in a Western economic and social system. I argue that there are unique characteristics of Māori business practice, which are grounded in Māori social organisation in

---

4 Bourdieu highlights specific examples, such as the artistic field, the academic field, or the economic field, each of which has its own prevailing logics that guide practice.
combination with Western philosophies and techniques of organisation that contribute to the performance of Māori businesses.

*The Pragmatic Power of Practice*

Paradigm in its meta-theoretical philosophical sense is used in this thesis to denote an implicit or explicit view of reality or worldview (Morgan, 1980). Indeed, Lincoln and Guba (2003) describe paradigms as representing a worldview that defines the nature of the world and a range of possible relationships within it, including cosmologies. Scholars of this field subscribe to the notion that the fundamental assumptions from different paradigmatic orientations can lead to a variety of ways to approach the building of theories (Gioia & Pitre, 1990; Lincoln & Guba, 2003; Morgan, 1980; Royal, 1998). In this thesis I take the view that the notion of a worldview is a paradigm that includes a matrix of beliefs constituted by kaupapa Māori and draws largely from a pragmatic orientation. Thus, when we consider practice through the filter of kaupapa Māori then the paradigmatic qualities takes on the physical, spiritual and philosophical characteristics we associate with a Māori worldview.

My conception of an Indigenous paradigm is grounded in the emerging conversation that captures the effects of multiple strands of social, cultural, economic and political issues in society. An Indigenous paradigm evokes the doctrine of pragmatism, a stance that directs us towards the practical consequences or real effects as vital components of both meaning and truth (Flyvbjerg, 2001; Kivinen & Piironen, 2006; Wicks & Freeman, 1998). Aristotle’s three intellectual virtues episteme, techne and phronesis are central to the notion of practice (Flyvbjerg, 2001; Tsoukas & Cummings, 1997). Episteme corresponds to modern scientific knowledge, that which is universal, invariable, context-independent, and based on general analytical rationality. Techné or craft knowledge refers to that which is pragmatic, variable, context-dependent and oriented towards production. It is a practical instrumental rationality governed by a conscious goal. Finally, and clearly Aristotle’s highest virtue (Tsoukas & Cummings, 1997), phronesis is practical knowledge, which deals with both universals and particulars. I argue that a focus on practical knowledge is a pragmatic context-dependent perspective, which offers an intellectual activity most relevant to practice.
Kaupapa Māori as the practice and philosophy of living a Māori, culturally informed life, takes for granted the validity and legitimacy of Māori knowledge; supports the revival and maintenance of Māori language and culture; and, consolidates the struggle for self-determination for Māori cultural well-being (Smith, 1997). Under the rubric of kaupapa Māori in research, we are then directed automatically to different sets of ideas and issues framed as assumptions, practices and methods that locate Māori philosophy, values (ethics) and knowledge in a central role. I use the terminology of kaupapa Māori research as a paradigm that guides research and ensures that Māori protocol will be followed during research processes (Henry & Pene, 2001).

An Indigenous paradigm draws attention to the basis on which Indigenous peoples have different ways of ‘viewing’ the world, which then shape their societal assumptions and knowledge about the world (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008; Mauss, 1970; Prasad, 2005; Sahlins, 1999; Said, 1993). To accept the existence of worldviews with their own philosophical orientation, logics, discourse and practices, means we accept that analysis requires a philosophic framework that is culturally informed and sensitive to the history and needs of Indigenous communities (Smith, 1997; Smith, 1999a; Steinhauer, 2002; Te Awekotuku, 1991; Wilson, 2003). Thus exploring worldviews is an essential precursor to understanding the alternate philosophical orientation required for scholarly engagement in organisational research and practice.

I argue that different viewpoints and perspectives of the world are crucial for research in Indigenous organisations to reflect Indigenous contexts and worldviews, derived from their own sets of beliefs, assumptions and epistemologies. In this thesis, I use the notion of worldview to capture the embeddedness of distinct Māori cultural practices and underscore the relationship between cultural integrity and practice as explained by Marsden:

Cultures pattern perceptions of reality into conceptualizations of what they perceive reality to be; of what it is to be regarded as actual, probable, possible or impossible. These conceptualizations form what is termed the ‘worldview’ of a culture. The worldview is the central systemization of conceptions of reality to which members of its culture assent and from which stems their value system. The worldview lies at the very heart of the culture, touching, interacting with and strongly influencing every aspect of the culture (Marsden, 2003: 56).
This is a central point in Markus and Kitayama’s (1991) argument that the construal of the self and others is tied to the implicit, normative tasks that various cultures hold for what people do, and which determine the nature of individual experience. A worldview encapsulates the way in which people perceive and understand the world and therefore situates the logic that guides practice. Understandings are themselves constrained by the patterns of social interactions characteristic of a given culture (Markus & Kitayama, 1991), which in this instance is kaupapa Māori.

I use the terminology of culture, in a socio-anthropological sense, referring to patterns of human activity and the symbolic structures that give such activity significance. As a ‘living concept’ culture has multiple definitions reflecting different theoretical bases for understanding, or criteria for evaluating human activity, each characterised by particular assumptions and discourses (Allaire & Firsirotu, 1984; Hannerz, 1992; Schein, 1996; Smircich, 1983). Connecting culture to the constructs of Indigenous and organisational practice has yet to surface in organisational research and practice as a robust field of engagement. The concept of culture has been linked more closely to the study of organisations, particularly in cross-cultural or comparative management and organisational culture (Hatch, 1993; Schein, 1996; Smircich, 1983). However, very little scholarship has engaged with the role and influence of Indigenous cultural practice.

I argue that to understand Indigenous cultural practices we need to be informed by an Indigenous paradigm. In doing so I am drawing on sets of customary beliefs and values that an Indigenous group uses as a sense-making mechanism providing meaning for their behaviour. These ‘cultural tool kits (Bruner, 1990; Swidler, 1986) include those sets of beliefs, ritual practices, art forms, and ceremonies. I also include informal cultural practices such as language, gossip, stories, and rituals of daily life which reflect how humans position themselves in the world (Bourdieu, 1977). A consequence is an approach to organisational research that will accord full recognition of Māori cultural norms, value systems and practices, and cultural legitimation of both the process and outcomes of research (Bishop, 1996; Smith, 1999a).
B. Narrative Inquiry

This thesis advances the utility of narrative as an expository technique and interpretive device that allows for the examination of the role of cultural practice in the field of Māori business (Flyvbjerg, 2001; Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zilber, 1998; Seale, Gobo, Gubrium, & Silverman, 2004). A central dynamic of kaupapa Māori is the strong cultural preference for narrative forms such as story and metaphor to make sense of the world and for the oral communication of knowledge (Bishop, 1996; Roberts et al., 2004). Narrative inquiry is a method that allows us to explore in the Māori context, social phenomena, which takes into account the socio-cultural systems of relationships, historic circumstances and current practices to enhance both understanding and explaining specific social phenomena (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Flyvbjerg, 2001; Polkinghorne, 1988).

This leads us to the experience of narrative, in particular drawing attention to the aspects of ‘discursive interaction’ that produce stories (Grant, Hardy, Oswick, & Putnam, 2004) which position this research and “engage not with a presumed neutral ‘real’ world, but with the complex nuances of the ‘lived’ world” (Rhodes & Brown, 2005: 180). Therefore I argue it is the taken for granted experiences of ‘being’ Māori which influence the embedded structures, collective and individual dispositions, and systems of exchange which play a significant role in influencing practice.

In addition, narrative research methods are associated with the ‘linguistic turn’ that has occurred in the social sciences including organisation studies (Boje, Oswick, & Ford, 2004; Deetz, 2003; Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zilber, 1998; Polkinghorne, 1988; Rhodes & Brown, 2005). In terms of organisational research, narrative is viewed as a useful tool with which to explore and develop forms of understanding about the meaning of organisational experience, mediated as it is by the socio-cultural context (Czarniawska-Joerges, 1995; Dunford & Jones, 2000; Rhodes & Brown, 2005; Tsoukas & Hatch, 2001). This view is supported by Gergen and Thatchenkery’s (1996) discussion of language in relation to post-modernism and its contribution to organisation science. They posit language as a by-product of human interaction situating sense-making as a communal activity, which suits the research process of narrative inquiry, particularly in an Indigenous context.
II. Situating the Research Problem

The preceding discussion outlines my conceptualisation of an Indigenous paradigm that draws from the pragmatic orientation and philosophical cohabitation of practical knowledge and kaupapa Māori. My aim is not to suggest Māori business practice is superior or inferior to other business practices, rather it is to provide deeper insight into how a Māori cultural context informs business practice. Importantly, my intention is to illustrate through difference a culturally specific alternative approach to research practice. To that end, it is important that questions are raised and addressed that contribute to and support the integrity of Māori business practice. It is at this juncture that I situate more precisely the research problem, specifically by connecting to the processes by which firms conduct their business.

A. The Research Questions

The heart of this thesis is narrative and narratives have ideas and plots. The ideas in this thesis explore the link between knowledge (both individual and collective) and human action in organised contexts. I consider how knowledge informs practice in an organisation context (Bradbury & Lichtenstein, 2000; Brown & Duguid, 2001; Jarzabkowski, 2004), specifically regarding collaborative relationships, leadership and the resource-based view of the firm. Tsoukas and Cummings (1997) raise three questions important to our understanding in organisation studies:

First, what are organisations? Second, what sort of knowledge do practitioners need to possess in order to manage organisations? Third, what mode of action should practitioners adopt towards organisational events and processes? (p. 655).

The answers to these questions have been debated in the arenas of ontology, epistemology and praxeology respectively (Tsoukas & Demetrios, 1996). I use them as an entree to my research agenda and to connect to the field of practice in the business arena.

The question of what an organisation is, presumes a dualistic existence between objective positivist and subjective anti-positivist traditions (Brubaker, 1985; Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Deetz, 1996; Wicks & Freeman, 1998). Historically, organisations have been conceived of in
a mechanistic imagery, advocating objectivity, predictability and efficiency (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Tsoukas & Cummings, 1997). This machinelike projection offered a ‘one-size fits all’ perspective of organisation theory and practice. It is one I argue that ignores multiple traditions of knowledge and knowing, which are illustrative of Indigenous systems of practice.

This has led to a body of scholarly work that views the context-independent, power-neutral and dichotomous framework of the subjective-objective divide view as resolutely incomplete (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Flyvbjerg, 2001; Foucault, 1982; Lather, 1986). We now have an understanding of organisations as cultural and political arenas or fields in themselves constituted by the contextualised patterns of behaviour of the various agents and stakeholders. I suggest that this leads to a situation which is much more open to the development and application of an alternative philosophic framework, such as an Indigenous paradigm.

Additionally, how knowledge is understood and managed is an important component of how organisations are construed (Cone & Everett, 2003). If we subscribe to the notion of multiple systems of knowledge and embrace cultural diversity, then the question of what sort of knowledge practitioners need becomes of greater significance. The appeal of practical knowledge is that it holds intrinsic to a practical wisdom, which draws from both the scientific and technical arenas of knowledge imbued with the relational dynamics of context, power, experience, common sense, and intuition (Flyvbjerg, 2001; Tsoukas & Cummings, 1997). This approach is more suited to the pragmatic orientation of Indigenous worldviews, and is particularly pertinent in the field of organisation and management.

The notion of practical knowledge and the pragmatic context of kaupapa Māori, forms the basis for the methodology used in this research. This methodology has two specific attributes useful for research of this nature. First, its primary logic involves the interweaving of socio-economic analysis, in particular the recognition of the three intertwining roles of society, culture and economy. Secondly, is the emphasis on drawing from the lived experience of agents to explicate the categories of perception and appreciation that structure action.
(Bourdieu, 1986; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). This leads us to the first research question of this thesis:

1. What does an Indigenous [kaupapa Māori] perspective of practice offer contemporary understanding of organisational practice?

To that end, it is important to examine the discursive interaction within the Māori cultural field that inevitably leads to the contexts from which practice emerges. This draws us to the third and final question posed by Tsoukas and Cummings (1997), which concerns the *mode of action practitioners should adopt* or in Bourdieu’s words *what strategies are enacted* by the agents in the field. Strategy is a behavioural pattern or pattern of decisions that has consequences which are beneficial for the agent or agents adopting it. In spite of the usual connotations of the term, strategies need not rely on an element of intentionality, indeed opportunities to maximise benefits in the field may be unconsciously chosen (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). It is, therefore the relations between the structural elements of the cultural field, the identity and process of identity construction of individuals and communal groups, and the inter-capital exchange that informs strategies of Māori agents. This is best seen when we consider the series of strategies agents employ in negotiating the social world (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). In this research I ask what strategies Māori make use of to inform and enhance their firm performance. Thus, the second research question addressed by this thesis is:

2. What strategies do agents in the Māori cultural field enact in business?

The answers to these questions are not simple. The contemporary Māori worldview is a product of deeply embedded Māori traditions, knowledge and practice; however it is also a combination of local non-Māori and global intrusions, in which colonisation and the resulting resistance by Māori have played a defining role. To address these questions, I ground this research in the ‘practice’ approach, which focuses upon the way agents interact with the social and physical characteristics of context and relations of power in the everyday activities that constitute practice.
This study will provide an opportunity for gaining greater insight into the dynamics of Māori business practice derived as they are from social practice and systems of exchange distinctive to Indigenous Māori knowledge and ways of knowing. A key argument is that there are unique characteristics of Māori business practice, which are grounded in the epistemological stance of kaupapa Māori in combination with Western philosophies and techniques of organisation that contribute to the performance of Māori businesses. I also argue that the perspective offered by Māori business practice has much to contribute to our understanding of organisational research and practice.

B. Using Reflexivity to Address the Research Problem

At the outset of this chapter I highlighted the main influences on this research. I claim that my experiences have shaped the important narrative strands to this research. This positions my experiences, combined with the collective enterprise of the social agents within the field, who determine what constitutes the field (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). This also captures the reflexive stance of this research. It is the sharing of their stories about lived experiences, and importantly their dialogical engagement with me, that the focus on the sophisticated and oftentimes subtle role of practice was shaped; a discussion that is extended in Chapter Five.

I engage with the notion of collective identity, in the form of the research whānau, which is discussed in Chapter Five. Research whānau is depicted in this thesis as the series of relationships, through culturally appropriate means of engagement, connectedness and commitment between the research participants (Bishop, 1996). This section continues on to present the platform on which I introduce my role as researcher, agent within and narrator of the field, that is, the way I oriented my own sense of Self to this research and how this influenced the representation of this thesis. Importantly it outlines how I aim to use episodes of reflexivity to respond to the false perception of this research as a linear process, which is a consequence of the constraints of thesis presentation.

---

5 My interest in kaupapa Māori and its influence on Māori business practice; my foray into understanding the methodological and theoretical diversity within the social sciences; my own personal and professional development
Orienting Self

You don’t have to apologise for who you are, your experiences or for what you think is your inexperience in the field of Māori knowledge. You don’t need to validate or legitimise why. Your position in the field just is. It is your whakapapa.

This statement by my advisor, made early on in the research process, forced me to reflect on what this doctorate was about and my role in it. Two years earlier, I had entered into the doctoral programme, certain of my focus – Māori business development. My thinking was typical of mainstream organisational thinking regarding theory and practice. I was going to examine Māori businesses and develop a robust business model for Māori business that would create avenues for improvement, as if there was some secret guide that only mainstream thinking could provide Māori business in order to succeed. It was not until I was firmly engaged with the field of Māori business that I recognised the “false transcendence” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992: 16) that guided the dominant streams of organisational research and practice. I realised that I was in danger of producing a representation of Māori business that was as plastic as mass produced green tiki’s peddled to unsuspecting tourists as ‘authentic’ Māori craft.

During the course of this research I have continually had to ask myself questions such as “Who am I?” and “Who do I want to be?” the answers of which, entwined as they are in notions of Self-identity, are central to the developmental and diagnostic elements of this doctoral thesis. This inevitably has led me to ongoing and dynamic negotiation in creating a sense of Self in relation to the research framework, analysis and representation. In particular, the necessity of reorienting the Self in relation to establishing an Indigenous oriented perspective in organisational research, which involves a constant process of restating and retaining the integrity of an Indigenous worldview. More specifically, it has been through my own reconfiguration of self-identity and the associated cultural rediscovery that I have registered the tensions encountered through my experience. In particular the notions of a fragmented self (Kondo, 1990), the perception of being both an insider and outsider to the
field (Smith, 1999a), and the subtle, or sometimes not so subtle, pressure to legitimise my research process within mainstream organisational research.  

In hindsight I don’t view these tensions as negative, but rather as catalysts for creative and opportune streams of thought, which have informed the theoretical perspective, research strategy and interpretation of my thesis quite significantly. The process of this research was somewhat nebulous in nature, where although I maintained a structure analogous to traditional research practice I often felt decisions and actions were driven more by intuition, who I was and who I was ‘becoming’ (Lincoln & Guba, 2003). The decisions made during this research process, from the selection of the topic (or did it select me?), to the construction of the theoretical framework, and the choices of Indigenous methodology and narrative inquiry as method are bound to me, to my self-identity and my personal journey of cultural rediscovery.

C. Representation

In this thesis, I take great care in my use of Māori terminology. It is often the habit of authors to italicise non-English terms, bracketing them or their translations. The utility of language and text is, as Bourdieu (1991a) and Deetz (1992) suggest, deeply political in terms of the dynamics of power and the symbolic violence that occurs as a consequence of the power disparities in relations between speakers or their representational groups. To counter this, and in reference to the paradigm within which this research rests, I offer no such italicisation or bracketing of Indigenous Māori terminology, and embed them in the text with the meaning in which they were spoken or presented.

In addition, through the process of writing I have taken into account my presuppositions and personal circumstances (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003), sharing my own stories using narrative as a means of (re)interpreting and (re)connecting my understanding of my own shifts in consciousness as I have (re)considered this research process. By putting my stamp or signature (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) on the writing of

---

6 What occurs in the field is a kind of fragmenting of identity into distinct ‘pieces’ that are at odds with one another (Kondo, 1990).
this thesis I confirm the reflexive interpretation of the research process that involves the whole self, cognitively and physically (Rosaldo, 1994). My intention is to present research that goes beyond a romantic ‘idealisation’ of the Māori business field, in order to present a comprehensive and realistic account of practice. My approach attempts to represent the relationship between my own discursive orders that discipline my approach to this research, and the substance of research as a value-laden as opposed to value-neutral process (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Mauss, 1970). I also suggest that through the process of researching, questioning and theorising we acquire insight to the individual, as well as collective sense of identity in the research context.

The presentation of the narratives is important. This research does not subscribe to thematic analysis, which involves the structured coding of data and the building of a set of themes to describe the phenomenon of interest as per Glaser and Strauss’ conception of Grounded Theory (1967). While grounded theory and narrative inquiry do share a multi-layered ontological stance and give primacy to the agent oriented attributes of the social act (Bryant & Lasky, 2007), I locate this research soundly within the continuous and collaborative actions required of and provided by narrative as the research process. Critically, the purpose of the representational style of this thesis is not to give ‘voice’ to Māori, rather it is to ‘listen’ to what Māori voices are saying and impart the sense of shared meaning and significance for researcher, participants and audience. That being so, as narrative inquiry, this thesis offers three strands of prose aimed at capturing the dynamic interaction inherent within the simultaneous focus on practical and theoretical issues that emerged during the fieldwork (Bourdieu, 1999).

1. My episodes of reflexivity wherein ‘I’ present narratives of ‘my’ own experiences and interpretation, which are written into the text.

2. The interactive discussion between ‘us’, which incorporates conversational dialog between myself and another participant. In these instances I’ve noted the exchange as a verbatim narrative excerpt.

3. This thesis, embedded as it is in the engagement with Kaupapa Māori positions the notion of whakawhanaungatanga, rendered here as social relationality originally genealogically based, as the most appropriate culturally constituted embodiment of the
research community. I have used Bishop’s (1996) notion of whakawhanaungatanga to capture the connectivity of a research whānau (discussed in Chapter Five, but noted here as myself as researcher and the participants, both individual and at hui). The whakawhanaungatanga narrative, in contrast to being a ‘grand’ or meta-narrative, is contextualised as a localised narrative of Māori business practice situated by the experiences and practice of the research whānau. It represents what Clandinin and Connelly (2000) describe as a sense of social significance by knowing that the ‘I’ is connecting with the ‘they’ reflecting the sense of researcher and participants being together in the midst of the narrative.

By presenting the fieldwork in these three strands I utilise narrative inquiry as a research process that involves constant negotiation as to the story and its meaning, between the researcher, the research group and the field within which they are embedded. The narrative form is dialectical by its very nature, and while I do make distinctions between the three strands, they are in essence the participatory and experiential embodiment of pragmatism. The concept of pragmatism automatically locates an understanding of practice not only in its social, cultural and economical contexts, but also in its historical connotations. This draws us to consider time as a crucial, yet often taken-for-granted aspect of research because of researcher temporal presuppositions, locating the experience of time in either objective or subjective ways, which influence the study organisational life (Cunliffe, Luhman, & Boje, 2004).

This thesis recognises the pragmatic orientation of kaupapa Māori, which highlights the synergy between the concepts of time, place and history. In that sense, history becomes a living tradition in which the past informs us of the nature of the present and the potential future (Henare, 2003). Therefore, for the purposes of analysis I view practical activity as an act of temporalisation through which agents transcend the immediate present via practical mobilisation of the past and practical anticipation of the future (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). The theory of practice offered by Bourdieu allows us to transcend the metaphysical representation of time and history as realities in themselves, and uncover “transhistorical invariants, or sets of relations between structures that persist within a clearly circumscribed but relatively long historical period” (Wacquant, 1989: 36). Narrative then is the medium
through which we need to embrace more nuanced and dynamic notions of temporality as a means of grounding our research in human experience (Cunliffe, Luhman, & Boje, 2004).

Narrative thus avoids the challenge of epistemic science and predictive theory, where the purpose of social science is not to develop theory, but to contribute to society’s practical rationality according to diverse sets of values and interests (Flyvbjerg, 2001). Narrative research avoids objections of determinism informed as it is by the “open-ended, contingent relations between contexts and actions and interpretations. The rules of a ritual are not the ritual. A grammar is not a language, the rules for chess are not chess, and traditions are not actual social behaviour” (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 43). It is this that reminds us to read the story, as opposed to the words, to capture the experiences being shared in the narrative.

III. The Structure of the Thesis

This thesis is presented in three parts with ten chapters (Figure 1). I draw attention to the necessity of presenting this research in a thesis form which requires a linear flow of activity. In practice, much of the clarity associated with the research process emerged during the fieldwork and there was ‘circularity’ to this research that reflects a more fluid composition. I draw on Schwab's (1960) notion of fluid inquiry described as "a way of thinking in which inquiry is not clearly governed by theories, methodological tactics, and strategies" (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000: 121). In writing, the reflexivity of my position is significant as I turn back the theory and reflect on events and, stories and I subscribe to Eisenhardt’s (1989) notion of ‘enfolding literatures’ to capture the continuous cycle of engagement between the emerging practices and existing literature.

With Part One I present The Kaupapa of this thesis. Kaupapa literally translated means guiding principle (Marsden, 2003) and it is with that in mind that I present the guiding theoretical and methodological foundations for the thesis over four chapters (two to five). To begin, Chapter Two situates practical knowledge as a different form of explaining and understanding action in an organisational context. Chapter Three presents an Indigenous paradigm as an alternate philosophic framework dependent on a complex opposition to and
emergence from dominant Western paradigms, and specifically introduces the logic of the kaupapa Māori as the orienting contextualisation of this research. Next Chapter Four locates the field of practice as the context of Māori business and outlines the framework of analysis. Finally Chapter Five considers narrative inquiry as a culturally oriented method that responds to the call for innovative methods for uncovering the conceptual complexity and dynamics in Indigenous organisations.

In Part Two *Raranga Kōrero*, which refers to the weaving of stories, involves the creation of the narrative, told over four chapters (Chapters Six to Nine). Although I use the theoretical concepts discussed in Part One as a basis for these narrative chapters, I emphasise the dialogical in Part Two where it is the voices other than those of myself and existing literature which are represented. Chapter Six presents the underlying facets of Māori business practice by outlining the characteristics of the field, habitus and forms of capital unique to the Māori cultural field. The final three chapters will discuss how Indigenous Māori practices inform our understanding of organisational practice in terms of leadership in Chapter Seven, combinations of resources and capabilities in Chapter Eight, and collaborative relationships in Chapter Nine.

Part Three *Weaving the Kete*, is the pulling together of the narrative threads and a closing discussion to this thesis. Although it represents the key insights generated throughout this research, it is not meant solely as a summation of the previous chapters. Chapter Ten is where I reiterate the contribution of this research by specifically addressing the research proposition and questions. The chapter then proceeds to pose possibilities for future inquiry using an Indigenous paradigm in organisation research and analysis.
Figure 1 - Overall Structure of the Thesis

**THE SLEEPING TANIWHA**

**Part One - The Kaupapa**

- Chapter 2 – The Utility of Practical Knowledge
- Chapter 3 – Theorising for an Indigenous Paradigm
- Chapter 4 – Situating Analysis of Māori Business Practice
- Chapter 5 – Whakawhanaungatanga Culturally Situated Research

**Theorising for an Indigenous Paradigm**
- Mainstream paradigmatic assumptions guiding our understanding of organisational theory and practice
- Indigenous paradigm – discursive political economy combining kaupapa Māori and unified theory of practice, grounded in a pragmatist epistemology
- Conceptualising and grounding empirical analysis for Māori business practice.

**Culturally Attuned Method**

**Part Two - Raranga Kōrero**

- Chapter 6 – Histories of Practice
- Chapter 7 – Kaupapa Māori Leadership
- Chapter 8 – Kaupapa Māori System of Exchange
- Chapter 9 – Kaupapa Māori Collaborative Relationships

**The Field**

- *What strategies do agents in the Māori cultural field enact in business to empower themselves?*
  - Leadership
  - Combination of resources and capabilities
  - Relationships & networks
  - *What does an Indigenous [kaupapa Māori] perspective of practice offer our understanding of organisational practice?*
  - *Firm performance is not merely an outcome of economic activity, but is also a corollary of the value derived from combinations of distinct socio-cultural resources and capabilities.*

**Part Three – Weaving the Kete**

- Chapter 10 – The Rising Taniwha
Part One - The Kaupapa

Part One presents the kaupapa of this thesis, or the guiding methodological foundations, over four chapters (Chapters Two to Five). The function of the dialogue presented in these chapters is to present the utility of an Indigenous paradigm as the pragmatic orientation and philosophical cohabitation of both kaupapa Māori and ‘practical knowledge’; and its complex opposition to and emergence from the dominant Western paradigm. An Indigenous paradigm contributes to the various philosophical, theoretical and practical issues in current debates on methodological approaches in organisational studies (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000; Brocklesby, 2005). It also makes a significant contribution to organisation studies, as an alternative conception of what constitutes knowledge and practice in the organisational setting (Hawkins, 1997; Tsoukas & Hatch, 2001; Wicks & Freeman, 1998). Moreover, when we consider paradigms as establishing parameters that inform knowledge acquisition and dissemination, an Indigenous worldview has implications for the study of Indigenous organisations, and organisation studies in general.

These chapters are foundational to Part Two, where I present the narrative as the accumulation of the stories and experiences shared by the participants. The concepts presented in Part One are recursive throughout this work and are not exclusive to the chapters in which they are explicitly covered. Specifically the framework of analysis offered in Chapter Four, drawn from the themes that emerge from the preceding chapters, is used to analyse the narrative fieldwork.

And for the Audience ...

During the writing of the initial drafts of these chapters, I would often read over what I’d put down into text and be frustrated that it didn’t read the way it sounded in my head. It seemed to me to be an incredibly linear depiction of what in actuality was a constant cycle of negotiation within and between those foundational conceptions of Indigenous paradigm, kaupapa Māori and organisational practice. I discuss this ‘circularity’ of the research process in Chapter Five, when presenting the method of inquiry as narrative, pointing particularly to Denzin and Lincoln’s (1994) view of the emergent and unfinished processes that capture the
essence of social science inquiry. Indeed I would suggest there is a sinuous quality in the connections between each chapter, which is captured by Schwab's (1960) notion of fluid inquiry described as "a way of thinking in which inquiry is not clearly governed by theories, methodological tactics, and strategies" (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000: 121). It is within these parameters that I locate this research as a narrative inquiry that allows for "… explorations of the phenomena of experience rather than in comparative analysis of various theoretical methodological frames" (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000: 128). Thus, the way in which I envision these chapters, which should be kept in mind in reading, is that while we read them in a linear mode, they are in fact threads of the narrative being woven together.
CHAPTER TWO: THE UTILITY OF PRACTICAL KNOWLEDGE IN ORGANISATIONAL ANALYSIS

This thesis takes as its subject matter the position that firm performance is derived from the value inherent within combinations of distinct socio-cultural resources and capabilities, in this instance Indigenous practices (specifically Māori cultural practices). In this chapter I provide the basis for two important threads of discussion. First, it introduces the founding research agenda for this thesis, which I regard as an intermediary step towards the conceptualisation of an Indigenous paradigm:

- Firm performance is not merely an outcome of economic activity, but is also a corollary of the value derived from combinations of distinct socio-cultural resources and capabilities.

I argue that this proposition provides space for the utility of a research approach that can take into account the distinct social complexities of an Indigenous Māori context. To that end, this chapter also presents the motivating logic behind my development of an Indigenous paradigm that conceptualises kaupapa Māori (Chapter Three) and grounds empirical analysis for Māori business practice (Chapter Four). These strands of discussion engage with scholars in the field of organisational research and practice that challenge the prevailing rational orthodoxy, influencing the way in which the academy and managers think about themselves and organisations (Knights & Morgan, 1991; Stacey, 2007).

In Section I, I begin by outlining the perspective that has guided organisational analysis and practice to date, identifying the dualist discourse of the Western worldview as the dominant logic. Section II presents the conception of practice as the primary lens through which we can understand social activity, outlining the pragmatist epistemology of ‘practical knowledge’. Section III continues to examine practical knowledge in the context of organisation and management using the strategy framework to articulate firm performance. Section IV concludes this chapter and provides a transition to Chapter Three where practical knowledge
is located as the primary lens through which we can understand social activity embedded in an Indigenous Māori context.

I. Questioning the ‘Status Quo’ in Organisation Research

The scientific field is a field defined by the continuous distribution of the specific capital possessed, at the given moment, by various agents or institutions operative in the field. It is also a field of struggles or a space of competition where agents or institutions who work at valorising their own capital – by means of strategies of accumulation imposed by the competition and appropriate for determining the preservation or transformation of the structure – confront one another (Bourdieu, 1991b: 6-7).

In this section I argue that researchers of phenomena grounded in Indigenous contexts face an ideological tension. A tension created by the disjunction of applying methodologies that align with what I conceptualise as a mainstream Western view of knowledge creation, at the same time as maintaining an Indigenous Māori worldview (For example see Bishop, 1996; Smith, 1999a). I highlight the dilemma faced by all organisational researchers, and that is the choice of methodological orientation. It is a choice heavily influenced by what Bourdieu (1991b) refers to as a ‘struggle for the monopoly of specific competence’ in research endeavours. It is here, at this site of ‘struggle’ and ‘competition’ between Indigenous and Western worldviews, where I position an Indigenous paradigm in organisational research. In this thesis, it is a choice that focuses attention onto an Indigenous paradigm as an alternate philosophic framework dependent on a complex opposition to and emergence from dominant Western oriented paradigms.

In Chapter One, I suggested that exploring worldviews is an essential precursor to understanding the alternate philosophical orientation required for scholarly engagement in organisational research and practice. As Morgan (1980) argues in order to understand the orthodoxy in organisation theory, we must understand the “relationship between different modes of theorising and research, and the worldviews they reflect” (: 606). I described paradigm in its meta-theoretical philosophical sense, as used in this thesis, as an implicit or explicit view of reality or worldview (Morgan, 1980). However, it is not my intention to invest in a detailed analysis of the different theoretical paradigms that operate in the field of organisation research (see Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Deetz, 1996; Morgan, 1980). I draw on paradigms as sets of interrelated assumptions about the social world which provide a
philosophical and conceptual framework for the organised study of that world (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Gioia & Pitre, 1990; Hassard & Keleman, 2002). Therefore, I do not subscribe to the paradigmatic framework in any hegemonic capacity, but rather view this space as a useful starting point to articulate my conceptualisation of alternative ‘views’ and ‘realities’ (Biggart & Delbridge, 2004; Deetz, 1996; Morgan, 1980).

A. To be or not to be … That is the Question

Certainly, the ‘space of competition’ in research is apparent in the field of organisation studies, which has a long and distinguished history, with research and practice based upon a well established philosophy of science (Bacharach, 1989; Burrell & Morgan, 1979). Knowledge development and community practice in organisational analysis is subsumed within a Kuhnian conventionalism, which divides the theoretical and empirical cake into various sociological paradigms (Hassard & Keleman, 2002). Consequently, each perspective argues that its notion of ‘organisation’ is more valid and each exhibits a variety of philosophical orientations endorsing specific practices and structural arrangements unique to each (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Deetz, 1996; Schultz & Hatch, 1996).

The book that ‘popularised’ (Jacques, 1992) the concept of paradigms in organisational analysis was *Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis* by Burrell and Morgan (1979). In it they explored the role of paradigms in organisational analysis and argued for the utility of different sets of meta-theoretical assumptions regarding the nature of science (the object-subject dimension), and the nature of society (the regulation-radical change dimension). Burrell and Morgan’s (1979) work mapped the diversity of paradigms in organisational theory and represented each as incommensurable, in that each must be developed and applied separately. Effectively they represented paradigms as “hermetically sealed intellectual compartments” (Hassard & Keleman, 2002: 336). They claimed that differences in ontology, epistemology and methodology, as well as assumptions about human nature, construct insurmountable barriers between paradigmatic perspectives. Each presenting a unique perspective that is “paradigmatically anchored” (Gioia & Pitre, 1990: 585) and in which concepts are defined and, theories developed, therefore preventing combinations of concepts or analytical methods.
The first paradigm, depicted by Burrell and Morgan (1979) as the functionalist paradigm, traditionally associated with the traditions of objectivism, positivism, structuralism, and cognitivism presupposes a break with immediate experience and seeks to construct the objective relations which structure practices and representations (Bourdieu, 1991a). A positivist method implies a monist epistemology grounded by the experience of scientific observation and law-like modes of knowing (Spender, 1998). Positivism’s ontology is one of realism, which assumes a knowledgeable reality external to the observer compelled by the immutable divide between human values and the rules and processes of science (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). The study of human activity is guided by a context-free-definition of an action, that is, a definition based on abstract rules or laws (Flyvbjerg, 2001). Positivism purports an *a priori* universal and objective structure of human knowledge, truth and conception of reality, which determines the nature of rationality (Chia, 1997), forming the assumption of rational and self-interested behaviour as the spring of all human action.

It is widely agreed that the field of organisation studies has been dominated by the positivist perspective, underpinning the development of organisation theory and practice (Chia, 1997; Gioia & Pitre, 1990; Tsoukas & Cummings, 1997; Zald, 1993). As Shotter (1997: 18) suggests “we are still in the thrall of the traditional, individualistic, non-relational paradigm, and both the representationalism and epistemology it projects”. This is a consequence of an era when the formation of the global market was dominated by the economies and cultures of powerful imperialist systems, embodied with a highly developed rationalising ideology and unilinear evolutionism that insisted on the universality of human reason and progress (Hall, 1991; Sahlins, 1999; Said, 1993).

In contrast to the positivists construal of the world, Burrell and Morgan (1979) offer an interpretive or anti-positivist paradigm. The anti-positivist stance in research aims to unseat the privileged location of the objectivity of science and provide the space for creativity and legitimation for a broad array of approaches to understanding organisation research and practice (Deetz, 1996; Wicks & Freeman, 1998). This perspective is commonly associated with such traditions in research as subjectivism, phenomenology, ethnomethodology, hermeneutics and reflexivity (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000). It reflects the internalised position and is an intellectual orientation to the social world which seeks to understand the
world as it appears to the individuals who are situated within it (Bourdieu, 1991a). People socially and symbolically construct and sustain their realities. Interpretive research relies on qualitative methods that focus on understanding the phenomenon, requiring a subjective perspective through an interpretative and rational approach to the research (Reichardt & Cook, 1979).

Dual representation for organisational research and practice is due to what the philosopher Richard Bernstein calls, “Cartesian anxiety,” the fear of relativism and nihilism when one departs from the analytical-rational scientific tradition that has dominated Western scientific reason (Flyvbjerg, 2001). Epistemology, specifically the debate between positivists and anti-positivists, becomes of central concern, primarily because the framework of positivism overtly renders marginal other, non-quantitative approaches to studying. At its core, positivism assumes the marginality of anything that does not subscribe to the characteristics of epistemological realism, which defines knowledge to the extent to which it can be verified by hard facts acquired through systematic observation (Chia, 1997). Anti-positivism emphasises the creative role of active, subjective participants, none of whom owns a privileged claim on truth (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). We are guided by these paradigmatic representations in the field of organisational analysis and practice. Assuming and endorsing a restriction of analysis within the confines of Burrell and Morgan’s mutually exclusive ways of making sense of the social world (Willmott, 1993).

Many scholars, however, are challenging the simplicity of this paradigmatic ‘either/or’ dichotomy (Bourdieu, 1991b; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Flyvbjerg, 2001; Giddens, 1984; Willmott, 1993). Indeed, as recognised by Deetz (1996: 194) “the philosophical distinction between subjectivity and objectivity is widely challenged by non-Western groups”; a sentiment strongly supported by Bourdieu. Therefore, this thesis heeds the call by organisational theorists (such as Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000; Deetz, 1996; Willmott, 1993) for the formation of a discursive space within which other knowledge-producing practices become valued in the scholarly fields of organisation studies. This brings to the fore this thesis’ preoccupation with the pragmatist epistemology of practical knowledge (Bourdieu, 1977; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Flyvbjerg, 2001; Tsoukas & Cummings, 1997), which I
II. Practical Knowledge

Pierre Bourdieu’s body of work extends the boundaries of and contributes to the fields of anthropology, sociology, political studies, education and more recently economics. He is perhaps better known for his work on the role of education systems in perpetuating class-based differences in power and prestige; and his theorisation of the production and consumption of symbolic goods (Brubaker, 1985). However, it is his approach to the study of social life in practice that seeks a more holistic and synchronistic relationship between the physical and cognitive aspects of human behaviour and institutional constraints, that is the basis for this thesis. Bourdieu is not alone in his dismissal of the distinctions between agency and structure. Giddens’ (1984) theory of structuration also posits all human action as being performed within the context of preexisting social structure and is therefore partly predetermined by the contextual rules under which it occurs.

Tsoukas and Cummings (1997: 661) propose that we should “get outside the ‘box’ … and think differently about management”. In their view, and that of other scholars (see Flyvbjerg, 2001), practical knowledge, derived from Aristotle’s account of phronesis, reflects a logical pathway to develop current thinking and practice in organisation and management research. The appeal of Aristotle’s phronesis is its understanding of practical knowledge, which draws from a pragmatic orientation imbued with the relationship between scientific and technical knowledge.

Attention to a practical knowledge approach offers three avenues to research. It provides a social scientific method that necessitates relational thinking and epistemic reflexivity, which involves a consideration of both the role of the researcher and the construction of the research object (Bourdieu, 1991b; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Everett, 2002). It also provides a logic and analytical apparatus allowing us to conceptualise distinctive social arrangements within and between fields and capital, resulting in different analytic categories.
and strategies becoming appropriate. Finally, and in conclusion to this section, it highlights the pragmatist orientation that constitutes the epistemological basis for this research.

A. A Focus on Practice

Bourdieu argues for the “possibility of a unified political economy of practice” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992: 4). From his perspective the chief merit of positivism is that it breaks with the immediate experiences of the social world and is therefore able to produce knowledge of the social world that is not reducible to the practical knowledge possessed by lay actors. In Bourdieu’s view the break with immediate experience is an essential prerequisite for social-scientific inquiry. Such a break that is difficult given the social scientist is also a participant in the social world and hence is inclined to draw on everyday words and concepts in order to analyse it (Thompson, 1991). However, positivism fails to take account of how people use or inhabit structures; that is the link between the knowledge positivism produces and the practical knowledge possessed by actors. Conversely, anti-positivism fails to take into account the close connection between objective structures of a culture and the dispositions of individuals. This approach incorporates the notion of symbolic power, and fuses structural and phenomenologically-inspired approaches into a coherent, epistemologically grounded, mode of social inquiry (Wacquant, 1989).

Bourdieu posits three distinct, yet interrelated aspects that are employed in his theory of practice: the notions of field, habitus, and the structure and distribution of species of capital. While it is necessary to unpack his philosophical stance, it should be noted that his work is highly integrated and these notions operate in a way which is mutually influencing. To understand the connection between the field as a defined social space, capital and individual identity, it is necessary to consider Bourdieu’s conceptual apparatus as a ‘three legged stool’ (Everett, 2002).

A field is the set of institutions, rules, rituals, conventions, categories, designations, appointments and titles that constitute an objective hierarchy, and which produces and authorises certain discourses and activities (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Fields are
described as networks of social relations within which struggles take place over resources, stakes, and access. These struggles and relations occur over capital. Bourdieu (1986) defines capital as “accumulated labour which, when appropriated on a private basis by agents or groups of agents, enables them to appropriate social energy in the form of reified or living labour” (Bourdieu, 1986: 241). Capital therefore holds with it the potential capacity for producing profits out of accumulated resources, within circuits of production and reproduction of value to particular markets, creating influence over the behaviours of others.

Bourdieu’s work has expanded the notion of capital beyond its traditional classical economic conception with its emphasis on material exchange, to include non-economic forms of capital. Bourdieu (1986) suggests that it is “impossible to account for the structure and functioning of the social world unless one reintroduces capital in all its forms and not solely the one recognised by economic theory” (: 242). He identifies and provides distinctions between economic capital (goods immediately convertible to money, quantifiable value, production and exchange, self-interested) and non-economic capital (intangible, cultural and social). This perspective provides a platform with which to examine the relationship between the social, cultural and economic elements of society.

The classical economic approach to defining capital is as a physical object that is able to contribute to output for purposes of consumption in a future period (Fine & Green, 2000). Economic capital can be described in monetary terms referring to the ownership of objects which others may not interfere with without permission, creating an element of exclusivity (Smart, 1993) and is distinctively material (Everett, 2002). From an organisation and management perspective, possession and control of economic capital is essential for the flow and production of goods and services and in particular the capacity for achieving sustainable competitive advantages.

The terminology of social capital is distinct from other forms of capital, its substance being provided by social sciences other than economics, particularly sociology and anthropology.

---

7 There are any number of iterations of capital beyond economic, social and cultural, such as linguistic and political capital (Everett, 2002); human capital (Brown & Lauder, 2000; Pennings, Lee, & van Witteloostuijn, 1998); and intellectual capital (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). More recently attention is being paid to spiritual capital (Ashar & Lane-Maher, 2004; Iseke-Barnes, 2003) and natural capital (Hart, 1995).
The notion of social capital exemplifies a rekindling of interest in the relationship between economy and society, in particular as a process of revalorisation of social relationships in economic discourse (Schuller, Baron, & Field, 2000; Zukin & DiMaggio, 1990). At the heart of this revival is an attempt to understand the mutual influences between economic exchange and those social structures in which the economy is embedded (Araujo & Easton, 1999; Granovetter, 1985).

Bourdieu (1986) was crucial in introducing the concept of social capital into modern discourse. He theorised the reproduction of class relations through cultural mechanisms, placing social capital firmly in the heart of his analysis as one of three fundamental species of capital (Schuller, Baron, & Field, 2000). Bourdieu defines social capital as, "the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition" (1986: 248). Bourdieu calls this ‘collectively-owned capital’, which is socially constructed and instituted within and by a community, family, tribe or society.

Cultural capital is the collection of non-economic forces (family, background, investment and commitment to education, etc.) which influence academic success (Bourdieu, 1986). It is a form of value associated with culturally authorised tastes, consumption patterns, attributes, skills and awards. The value associated with cultural capital is the capacity of agents to engage in certain types of practices (Smart, 1993), and the creation of social spaces (fields) where certain behaviours and linguistics are accepted, understood and encouraged based on cultural norms. Cultural capital reflects knowledge and claims ability to act in certain practices. In the strongest form it accords a monopoly over including others in such practices (Smart, 1993).

The logic of habitus is what Bourdieu describes as the ‘unconscious taking in’ of rules, values and characteristics (knowledge), which produce and influence practice. The habitus counters the one-sided nature of objectivism and is in an abstract sense the system of internalised dispositions that mediates social structures and practical activity, being shaped by the former and regulating the latter (Brubaker, 1985). Bourdieu describes it as the way in which
individuals become themselves, develop attitudes and values, and the ways in which those individuals engage in practices. It is a concept that is useful in that it allows the researcher to describe how individuals respond to cultural rules and context in a variety of ways (Bourdieu, 1977).

Habitus is a concept that expresses an individual’s perception of ‘being’ that has developed from their cultural history. Importantly, this process highlights the means of examining social settings, the individuals who inhabit these settings and how they make sense of surroundings through symbols, rituals, social structures and social roles and so forth “to make sense of themselves and others” (Berg, 2001: 7). In a kaupapa Māori context, this expression of habitus engages both the individual and collective as key constituent habitus of Māori social organisation (Chapter Three).

B. The Logic of Practice

For Bourdieu reflexivity entails systematic reflection by intellectuals to recognise and disconnect from the specific determinisms embedded in their innermost thoughts. Tsoukas and Cummings suggest (1997) it has required a change in researcher perspective: “where earlier researchers saw clarity, researchers now see ambiguity; where there was singularity, now there is diversity: where earlier theorists searched for regularities and general theories, many now discover idiosyncrasies and particularities” (: 657). The key role of epistemic reflexivity is to negate the world as an objectively accessible social reality and destabilise hegemonic accounts by exposing their modes of social organisation and reproduction. It sanctions the investigation and problematisation of the taken-for-granted social constructions of reality which are located in the varying practices, interests and motives which constitute different communities’ sense making (Bourdieu, 1991b; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Johnson & Duberley, 2003).

Nussbaum (1990 cited in Tsoukas and Cummings, 1997: 666) points to three reasons for the acquisition of practical wisdom. First, practical matters are mutable and they change over time. According to Bourdieu practice takes into account historical dimensions, and therefore
the relativity, of cognitive structures. Indeed, “social agents are the product of history, of the history of the whole social field and of the accumulated experience of a path within the specific field” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992: 136). Thus, symbolic relations of power tend to reproduce and reinforce the power relations that constitute the structure of social space over time (Bourdieu, 1989). It then follows, that the way power expresses itself in the form of strategies undertaken by the agents of the field, in their approach to navigating the field, become of critical concern (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). We aim to examine strategies, in the form of decisions, which are influenced by the network of relations in which agents are embedded and the consequences as they acquire validity over time.

Second, practical matters are inherently indeterminate or ambiguous as it depends on the position of the agent posing the definition. Every definition has multiple perspectives and intent. Bourdieu’s perspective embraces the social world as a product of the sociological construction of multiple visions of the world. We recognise that the construction of social reality is not only an individual exercise but a collective one (Bourdieu, 1989). This captures a point central to Bourdieu’s work, the notion of fields as sites of forces, struggle and relationships defined by the relations of power. Hence attention is paid to shared constructions of knowledge and the negotiation of meaning amongst communities of practice (Bradbury & Lichtenstein, 2000; Brown & Duguid, 1991). No construction of social reality is bound to a single discursive regime and its inherent power relations, instead what we have are multiple fragmented and changing regimes of power (Bourdieu, 1989, 1991b). Therefore we must attend to the multiple meanings and perspectives that continuously emerge throughout the research process (Deetz, 1996).

Lastly, practical matters cannot rely on particular and repeatable elements, as the stuff of real life is unpredictable. This takes into account the ungeneralisability of moral decisions. As “in Hunter’s (1991: 39) words: no sure answer is to be found in even the clearest of principles” (Tsoukas & Cummings, 1997: 666). Practice focuses attention on to what is variable, on that which cannot be encapsulated by universal rules, on the interaction between the general and the concrete. Thus it is an approach that requires consideration, judgement and choice; and more than anything else it requires attention to the relational experience (Flyvbjerg, 2001). It
is the context-sensitive character of social action that must be understood as context specific understanding of the field.

I argue that practical knowledge and its epistemological basis in pragmatism is a consistent intellectual foundation from which to connect to management practice (Powell, 2001). I also argue it is requisite for engagement with an Indigenous worldview because of its inclusive, relational and experiential foundations, which counter one-dimensional meanings or worldviews. In the following discussion I highlight the utility of practical knowledge, grounded by its logical and philosophical foundations in a pragmatic epistemology (Powell, 2002; Tsoukas & Cummings, 1997), as a cornerstone to the construction of an Indigenous paradigm (discussed in Chapter Three).

**C. Pragmatist Epistemology**

This draws us to the pragmatist contention that there are no meanings offered as "ultimate" truth or "absolute" knowledge, thus rejecting the idea that truth corresponds to some non-experienced, pre-constituted reality. Rather truth is a set of relations within the human experience. Certainly, in contemporary writing most of the thinkers who describe themselves as pragmatists point to some connection with practical consequences or real effects as vital components of both meaning and truth (Kivinen & Piironen, 2006; Powell, 2001). The pragmatist proposes to reorient the assessment of theories around a third criterion: the theory’s capacity to solve human problems. This clearly connects to the objective of practical knowledge to adequately explain a theory of practice, specifically by reintroducing the lived experience of agents to illuminate the categories of perception and appreciation that structure action (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Therefore, to examine human behaviour in social settings we should focus on the minutiae and practice that make up the basic components of life (Flyvbjerg, 2001).

The traditional emphasis of what constitutes knowledge is described by Herbert Dreyfus as theory that is explicit, universal, abstract, systematic and, predictive (Flyvbjerg, 2001). In that function, valid theory and knowledge production requires that the concrete context of
everyday human activity and power dimensions systems be excluded (Bishop, 1996; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Flyvbjerg, 2001; Heshusius, 1994; Lather, 1986). I argue that practical knowledge, guided by a pragmatist orientation, constitutes a viable epistemological avenue for addressing the problems associated with the normative models of science that dominate organisational management.

Pragmatism offers a more diverse and interpretive approach to the study of organisations. It does so by opening up opportunities and countering the dominant epistemology of Western culture. Particularly, where all knowledge is believed to be best acquired through reason and the use of concepts and methods that are freed as much as possible from the fallibilities of our senses or the context of given situations (Chia, 1997; Cook & Brown, 1999). Pluralist epistemology also rejects the notion of a single reference system in which we can establish truth (Spender, 1998). In organisation research and practice, a pragmatist epistemology allows us to engage with the multiplicity of pluralist epistemologies. The significance of practical knowledge which draws from a pragmatist epistemology is that it embraces the different kinds of human knowledge. In Spender’s (1998) view a pluralistic epistemology seeks to capture different types of knowledge, differentiated according to (a) the ways in which the various types of human knowledge are distinguished, and (b) the ways in which they are interrelated and formed into coherent knowledge systems.

As discussed earlier human knowledge can be categorised in Aristotle’s three elementary distinctions of episteme, techne and phronesis (Flyvbjerg, 2001; Tsoukas & Cummings, 1997), corresponding to modern scientific/empirical knowledge, craft/non-empirical knowledge, and phronesis which deals with the synthesis of both. Given the context of this thesis, Chapter Three introduces mātauranga Māori, or Māori epistemology which demonstrates the construction of human knowledge that is created by Māori and captures the relationship between humanity and the world of which they are a part (Royal, 1998).

First, however, attention is drawn to managers’ intuition, that collective knowledge, what Bourdieu calls ‘le san pratique’, which refers to the socially constituted sense of the game (Bourdieu, 1977). Bourdieu often made use of the game metaphor to illuminate the form and functioning of his conception of field, although, “… a field is not the product of a deliberate
act of creation, and it follows rules, or better, regularities, that are not explicit and codified” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992: 98). And so the players of the game, or agents in the field, both individually and collectively, have a sense of how to act in situations without continually having to make fully conscious decisions. The game drives the strategic orientation of agents in the field with regards to the ‘moves’, ‘decisions’ or ‘strategies’ undertaken. Thus, this perspective has contributed a great deal to the emergence of a ‘practice’ approach in organisation and management literature.

III. Advancing a Pragmatic Epistemology in Firm Performance

Section I of this chapter outlined foundational principles governing organisational practice and management that stem primarily from the consequences of applying positivist frameworks in research. It identified as a key failure the inability to take into account the unique circumstances or context of each firm and the power dynamics of human actors engaging in ‘rule-bound practical activities’ (Knights & Morgan, 1991; Tsoukas, 1996). This section examines a shift in understanding of firm performance within the field of organisational studies, towards an emphasis on connecting the concepts of society, culture and organisation. I argue that scholarship in the field is beginning to move away from the historically contingent mechanistic projections of organisations towards a pragmatic orientation. A shift that necessitates a reconceptualisation of subject matter in terms of meaning, interpretation, ambiguity, conflict, context-dependence, and reflexivity (Tsoukas & Vladimirou, 2001).

As Rouse and Daellenbach (1999) have suggested, strategy research has provided for a myriad of strategic variables. However, an integrated perspective actualised in field-work-based or ethnographic-type research would point to valuable, strategically important factors and social synergies in organisations. In this section I aim to illustrate how practical knowledge grounded by a pragmatist epistemology offers a counter to the traditional economics-based dominance over strategy research (Jarzabkowski, 2005; Powell, 2001). I argue that practical knowledge contextualises and brings power to the forefront in research and analysis of firm performance.
A. Consequences for Firm Performance

My thesis examines activities associated with firm performance, which I suggest is situated comfortably within the field of strategic management. As Powell’s (2001) commentary suggests, theories of strategic management evoke the concept of competitive advantage to explain firm performance. According to Porter (1991) the central issue in organisation and management research and practice is the question of why firms succeed or fail. He argues that it is an issue inextricably linked to why firms differ in terms of their behaviour, how they choose strategies and how they are managed. It is an issue which explicitly connects organisational decisions and actions to organisational performance. A key point is that organisational practices are driven by their continuous attempt to identify, create and leverage some form of advantage to achieve improved firm performance (Collis & Montgomery, 1995), or competitive advantage.

The key distinction in strategy tends to be in the level of analysis, from an emphasis on industry structure to firm specific effects (Dyer, 2000; Spanos & Lioukas, 2001). The two leading theories that have dominated current discourse to date are the industry structure view (Porter, 1980, 1985) and the resource-based view (Barney, 1991; Wernerfelt, 1984). Porter’s (1980) Industry Structure View (ISV) is founded in the idea that the firm can position itself within the characteristics of industry structure in such a way as to achieve a competitive advantage and hence superior performance. Specifically, if a firm wants to achieve a competitive advantage it needs to focus strategic decision-making on modifying the structural characteristics of its industry to achieve high returns. Porter’s key hypothesis is that superior performance and the ability to achieve long-term profitability, often indicative of a sustainable competitive advantage, “takes the form of monopoly rents to protected market positions” (Powell, 2001: 875).

At the same time, however, evidence from organisational practices has illustrated a shift in emphasis on industry structure to firm specific effects (Dyer, 2000; Spanos & Lioukas, 2001). Firm differences and distinctive competencies have long been recognised as important variables in strategy development (Caves, 1980; Porter, 1980, 1985). Wernerfelt (1984) first introduced into the field of strategic management the perspective of the ‘firm as a bundle of
resource sets’, paving the way for the resource-based view (RBV) of the firm. Barney (1991) is largely credited for positioning the RBV of the firm, as the critical unit of analysis, rather than the industry as an important determinant of firm profitability.

More recently authors have engaged with the hypothesis that these two perspectives are in fact, more complementary than contradictory (Cockburn, Henderson, & Stern, 2000; Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Powell, 2001) and have argued for the development of a more complete approach to the theory of competitive advantage. That is, one based on the combination of resource and broader environment-based perspectives (Barney, 2001; Peteraf, 1993; Priem & Butler, 2001). This approach requires explicit attention to both the internal and the external variables. It could be argued that only an integrated understanding of both perspectives (and their underlying assumptions) may produce a more useful and complete contribution to strategy knowledge. However, in terms of understanding organisational practice, those dominant perspectives do little to provide a coherent account of strategy making, how capabilities are developed and modified over time and what difference that makes to the strategy of the firm (Cockburn, Henderson, & Stern, 2000).

Whilst there has been a concerted effort in strategy scholarship to mediate more comprehensively the relationship between society and the economy, each perspective is at its core embedded in a rationalist economic paradigm. Therefore, both fields are based primarily in an economic paradigm (Conner, 1991), conceiving of the sources of advantage as static and objectively discoverable. Each maintains a positivistic stance that is too coarse to access deep understandings of how firms differ and what a difference that makes (Rouse & Daellenbach, 1999). This predicament is not unique to strategy and firm performance research and analysis, however, as Powell (2001) argues:

…strategy scholars should acknowledge that the search for sustainable competitive advantages almost certainly arises from a false mental picture, namely the idea that a competitive advantage resides somewhere in time and space, findable in the same way that we find a misplaced fountain pen, or a sunken ship. … It should by now be obvious, but we point it out anyway, that competitive advantages, especially resource-based advantages, do not exist as sensible entities, and researchers will not discover them sunken deep within organizations, Titanic-like, creating sustained superior performance (: 885).
The epistemological premise of much of the literature on firm performance and specifically strategy has been predominantly positivist. However, it can be argued that strategy “is an experiential arena where philosophy matters, and strategy research is beginning to recognise this connection” (Powell, 2002: 879). A more satisfactory representation capturing sources of advantage derives from the dynamic weaving together of the organisational activities and routing that marshal resources (RBV) and put them to use in the context of an industry (ISV). I engage with the growing body of organisational research and practice that challenges the prevailing orthodoxy, specifically in the field of strategy and questions the extent to which strategy is a rational process (Jarzabkowski, 2004, 2005; Knights & Morgan, 1991; Pettigrew, 2001). This is an approach usefully understood from the field of dynamic capabilities (Teece, Pisano, & Shuen, 1997), however it is to strategy as practice that we turn.

B. Strategy as Practice

To date organisational orthodoxy has relied on a set of ‘rational’ techniques that produce organisational movement according to designs formulated before any action (Knights & Morgan, 1991; Stacey, 2007). Practice has emerged as part of the broad changes in contemporary social theory and management sciences over the past 20 years (Jarzabkowski, 2005; Johnson, Langley, Melin, & Whittington, 2007; Reckwitz, 2002). The contribution of practical knowledge is relative new to the field (and sub-fields) of organisation and management research (Everett, 2002; Jacobs, 2004). It is, however, becoming well established in strategic management research (Chia, 2004; Jarzabkowski, 2003, 2004; Johnson, Langley, Melin, & Whittington, 2007; Johnson, Melin, & Whittington, 2003) and it has emerged in the recent focus on knowledge management in organisational contexts (Bradbury & Lichtenstein, 2000; Brown & Duguid, 1991).

Traditionally, the strategy discipline has treated strategy as a property of organisations: an organisation has a strategy of some kind. Increasingly, however, strategy is being seen also as a practice: strategy is something people do (Jarzabkowski, 2004). The strategy as practice research agenda in the field of strategic management reflects the promise of recent theoretical initiatives in the literature that draw explicitly on practice theory (for example see Hendry, 2000; Jarzabkowski, 2003; Jarzabkowski & Wilson, 2002; Orlikowski, 2002; Tsoukas, 1996).
It is an approach that aims to develop closer connections and a deeper appreciation of the activities occurring deep inside organisations and broader phenomena outside. Typically, those efforts are divided into two arenas: strategy as part of broader societal phenomenon and strategy that explains performance of the firm with reference to intra-organisational activity that changes what agents (e.g. managers) do and their self-understanding in general terms (Whittington, 2006).

As an example of research that encompasses the broader extra-organisational level, Oakes et al (1998) examined the wider implications’ of the introduction of business planning practices in Canadian public museums. Using Bourdieuan analysis they found the technical rationality of planning subtly undercuts the traditional sources of cultural capital for managers throughout the sector, shifting the balance from education to commercial logics. Other research that has developed a practice-oriented approach has taken a more internal focus on intra-organisational strategy activity. For example, in their ethnography of university practice, Jarzabkowski and Wilson (2002) made use of Bourdieu, as well as Giddens, to show how the minutiae of its committee cycles actually become a source of advantage in shaping and responding to strategic change.

Each of these intra- and extra-organisational approaches to research have achieved considerable insight in advancing strategy practice research (Whittington, 2006). However, practical knowledge requires a more integrated view that does justice to the complexity and unique perspectives of contemporary strategy (Powell, 2001). Strategy research requires an appreciation of wider contexts to help make intelligible many of the complex details revealed by intimate investigations of minute practices. Close engagement can uncover the real ambiguity and fluidity of the broad strategy trends found in industry, sectoral or societal analyses (Whittington, 2006).

In a study on the specific strategic practices used in three UK universities, Warwick University, London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) and Oxford Brookes University, Jarzabkowski (2003) developed an activity theory framework to analyse how strategic practices are implicated in sustaining or changing patterns of strategic activity over time. Jarzabkowski’s study and others like it emphasise strategy as practice, a notion which is
concerned with how strategy emerges from the interactions between actors and their contexts. This perspective moves beyond strategy as phenomena predicated upon the cognition of the individual or arising largely from external structural considerations. Strategy as practice involves connecting the two levels more closely. Indeed, strategy as practice examines both structure and individual as they engage in the daily activities that comprise their practice context (Jarzabkowski, 2005; Johnson, Langley, Melin, & Whittington, 2007; Whittington, 2006).

Scholarship on strategy as practice has rightly focused attention on the failure of conventional approaches to organisational analysis and the institutionalised practices that inform it. Both of which assume a lower level of micro activity but traditionally do not enter it, at least explicitly. Primarily this is because much of strategy research is generated through large-scale studies, which reduce the complexities of doing strategy to a few causally related variables, reducing actors to simplistic figures represented by demographic variables that may be questionably linked to firm performance (Jarzabkowski, 2005; Powell, 2001). Thus, strategy as practice reflects the ‘practice turn’ in the field that has responded as a challenges to the dominant approaches to strategy research (Chia, 2004).

It is a response to calls for debate articulating alternate modes of understanding organisational theory and practice through ‘rethinking’ (Deetz, 1996) and ‘re-examining’ (Zald, 1993) fundamental assumptions. In the context of the organisational research environment a practice perspective is offered as a different form of explaining and understanding action and a medium to understand the messy realities of strategy as lived experience (Jarzabkowski, 2005; Johnson, Langley, Melin, & Whittington, 2007). The focus is on how the ideas, concepts and representations that make up strategy discourse can help legitimise certain kinds of strategies and so influence the allocation of resources among key actors with the field. Therefore, we can focus our attention more on the activities of those who enact, develop and deliver strategies, with the activities related to the doing of strategy to improve firm performance (Johnson, Langley, Melin, & Whittington, 2007).

This perspective highlights the concept of strategy as socially constructed, and therefore we can focus on strategy as social practice (Jarzabkowski, 2004; Whittington, 2006). We are
then drawn to human agency and an emphasis on moving away from the unitary perspectives that have characterised strategy research in terms of levels of analysis, explanatory variables, and theoretical perspectives towards those that sit comfortably within pluralist approaches (Johnson, Langley, Melin, & Whittington, 2007). The strategy as practice approach to research and analysis has advantages and I would also suggest it is an important step towards achieving an approach required by a pragmatist epistemology. However, I would agree with those scholars who suggest that without a comprehensive examination of the philosophical underpinnings of firm performance we are still left with the problems posed earlier. Specifically, those regarding the notion of individual agent, organisations and society, and the relationship between them (Powell, 2001, 2002; Stacey, 2007).

C. Rethinking Firm Performance

This chapter has argued that contemporary modes of organisation and management analysis require a conceptual reorganisation to embrace new themes in organisation studies. Organisational scholars are exhibiting increasing unease with applying purely economic conditions on the development of competitive advantage (Granovetter, 1985; Zukin & DiMaggio, 1990), and therefore are paving the way for inclusion of non-economic dimensions in organisational analysis to take account of firm performance. Tsoukas and Cummings (1997: 657) argue that the positivist-cum-rationalist assumptions on which modern organisation and management are founded have “led to the creation of a disciplinary self-image, whereby the field drew the boundaries around itself so narrowly as to exclude ideas and practices of organisation and management which were not modern”. As a consequence, the broad construal of sustainable competitive advantage does little justice to the complexity and distinct flavour of contemporary strategy practices.

Researchers have long debated the extent to which superior performance occurs at the level of the firm, business unit, corporations or industry (Barney, 1991; Porter, 1985; Powell, 1996; Rumelt, 1991). In the field of strategic management the focus is firmly on the firm and industry levels of analysis with scant attention given to human action (Jarzabkowski, 2005). A central facet of a pragmatist epistemological approach in management and organisation studies is the more ‘humanised’ conceptualisation that situates actors and action back in the
research frame. Indeed pragmatism plays an equally significant role as a philosophical foundation for transferring knowledge to managers (Powell, 2001). Therefore, amongst the macro, institutional and resource based approaches that have dominated the literature in strategy research there have been increasing calls “to attend to the myriad micro-processes and practices of organisational life that are woven together to form meaningful strategic outcomes” (Chia, 2004: 29).

In drawing from a pragmatic epistemology, we necessarily engage the whole set of power relations which are written, spoken, communicated and embedded in social practices (Knights & Morgan, 1991; Powell, 2002). It provides a valuable comprehensive and flexible framework to understand organisational forms and management practice (in their historical, social, cultural and economical contexts). In this thesis, I see firm performance as a relational dynamic of the organisational field itself whose actors include corporations, consultants, financial institutions, and business schools. The organisation can be viewed as an entity that does not exist independently from its surroundings. As Drummond (1998 cited in Everett, 2002: 60) argues, the organisation can be viewed as a subfield, embedded in a field, as enclosed in a social universe with its own laws of functioning that posit a space within which a game takes place. That is, a field of relations between individuals who are competing for personal advantage.

An understanding of organisations as fields is constituted by the contextualised patterns of behaviour of the various agents and stakeholders. In this light context is important for understanding and applying advantage. Therefore, results that can specify contexts’ relevance would be of considerable theoretical and practical utility (Rouse & Daellenbach, 1999). Primary attention is focused upon the nexus of relations, rather than discrete, abstracted phenomena. Power can then be seen to function through a multiplicity of relations, such as those found in organisations (Everett, 2002). This allows us to go beyond the traditional and cross the boundaries between the universal and the particular, the micro and macro as levels of analysis. Providing opportunity to give organisation and management studies a rich and exciting research agenda (Powell, 2001; Wicks & Freeman, 1998).
In an organisational context the field of strategic management does make the effort to include the non-economic and primarily intangible resources and capabilities in analysis and practice. However, as Powell (2001) argues, the field needs to move beyond formal logical relations to examine the foundations of leading theories of sustainable competitive advantage. In his theory of practice, Bourdieu emphasises the interweaving of socio-economic analysis, in particular the recognition of the three intertwining roles of society, culture and economy (Bourdieu, 1986; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). We can use the logic and apparatus of practical knowledge the question of how the strategy game works in different social and cultural contexts, specifically how value is appropriated and created through the relations of power evident in the transformation of capital.

In strategic management, therefore, there is space for an argument beyond our traditional approaches to understanding resources and capabilities and the decisions we make about them. Strategy can be located in a pragmatic sense and “if certain approaches do not shed light on business practices, or if practitioners deny their validity, the proclivity of the strategy field will be, and should be, to reject them” (Rumelt, Schendel, & Teece, 1991: 20). We now seek advantages that may arise from socially complex assets, such as culture, knowledge, and capabilities embodied in specific actors and learning routines of organisations (Jarzabkowski, 2005), and the broader networks in which they are embedded.

IV. Proposing an Indigenous paradigm

My research engages with the current discourse offered by scholars who subscribe to a more reflexive and critical approach to the production and dissemination of knowledge regarding organisational practice (for example see Deetz, 1996; Hassard & Keleman, 2002). This chapter therefore has engaged with the current debate that challenges the boundaries created by the conceptualised paradigmatic grid of Burrell and Morgan. In particular, it proposes that the utility of practical knowledge, by means of its pragmatist epistemology, lies in its capacity to provide critical analysis of organisations in the contemporary business environment. I argue that this approach is well suited to the pragmatic orientation of Indigenous worldviews.
Despite its increasing popularity in the social sciences, the connection of society (imbued within social and cultural relations), to the constructs of Indigenous and organisational practice has yet to surface in research and practice as a robust field of engagement. A central point for this thesis is that the epistemological and ontological assumptions which are central to the sense-making and knowledge creation cycle in Indigenous contexts are often invalidated in mainstream research settings. Chapter Three picks up the threads of the discussion offered in this chapter by developing further my theorisation of an Indigenous paradigm that responds to calls of integrity and authenticity in conceptualisation and empirical analysis of Māori business practice.
CHAPTER THREE: THEORISING FOR AN INDIGENOUS PARADIGM

In this thesis, I argue for the utility of an Indigenous paradigm. I do so because Indigenous organisations are accountable to a multiplicity of socio-cultural constituents and associated relationships from within and between Indigenous communities. In Chapter Two I argued for the utility of practical knowledge by means of its pragmatist epistemology to provide critical analysis of organisations in the contemporary business environment. I suggest that practical knowledge provides a comprehensive and flexible framework to understand organisational forms and management practices. In this chapter I also argue that it offers an approach to connect, with integrity, the constructs of Indigenous and organisational practice in organisational research.

My purpose here is to examine the notion of an Indigenous paradigm as providing a powerful and productive conceptualisation and empirical analysis of Māori business practice. To that end, given the stated context of my research, Section I presents the underlying tenets of kaupapa Māori, which is described as an Indigenous worldview that takes for granted the validity and legitimacy of Māori knowledge and practice (Smith, 1997; Smith, 1999a). Section II proposes kaupapa Māori research as an Indigenous paradigm as an alternative framework for research that takes into account the distinct pragmatic orientation that guides practice in Indigenous Māori communities. Finally, section III concludes this chapter.

I. Kaupapa Māori – A Māori Worldview

I have framed this research within kaupapa Māori, which I have argued is a central contextual element of the Indigenous paradigm for this thesis. The notion of kaupapa Māori captures the embeddedness of distinct cultural practices informed by the inherent logics, relations, embedded structures and dispositions that exist within it (Bourdieu, 1986), providing reason, balance and governance (Henare, 2001; Mauss, 1970). Henry and Pene (2001) describe kaupapa Māori as ‘the Māori way’, as a term used to describe traditional Māori ways of doing, being and thinking, encapsulated in a Māori worldview. This view forms the nexus of
social practice and systems of exchange distinctive to Indigenous Māori ways of knowing and knowledge.

A. Mātauranga Māori: Māori epistemology

Prior to the arrival of Europeans, Māori social organisation was structured into communal, hierarchically based kin-based tribal configuration (Henry & Pene, 2001). Informed and guided by an intricate set of relationships, this tribal configuration provided a flexible social structure encouraging inter-action of different degrees between whānau (family), hapū (tribe), and iwi (confederation of tribes) (Petrie, 2006). The social structure is a consequence of Māori migration throughout New Zealand’s lands as they established territories, which resulted in distinct tribal identities.

Although each iwi has its own historical experiences, dialects, customs and practices, they share common cultural and genealogical connections to knowledge creation and transmission. Mātauranga Māori refers to the systems of knowledge embodied by kaupapa Māori (Durie, 2001). It is a traditional form of knowledge with genealogical and cosmological connection to ancient Polynesia. It can take many forms, including te reo (language), tāonga tuku iho, mātauranga o te taiao (traditional environmental knowledge), rongoā (traditional knowledge of cultural practice, such as healing and medicines), kai moana (fishing) and mahinga kai (cultivation). Indigenous Māori systems of knowledge, or tribal epistemologies, are guided by tohunga (experts of various forms of knowledge) and kaumātua, (elders) and transmitted through various mediums including waiata (song) kapa haka (dance), whakairo (carvings) and whai kōrero (tribal speeches).

Mātauranga Māori, or Māori knowledge, is defined as knowledge that is created by Māori according to a set of key ideas derived from their worldview that explains their human experience of the world (Royal, 1998). The concept of mātauranga Māori captures the

---

8 The iwi or tribe operated as the functional and fluid macro-political entity where, in different circumstances and at different periods of history, descent groups might be classed as either iwi, hapū , or a combination of two or more hapū (Petrie, 2002, 2006).

9 http://www.natlib.govt.nz/collections/online-exhibitions/matauranga-maori
relationship between humanity and the world of which they are a part. Here I draw from the Māori legend of the ‘Three Baskets of Knowledge’ to emphasise the interconnectedness of humanity and the world (both visible and invisible) that plays a role in knowledge acquisition and dissemination. The karakia below (Figure 2), which refers to a spoken incantation, describes how Māori make sense of the world within which they exist, in particular the sources of knowledge that humankind needed to survive in the world.

**Figure 2 - The Three Kete of Knowledge**

Here am I, here am I, here am I quickly moving by the power of my karakia for swift movement, Swiftly moving over the earth, swiftly moving through the heavens, the swift movement of your ancestor Tanenuiarangi who climbed up to the isolated heavens, the summit of Manono, and there found Io-the-parentless alone. He brought back down the baskets of knowledge: the basket named Tuauri, the basket named Tuaatea, the basket named Aronui. Portioned out and planted in Mother Earth, the life principle of human beings comes forth into the dawn, into the world of light.'

The Three Kete, or Baskets, of Knowledge’ captures the sense of unity between the physical, spiritual and philosophical as represented metaphorically. The three kete and the whatukura, two sacred stones, held within are central to the power of knowledge and learning.¹⁰ The first kete Tua-Uri (Beyond in the world of darkness) refers to the ‘first world’ where everything in the natural world originates, where cosmic processes originate and operate as a continual rhythmic pattern of energy sustaining and replenishing the life of the natural world (Marsden,

---

¹⁰ There are slight variations in the narrative regarding the three kete that emerges from within each iwi, or tribal configuration. I follow the korero, narrative, of Rev. Māori Marsden, who was viewed, by many and particularly those of Ngā Puhi te iwi as a tohunga, a renowned philosopher and scholar.
This kete contains the source of Māori philosophical lore that guides Māori perception of ‘being’, which requires the balancing of four related concepts: Mauri, the vital principle that interpenetrates all things creating unity in diversity; hirihiri, which is viewed as a more refined form of mauri, a pure energy manifest in the aura that radiates from all matter but is especially evident in living things; mauri-ora is the bonding energy which makes life possible; and hau-ora described as the wind of life, producing forms of the everyday world through genealogical engagement and thus life (Marsden, 2003; Salmond, 1997).

The second basket of knowledge, Te Aro-nui (That before us), is described as the natural world that is comprehensible to human senses. Through observation the natural cycles of nature, such as when to plant crops, where and when to fish, became part of the “corpus of general knowledge” (Marsden, 2003: 61) that was transmitted through each generation. Beyond the general wisdoms passed down through each generation, this basket provided for genealogical connection to the natural world through whakapapa, which in this instance refers to a classificatory genealogy. Humans, and other living species of animals, flora and fauna, were classified in the order in which processes occurred and the order in which the intricate and prolonged activities or ceremonies should be conducted. The third world, Te Ao Tua-atea (beyond space and time) is where space and time are conjoined and relative to one another.

The ‘Three Kete of Knowledge’ is an important expression of mātauranga Māori, highlighting the historicity, continuity and connectivity between knowledge and knowing. As Marsden describes, “knowledge and wisdom are related but different in nature. Knowledge is a thing of the head, an accumulation of facts. Wisdom is a thing of the heart. It has its own thought processes. It is here that knowledge is integrated for this is the centre of one’s being” (Marsden, 2003: 59). This represents the eternal world of life, mind and spirit as infinite (Marsden, 2003). Kaupapa Māori, therefore is both a set of philosophical beliefs and tikanga, a set of social practices, founded on a series of deeply embedded Māori values. Whanaungatanga, noted here as collective interdependence between and among humankind, wairuatanga, which refers to the sacred relationship to the ‘gods’ and the cosmos, and kiatiakitanga, the acknowledgement that humans are guardians of the environment. It refers
to the knowledge of spiritual realities, beyond space and time, a world Māori experience in ritual, combining in the interconnection between mind, body and spirit.

Taken together, these ethics inform traditional Māori ontology and assumptions about human nature; that is, ‘what is real’ for Māori (Henry & Pene, 2001), and hold symbolic meaning for the pursuit of knowledge in contemporary Māori generations (Royal, 1996). I suggest similarity with the Confucian understanding chih, noted as a form of knowing, understanding and realising that rejects the Western distinction between knowledge and wisdom (Hall & Ames, 1987). For Māori, knowledge is not a linear representation of facts as is the case with the dominant modes of thought discussed in Chapter Two. Rather it is a cyclical or circular representation that takes into account collective meanings; relations between objective structures and subjective constructions; and temporal dimensions such as how meanings and relationships can change over time. Importantly, this is a reflection of Aristotle’s phronesis, which captures the relationship between knowledge and wisdom (Flyvbjerg, 2001; Tsoukas & Cummings, 1997).

A person so orientated not only holds justified true belief but uses intellectual grasp and insight to practically apply it. This representation of wisdom is, for the most part, historically and culturally consistent, with philosophical non-secularised traditions that treat wisdom as instantiated by wise persons. Focusing on Eastern thought, a consistent idea is that wisdom involves establishing harmony with one’s environment and leading a good life (Bierly, Kessler, & Christensen, 2000). I suggest that Māori, as with peoples of Eastern worldviews, have a cultural precondition for thinking more broadly, diffusely and holistically about knowledge, as opposed to narrow, specificity and analytically (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 1997). By this definition I am referring to the cultures who in some way share their antecedents in language and culture with the ancient traditions of other non-Western cultures found in the Asia Pacific region.

An Indigenous paradigm derived from the social practice and systems of exchange distinctive to Māori knowledge and ways of knowing would suggest that a special approach to research is required. An approach that takes into account how Māori view certain knowledge as highly valued, specialised and tapu, or scared (i.e. that it contains culturally based restrictions
around its use), and therefore must be treated with respect and protected (Walker, Eketone, & Gibb, 2006). This corpus provides the thread of continuity which integrates and holds together the social fabric of the culture (Marsden, 2003), providing continuity in the transmission of cultural meaning and practice within the field (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Wolfram, 2001).

B. He aha te mea nui? He tangata. He tangata. He tangata.

The title of this sub-section is a whakataukī, or proverb asking ‘what is truly valuable in life? It is people. It is people. It is people’. In essence this whakataukī draws on the centrality of human agency in kaupapa Māori (Pihama, Cram, & Walker, 2002). In New Zealand the term tangata whenua or Māori is used as a universal term to denote the various nations of Indigenous peoples who were already occupying the land when the first European ships arrived (Rika-Heke, 1997; Smith, 1999a). Identity is a means of differentiation for the purpose of seeking affiliation (Bourdieu, 1977; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) characterised by shared perspectives of the world, sets of values and belief systems. Māori identity, born of history and geography that has produced positions from which they have enunciated their own narratives and cultural practices, has continued to support the development of their cultural distinctiveness in their worldview (d'Hauteserre, 2005).

The concept of ‘Māori’ emerged after the arrival of the Europeans (Ward, 1973), providing definition for the colonial relationship between Māori and Pākehā, the non-Indigenous settler population (Rika-Heke, 1997). The word Māori reflected an ancient time when there were two peoples in the land, the tribe of atua (gods) and the tribe of tangata Māori (ordinary people). Māori accounts of the first encounters with Europeans, share the position that they were not ordinary peoples of the land. The newly constituted groups were defined in relation to each other Māori (familiar, everyday) and Pākehā (extraordinary in some way) (Salmond, 1997). The term was and is still often used somewhat conveniently to collectivise ‘Māori’, to somehow package differences between Māori and Pākehā in the simplistic manner of constructed dualisms of the savage and the civilised, heathen and Christian, immoral and moral (Rika-Heke, 1997).
Much of the historical discourse was couched in paternalistic or racist undertones where the label Māori was often used as an insult meant to denigrate, a classic codification of colonial discourse. However since the 1960’s it has become politicised as a powerful signifier of opposition (Rika-Heke, 1997). It was during this period that the term ‘Māori’ re-emerged as a symbol of strength, unity and pride to affirm and enhance the Māori sense of separate identity from Pākehā (Rika-Heke, 1997; Smith, 1999a). Of note, is the fact that the Pākehā settlers first used the term New Zealanders to describe the ‘native’ Māori. Over the one hundred and fifty years of colonisation those Pākehā settlers have claimed that name as their own in the creation of their own identity separate to the British, whereas Māori have been relegated to a contrasted category as a culture or race (Wetherell & Potter, 1993).

Contemporary representations of Māori identity have responded to the “uncritical adoption of essentialist notions of race identity” (Matahaere, 1995: 16), and embrace the multiplicity and richness of contemporary Māori identity. There is the individual Māori self, the collective Māori and the vision of nationhood, where all New Zealanders can be included. These categories are interdependent, because they are each intertwined and influenced by self-definition. As Barcham (2000) asserts, a Māori identity embodies a plurality of self, with composite selves positioned simultaneously along multiple social axis.

From an individual level, the self for Māori is dynamic, constantly moving across multiple sites, formal institutional boundaries and informal networks, where Māori live in diverse cultural worlds where there is no one reality nor a single definition that captures the range of lifestyles that now exist (Durie, 2001, 2003). The nature of the Māori experience is very much entwined in the view held of the Self. The view that one holds of the Self is critical not only to understanding individual behaviour, but also understanding those phenomena that assist in depicting the Self. In the case of Māori the Self is viewed in relation to surrounding contextual factors, whose behaviour is determined by what that actor perceives to be the thoughts, feelings and actions of others, therefore recognising the fundamental connectedness of human beings (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

This is somewhat similar to the classical Chinese tradition that presumes that the human being is something that one does rather than is. The individual is how one behaves within the
context of the human community, which takes note of the way of the world as constituted by li, the Confucian concept of ritual, or a framework of formal roles, relationships and institutions (D. L. Hall & R. T. Ames, 1999). In addition, we see the significance of communal affectation in the Japanese term kata or forms of behaviour, which permeate Japanese society determining the common expectations of behaviour (Alston & Takei, 2005). The desire to have a definitive identity, as determined through the habitus, distinct from others is not merely confined to the individual, but also extends to groups forming the basis of a collective identity based on commonly shared factors, such as language, historical experiences and beliefs.

Conceptualisation of Māori identity is also processed through links to distinct territories and hierarchically based tribal configurations providing inter-action of different degrees (Salmond, 1997). The Māori perspective locates the individual as engaged in an agonistic construction within a community, whānau, hapū, and iwi context. Sen (2006) describes Indian society as an agonistic community, which he describes as being true to argumentative propensity. He suggest that there exists a long tradition of arguing against the heterodoxy in India combined with the large volumes of agnostic writings where there are “a great many discussions and compositions of different kinds, conforming to the loquaciousness of the argumentative traditions” (Sen, 2006: 23). The constructive role of which, he argues is to foster public reasoning and founding the roots of political democracy. In his writings, Sen (2006) emphasizes the importance of India’s argumentative tradition to its intellectual and social evolution. In particular there exists in India a multi-religious spectrum across the religious sectors including with Buddhism, Judaism, Christianity and Islam. A diversity that draws specific attention to the religious pluralism of the Indian people, which results in not being able to derive the notion of ‘Indianness’ from any specific religious identity.

A key feature of an agonistic community is the contesting of anything deemed of value. For example the role of the tribal Chief was as leader of the tribe, his mana and well-being secured through his ability to husband and manage communally owned resources for the benefit of all, as well as his stature and generosity (Petrie, 2006; Salmond, 1997). Agonistic practices in Māori culture also relate to the contested actions regarding deceased bodies, where the different factions of the whānau, or family contest to have the deceased taken to
their urupā, defined here as cemetery. It is viewed as a mark of respect for the deceased (Sharples, 2008).

Mouffe (2000) takes the point of view of an agonistic pluralism. The aim of democratic politics or governing collective identity is to construct the ‘them’ in such a way that it is no longer perceived as an enemy to be destroyed, but an ‘adversary’, somebody whose ideas we combat but whose right to defend those ideas we do not put into question.11 A predominant belief in kaupapa Māori is that the freedom of the community is a prerequisite to personal autonomy and therefore supersedes it. Such a society is held together by the principle of reciprocity, a sense of interdependence, which has generally acted as a sufficient restraint on anti-social behaviour (Owen, 1995).

One of the key premises of agonistic pluralism is the recognition and legitimation of conflict and the refusal to suppress it, a characteristic of which is the acknowledgement of the pluralism of values. Such a consensus is bound to be a contested consensus (Mouffe, 2000), asserting the hegemonic nature of social relations and identities, and contributing to subverting the ever-present temptation that exists in democratic societies to naturalise its boundaries and essentialise its identities. For this reason the notion of agonistic community is much more receptive to the multiplicity of voices that contemporary pluralist societies encompass and to the complexity of their power structure (Mouffe, 2000).

Most often the term Indigenous peoples have combined many distinct populations whose experiences under imperialism have been largely different. The term now acts as an enabler for the collective voice of colonised peoples to be expressed strategically in the international arena. It has been an extremely useful term that has provided an umbrella for different Indigenous communities and peoples to come together, beyond their own colonised contexts and experiences, in order to learn, share, plan, organise and struggle collectively for self-determination in both the global and local arenas (Smith, 1999a). Throughout the 1980’s,

---

11 Mouffe (Mouffe, 2000) distinguishes between antagonism and agonism by introducing the category of the “adversary”, which distinguishes antagonism as a struggle between enemies, while agonism is struggle between adversaries.
Māori indigenisation involved the revival of Māori genealogy, language and kinship relations as well as identification of the ethnic self.

In reality, Indigeneity, as with culture and identity (Khazzoom, 2003; Said, 1993), is socially constructed and historically contingent (Barcham, 2000). Any engagement with notions of Indigeneity must take seriously the realisation that Indigenous cultures and societies necessarily change over time. To ignore the evolutionary aspects of Māori society that have been evident pre- and post-contact is an act of self-censorship, the consequence of which is to render large portions of Māori history a non-event (Matahaere, 1995). Māori identity is therefore largely constructed around a shared history with non-Māori, structured by nineteenth-century colonisation and twentieth-century assimilation, which has shaped the identity of each to the other (Barcham, 2000; Matahaere, 1995; Wetherell & Potter, 1993).

C. The Māori Economy

Māori were and are no strangers to the art of contracts and exchange. Governed by tradition, custom and social norms, Māori exchange was relational and dictated by genealogical connection to ancestors, the environment and each other (Mauss, 1970). The nature of pre-colonised Māori exchange varied based on regional resources, timing, local politics and individual characteristics. In times of peace, tribes would trade amongst each other for flax and greenstone for axes and ornaments as groups regularly visited one another (O'Regan, 2001; Petrie, 2002; Salmond, 1997). Trade involved intricate sets of relations between modes of economy, Māori belief systems, customary land rights, norms, customs and traditions regulating social and economic life (Ward, 1973), which were provided by core tenets of Māori philosophy.

Māori social organisation is often connected to discourse around the nature of gift economies. A gift economy is known to operate where goods and services are transferred without explicit agreement for immediate or future remuneration. Its full meaning cannot be so simply stated; what is exchanged goes beyond tangible goods or produce to include courtesies, ritual, entertainment, military assistance, women, children and so on (Mauss, 1970). Embodied in
this expression is an important system of reciprocal obligations and behavioural expectations which governs the actions of the participants. However a reciprocal obligation exists in a gift economy, where the gift activates a unilateral relationship of indebtedness undone only by means of a properly offered return gift (Kaut, 1961), or action. That is to say, obligation and what constitutes a balanced exchange is a socially negotiated outcome in which performances serve to interpret, legitimate and constitute the situation.

The exercise of relations that surround the notion of gift economy have been scrutinised in understanding the modes of exchange for traditional or archaic societies (Bourdieu, 1977; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Dalton, 1961; Mauss, 1970; Smart, 1993). The work of Mauss (1970) is well known for its approach to understanding the total services of an agonistic form of practice called potlatch used by the Northwest Coast Native American Indians. Mauss also found similar features bound in social and cultural processes that oblige a person to reciprocate in an exchange situation in the practices of Melanesian and Polynesian peoples.

Kaut’s (1961) observations of the Tagalog people is another example of the principles guiding a gift economy. Tagalong are the second largest Filipino ethnic peoples who have their own linguistic and cultural domain, within which they draw upon the concept of utang na loob, which simply translated means debt of prime obligation. As with the case for Māori the principles of gift exchange offered a form of behavioural governance that defined and organised sets of relationships for social action and interaction.

From a kaupapa Māori perspective, Māori make sense of the world as being ordered by utu or reciprocal exchanges (the principle of balance), which was the stuff of life, where relationships were constantly being negotiated in reciprocal exchanges (Salmond, 1997). Petrie (2006) describes utu as a practically oriented system serving to protect the hierarchy of relationships and preserve harmonious interaction. A critical principle being reciprocation ‘with interest’, ensuring a constant imbalance between parties and hence binding and on-going relationships (Petrie, 2006).
In accord with other cultural norms, such as muru noted as the means of exacting compensation, utu ensured that community values were widely understood and reminded people of the penalties for failing to abide by them (Petrie, 2006). For example, failure to receive as well as to give was hau whitia. That is hau turned away, and this in its turn engendered hauhau aitu, which is harm to the hau leading to illness and sometimes to death (Salmond, 1997). Tapu (the power of the gods) marked out those people, places and things where ancestors were present in the world. Mana, or efficacy, was a sign that relations with ancestors were working well, allowing transactions with others to succeed. Mate, or ill-being, showed that relationships were out of kilter, while ora was well being, when all relations were in balance and good heart (Salmond, 1997).

Māori believed that to breach these ‘codes of conduct’ would result in illness or death. Supernatural sanctions might be meted out by the gods, but generally disputes between kinship groups might also be settled by payment of compensation. If payment was withheld blood feud might follow (Ward, 1973). The need for reciprocity was not in itself sufficient to prevent wayward behaviour and had to be backed by coercive sanctions. Within a kinship group a defaulter could be punished by withdrawal of community assistance, demand for compensation, eating, banishment, or more rarely execution (Salmond, 1997). Unfortunately, a relational logic works well with people who share its assumptions, but when other parties to this psychological contract assume the superiority of their own forms of life, one could be faced with one-way relationships and constant failures of reciprocity. Therefore, it is possible that a philosophy based on balanced exchange was a source of vulnerability for post-contact Māori, which had implications for early commercial activity.

Early Commercial Activity

The characteristics of the economy of Indigenous peoples were primarily construed to be antithetical to the positive creative characteristics of Western economic behaviour (Firth, 1959). It has often been thought that communal ownership, a lack of innovation and an incapacity for deferred gratification were not only characteristic of kin-based societies like the New Zealand Māori, but constituted a barrier to economic growth and an impediment to extensive economic changes (Petrie, 2002). This perspective sits in contrast to the historical
evidence of Māori entrepreneurial success. Petrie (2006) presents a succinct and realistic portrayal of Māori commercial focus during early contact with, and preceding colonisation by the British. Pre- and immediately post-colonisation Māori entrepreneurial activity appeared to have been successful and conducted in sensible and considered ways (King, 2003; Petrie, 2006). From the earliest moments of European arrival on the shores of New Zealand, Māori proved to be eager to engage in trade (Salmond, 1997). Māori adopted a confident, entrepreneurial approach to the various European ships that arrived in their territory. Tribes were quick to recognise the value in trading with these foreigners and wherever they weighed anchor, fleets of canoes would arrive to engage in trade. The initial products offered for trade by Māori were greenstone, potatoes, fish, flax and pork and even sex, in return for iron implements, cloth and ornaments of interest (Salmond, 1997).

By the 1830s there was a definite entrepreneurial flair in Māori practice, with many entering into what were effectively joint ventures with whaling captains and flax and timber merchants (Wanhalla, 2008; Ward, 1999). Therefore, by making use of a range of commercial strategies, adopted through engagement with Pākehā, Māori had captured a considerable volume of trade by 1840. Māori quickly made use of new products and technologies, for example the ‘white’ potato became extensively cultivated and new agricultural techniques were also established (Petrie, 2006). Indeed, the flexibility inherent in Māori society and the negligible capital investment required for profitable participation allowed Māori to adjust quickly (Petrie, 2002).

Commercial activity in New Zealand during the frontier era of 1792 – 1840 (King, 2003) highlighted distinct entrepreneurial activities that had relevance for the country’s immediate and long-term future. These endeavours included the development of significant agricultural, flour and saw milling, as well as substantial agricultural products to supply the growing populations of a domestic market. Māori communities supplied vital produce and labour to the new colonial settlements. In addition, Māori agricultural and forestry goods found international markets, including Australia, providing a significant contribution to New Zealand’s burgeoning economy. Māori investment in trading ships and flour mills was intended to produce wealth as well as build mana, authority and prestige both within Māori society, and with the rapidly growing government and settler community (Consedine, 2007).
Flour was the staple food for the colonialists and Māori became prolific owner operators at wheat production and flour mill operations. For example, a report by the Government Inspector of Mills compiled in June 1856 listed twenty-nine, plus another four under construction in the Waikato and Rotorua districts alone (Petrie, 2006). Therefore, Māori cultivation of land and flour milling was acknowledged for its considerable extent and significance. Māori were also key players in the coastal and internal shipping routes. Most often being involved in the wheat distribution, whaling and sealing operations that were essential constituents of economic development at this period of time (Petrie, 2006; Wanhalla, 2008). An entrepreneurial perspective in shipping is also evident, as the following excerpt from Petrie attests:

Te Hēmara Tauhia of Ngāti Rango, who was equally eager to maintain, complete control of his timber sales at Mahurangi, Northland in the 1850s, paid Pākehā 15s a hundred super feet to saw his timber and commissioned the building of the 20-ton Duke of Wellington to transport it to Auckland. Like many other chiefs, Te Hēmara not only superintended sales and kept the accounts himself but also captained the vessel. This schooner cost £370 but, according to the Māori Messenger, it was usual for Māori ‘to realise from £200 to £500 per trip’ for produce brought in their coasters during the boom period of the mid-1850’s (Petrie, 2006: 124).

This narrative captures the entrepreneurial character of Te Hēmara and highlights the economic opportunities available to Māori at this time. Māori dominance in the economy also extended to international exports. Prior to 1840, Māori were ardent traders of seal skin to the countries as far reaching as China, the Americas and other European nations. In addition, flax fibre and timber was highly prized for the hulls and rigging of naval vessels, as well as sails and uniform fabrics (Salmond, 1991).

The rapid expansion of Māori commerce was not ad hoc, but rather it was advanced with a great deal of strategy and deliberation in keeping with customary practice. Therefore, as Petrie (2006) notes, historical evidence does not support the claim that Māori systems of exchange and in particular, communal ownership of land, were either insufficient or detrimental to production. Indeed, there is considerable evidence that up until 1855 Māori commercial endeavours were the mainstay of the colonial economy. At this time, however, long-lasting economic decline for Māori had begun. Not only had the flour milling and shipping industries collapsed, but the imposition of Western economic, social, and political changes has significant consequences for Māori.
D. Involution: A Period of Disruption

The increasing pressure on Britain to be able to determine some aspect of control over New Zealand’s lands, people and resources became increasingly evident throughout the early nineteenth century. The Treaty of Waitangi, signed on the 6th February 1840, was the basis for British settlement and government in New Zealand and an agreement whereby Māori tenure of lands and resources was recognised (Stokes, 1992). The agreement created a formal alliance with the British Crown, under which Britain would have kawanatanga, noted here as governance, of New Zealand and Māori retain their rangatiratanga, or chieftainship. Māori understood the arrangement to be one of partnership, reciprocal obligation, and mutual benefit with the guarantee of rangatiratanga ensuring autonomy over their own affairs (Durie, 2001). This interpretation provides the Crown the right to a single legal system, but acknowledges that those laws must protect rangatiratanga and maintain full authority by Māori over their lands and resources.

With the colonisation of New Zealand a previously autonomous cultural field was compromised and systematically undermined. The continual struggle Māori have been faced with since Europeans first arrived on their lands is explicit in the preamble to the first Colonial ordinance aimed at the promotion of Māori welfare (Native Trust Ordinance, 1844, The Ordinance of the Legislative Council of New Zealand, Session III, no. IX), which states:

And whereas great disasters have fallen upon uncivilised nations on being brought into contact with Colonists from the nations of Europe; and in undertaking the colonisation of New Zealand Her Majesty’s Government have recognized the duty of endeavouring by all practicable means to avert the like disasters from the native people of the Islands, which object maybe best obtained by assimilating as speedily as possible the habits and usages of the Native to those of the European population (Ward, 1973: 39).

Therein lies the founding objective of colonialism in New Zealand - assimilation. In New Zealand, in spite of Tiriti o Waitangi, or the Treaty of Waitangi signed by Māori chiefs and representatives of the British Crown in 1840, there were devastating economic, political,

12 Much of the tension surrounding the Treaty of Waitangi stems from the two versions of the Treaty – one in Māori and one in English. In the Māori text of the first article, Māori gave the British right of kawanatanga, whereas in the English text, Māori ceded sovereignty. However considering Māori society and culture at that time, it is very unlikely that the signatories would have signed away all that gave them mana.
cultural and social consequences for Māori. Whilst the Tiriti o Waitangi was an indication to Māori of partnership between themselves and the Crown, to the British it signalled the annexation of New Zealand into its imperialist framework of colonialism. It heralded the floodgates of British migration to New Zealand for its cheap land and new lifestyle opportunities (Durie, 2001).

The settler government set about establishing legislative frameworks, which on the surface were designed to improve and protect Māori society, but which had the opposite effect. Under the guise of annexation for the protection of Māori people and their possessions, te Tiriti o Waitangi cloaked the expropriation of land, suppression of culture and language in a more palatable light. Among the most determining pieces of legislation were the *Native Lands Acts of 1862* and *1865*. These provided for the Native Land Court to establish individual Māori land titles, which effectively disposed of communal property rights, which was the traditional mode of Māori land tenure.

The resulting individualisation of title made it easier for settlers to deal with Indigenous systems of land tenure. It did so through the shifting of power dynamics through ownership and control of important resources. As a well entrenched mechanism of colonialism it was not specific to the Māori experience. For example, the Great Māhele, the Hawaiian land division of 1846-55, and the cadastral survey to establish ownership and tax rates of Egyptian lands, which meant the removal of customary forms of tenure.

The Great Māhele was designated as the legislative overhaul of traditional forms of land tenure towards private ownership along Western lines in Hawaii. Consequently, Hawaiian lands passed into the hands of foreigners, with their own business interests, setting in motion the eventual loss of Hawaiian sovereignty (Linnekin, 1987). In Egypt, during the late nineteenth century, colonial politics exercised arbitrary and often violent forms of power. The evolution of private ownership "emerged not as a right won by individuals against the state but as part of a penalty imposed upon them as a means of paying government debts, a penalty that in fact caused many smaller landholders to fall into debt themselves and lose their land" (Mitchell, 2002: 67). Through the establishment of Western institutional arrangements, expropriation of land and suppression of culture, the intention was to assimilate and so
control Indigenous societies. Indeed, the surveying of land and individualisation of title has been a form of colonial violence masquerading as science to expropriate property throughout the colonial period (for further examples see Byrnes, 2001; Maurer, 1997).

The loss of land and resources certainly had a detrimental impact on the Māori economy. Most significantly, it effectively undermined the traditional social, cultural, economic and political structures based on communal forms of tenure and management of resources (Stokes, 1992). However, it is important to note that Māori resistance to such symbolic violence is not a contemporary manifestation. For example, *Wi Parata vs Bishop of Wellington* (1877) is indicative of the struggle between Māori and Pākehā regarding native title played out in the judicial system. The case refers to Wiremu Parata, who in the 1870’s was a successful sheep farmer and Member of Parliament, taking the Bishop of Wellington to the Supreme Court over a breach of oral contract. This concerned the gift of Ngāti Toa land to the Anglican Bishop for a Māori school at Porirua. The Church had received a Crown grant of land in 1850, but no school was built (Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 2009).

Parata had sought the return of the land in recognition of a breach in the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. Unfortunately, the court ruled that Māori had lacked the sovereign capacity to engage in treaty negotiations, it purported to be an instrument of cession, was a ‘simple nullity’ effectively negating the Treaty of Waitangi (Tate, 2003). The ruling had far-reaching consequences, well into the twentieth century. It was cited as precedent during subsequent claims regarding breaches of the Treaty, allowing for widespread expropriation of land and property.

This ruling was invalidated to some degree by the rule established in *Te Heu Heu Tukino v Aotea Māori District Land Board* (1941) where the Privy Council held that a claim could not be rested on rights and duties set out in te Tiriti in the absence of statutory recognition of those rights, and noted that the New Zealand legislature had not adopted te Tiriti as law (Te Runanga O Kirikiroa Trust Inc, 2006). However, in the sixty year interim, a significant proportion of Māori land succumbed to the arbitrary and capricious confiscation and/or discriminatory regulation. Land was (and still is) vital to Māori identity lying at the heart of who they are, as well as providing a source of income and sustenance. Once land was
converted to Pākehā hands it became the source of wealth and riches, much of what New Zealand’s folklore is built on (Steven, 1989).

History has identified intertwining mechanisms of colonisation designed to weaken or extinguish altogether the things, which give meaning to Indigenous people. The objectives of these mechanisms aimed at reversing the population balance in favour of the coloniser by; imposing the institutional arrangements, laws and values of the coloniser; and, attacking the Indigenous identity to allow the coloniser to establish legitimate control over colonised lands and peoples (Jackson, 1992). A direct consequence in New Zealand was the rejection and censure of Māori philosophy, institutions, law, religion, land tenure, economic distribution and political authority, in particular those values which nourished society, the language that gave it voice, the law which gave it order and the beliefs which was its strength (Jackson, 1992).

The change of economic and political power in New Zealand was reflected by the shift in population dominance, which occurred throughout the nineteenth century. The result was a rapid decline in the Māori population relative to Pākehā, due to rapid immigration, military campaigns, or indirectly through disease (Jackson, 1992; Salmond, 1997). The ideology of Orientalisation, the corollary of which saw the establishment of sophisticated formal rules of practice, regulating who was the Other, who was not and the status of each (Smith, 1999a) provided much support for Pākehā legislators to set about dismantling Māori laws and institutions.

The doctrine of a new religion (christianity), and the imposition of different socio-political and economic structures, based around capitalist ethics of individualism, a common law, an imperial domain and Western political ideas (Jackson, 1992; Smith, 1999a), held a calculated role in the destruction of Māori society. Singularly they can be seen as mere institutional arrangements, but when employed together in the pretext of colonisation they are as

---

13 At the time of the signing of the Treaty it is estimated there were 70,000-90,000 Māori. Settlers began to arrive in greater numbers from this point, whilst the Māori population continued to decline. By 1858, the European population equalled the Māori population at approximately 59,000 (Consedine, 2007).
destructive as a nuclear device to the colonised society. Seriously eroding the social, economic and political infrastructures upon which that society depends.

Prior to colonisation, Māori society had an established culture, network of social relations and mode of economy. There is ample evidence that during the early stages of colonisation, many Māori chiefs recognised that they needed to adapt to the presence of foreigners and live in harmony with Pākehā or they were at risk of becoming overwhelmed (Ward, 1973). Through various overtures to the Pākehā governing body they thought they had succeeded in achieving this transition, keeping the wealth of their culture and identity intact, as well as those institutions of political and economic importance to Māori society (Head, 2001; Ward, 1973). However, in reality this was not the case as Māori development was severely undermined due to the systemic violence perpetuated through the social and political upheaval they encountered during this period. As a result the Māori economy that had been expanding, diversifying and ‘globalising’ became involuted, entering into a period of decline that had consequences for generations of Māori.

II. Kaupapa Māori Research - An Indigenous Paradigm

From the vantage point of the colonised, a position from which I write, and choose to privilege, the term ‘research’ is inextricably lined to European imperialism and colonialism. The word itself, ‘research’, is probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world’s vocabulary (Smith, 1999a: 1).

Indigenous peoples have long condemned dominant research agendas that adhere to rigid criteria for authority, representation and accountability, which distance Indigenous peoples from participation in the construction, validation and legitimation of Indigenous knowledge (Bishop, 1996; Kovach, 2005). Research in many, if not all, of its approaches to the production and dissemination of knowledge, including those associated with the more interpretive, qualitative, subjective domains has served as a metaphor for colonial knowledge, for power (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008). This has led many to argue that imposition of organisational knowledge drawn from dominant paradigms is a form of epistemic coloniality or conquest of identity through knowledge (Ibarra-Colado, 2006).
This section centres on the precept that Indigenous peoples have different ways of ‘viewing’ the world, through the lens of their own philosophical orientation, logics, discourse and practices (Smith, 1997; Smith, 1999a; Te Awekotuku, 1991; Wilson, 2003). In the preceding chapters I have suggested that exploring worldviews is an essential precursor to understanding the alternate philosophical orientation, particularly those of Indigenous communities. The notion of worldview reflects contexts and practices, derived from specific sets of beliefs, assumptions and epistemologies and underscores the relationship between cultural integrity and practice. In this thesis a Māori worldview is the primary orienting mechanism for the research that draws us to the jurisdiction of kaupapa Māori research.

Walker et al. (2006) have summarised kaupapa Māori research as research that gives full recognition to Māori cultural values and systems. It is a strategic position that challenges dominant Pākehā (non-Māori) constructions of research; it determines the assumptions, values, key ideas, and priorities of research; it ensures that Māori maintain conceptual, methodological, and interpretive control over research; and it is a philosophy that guides Māori research and ensures that Māori protocol will be followed during research processes (for example see Bishop, 1996, 2008; Henry & Pene, 2001; Pihama, Cram, & Walker, 2002; Smith, 1999a, 1999b). I identify kaupapa Māori research as research embedded in the pragmatic orientation of the Māori worldview that engages with the processes of social interaction, and draws from an epistemology which is reflexive, relational and experiential. Therefore, I argue in order to undertake organisational research in an Indigenous context it is necessary to do so from an alternate philosophic orientation to that which is currently endorsed by mainstream organisational theory and practice.

A. An Alternate Philosophic Framework

The emergence of a kaupapa Māori research approach was in response to the dominant hegemony of Westernised positivistic research (Henry & Pene, 2001; Pihama, Cram, & Walker, 2002). Without doubt, kaupapa Māori research is a co-conspirator to the ‘troublemakers’ of Alvesson and Skoldberg’s (2000) dialogue regarding the objections raised by ‘hermeneuticians, critical theorists, post-structuralists, linguistic philosophers, discourse analysts, feminists, constructivists, reflectivists and other trouble makers who render life
difficult for the supporters of either quantitative or mainstream qualitative methods” (3). It is at this juncture necessary to highlight that Indigenous research is often captured under the rubric of a critical paradigm (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008; Kovach, 2005; Smith, 1999a).

Critical theory defines an emancipatory approach to research as one that reflects critically on how the reality of the social world, including the construction of the self, is socially produced and therefore open to transformation (Alvesson & Willmott, 1992). It is a vital arena in which critical theorists challenge the established orthodoxies of the scientific field that serve to sustain the autonomy of an elite few. Therefore, clearly there is resonance between critical and interpretive paradigms in understanding the power relationships that exist in a research field, and my articulation of an Indigenous paradigm, such as kaupapa Māori. Epistemologically, they both offer a response to the universality of knowledge and advocate multiple ways of knowing and knowledge. Each has a predisposition for research strategies or methods that embrace approaches that provide for context and emphasise social rather than economic scrutiny of organisational reality (Deetz, 1996).

It is the research methods associated with an interpretive paradigm which have been of particular interest to Indigenous contexts. Interpretive research strategies encompass a variety of research methods, such as collaborative research (Bishop, 1996, 2008; Bishop & Glynn, 1999), participatory inquiry (Heron & Reason, 1997) and cooperative inquiry (Reason, 1999). These approaches allow for co-joint construction of meaning and the facilitated creation of collaborative stories predicated on mutual respect and commitment to the outcomes of the research. These forms of inquiry are based on experiential knowing, which is subjective-objective and focuses on the interactions between researcher and research subjects (Heron & Reason, 1997). The construction of organisational knowledge is through insight, experience and intuition, influenced by a socially constructed view of the world (Deetz, 1996; Flyvbjerg, 2001).

I do not doubt the potential ‘positives’ from the alliance with the critical and interpretive domains for Indigenous research. Recent scholarly works by noted Indigenous authors have contributed to Denzin and Lincoln's (2008) *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*, which regards critical qualitative research as allowing researchers and
research participants to be drawn into a “shared, critical space, a space where the work of resistance, critique and empowerment can occur” (2008: 5). Indeed, Indigenous researchers often find a natural allegiance with emancipatory research approaches, as it is clearly designated as a counter to the epistemic privileging of the scientific paradigm and it recognises that both the research process and product of research are political (Henry & Pene, 2001; Kovach, 2005).

However, I am reluctant to ‘brand’ my conceptualisation of an Indigenous paradigm with the ‘yoke’ of emancipatory research for two reasons. First, it evokes a sense of ‘helpless victims’ of ‘people without a voice’, which privileges the dominant view and marginalises those voices it proclaims an affinity for. It has an inherent connection to the rhetoric of resistance and self-determination for Indigenous peoples, which while extremely important and noteworthy, is not an avenue I want to tread. Second, my focus is on the pragmatist epistemology which I argue counters the traditional positivist/anti-positivist, objective/subjective, quantitative/qualitative debate (Chapter Two).

The alternative mode of theorisation and practice I introduce in this thesis, captures the pragmatic vision and rejects sharp divisions or categorisations between worldviews or social realities (Wicks & Freeman, 1998). Indeed, Deetz (1996) argues that the assumptions that undergird positivism are unwittingly retained, and rather than moving beyond the basic distinctions outlined between the two on positivism, anti-positivism simply inverts them. In addition, as Wicks and Freeman (1998) maintain, regardless of the attention paid to the subjective experience of individuals, it lacks connection to particular persons and communities with specific values and goals.

My argument therefore, is that an Indigenous paradigm is closely aligned, but not sufficiently captured by the methodologies and practices associated with the critical and interpretive fields. The development of an Indigenous paradigm resonates deeply with the calls by researchers to design research that can grasp the subtle variations inherent in the social world (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Fine, Weis, Weseen, & Wiong, 2003; Flyvbjerg, 2001; Shotter, 1997). It confirms arguments for researchers to make use of paradigms “(or some other orienting device) in order to maintain and make use of the
Indeed what is important is the development of different modes of methodological choice to represent lived organisational reality as it is.

At the forefront of my argument are two interrelated caveats that I suggest are important to consider with respect to research in Indigenous organisations. The first is the censure of a monocultural approach to knowledge and lack of recognition provided to distinctions between different cultural groups (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Said, 1993). The second caveat reflects Indigenous concerns over researcher imposed logic and therefore what constitutes knowledge. In a Bourdieuian sense, those players of the game, in this case those who subscribe to dominant sociological functionalist stance, create the rules of the game, define the parameters of the game and bestow an overwhelming sense of ‘all being right’ with the game. From an organisational analysis perspective, Deetz (1996) critiques the Burrell and Morgan representational grid as a scholarly form of political intervention wherein researchers speak on behalf of the ‘Others’ as defined and constituted by those who have the self-imposed power to do so. This, he adds, results in already marginalised groups conforming to the role of ‘Other’, acquiring an identity and valued functions but only as given by the opposition pole in the dominant group’s conceptual map.

They acquire a type of autonomy but only in a language/conceptual game not of their own choosing. In accepting the state of ‘other’ they have little self-definition, and the game is stacked (Deetz, 1996: 192).

One of the most common conceptualisations apparent in organisation literature is the plight of feminist writers in their contesting of male dominated research and their voice as a marginalised group (Deetz, 1996; Fine, Weis, Weseen, & Wiong, 2003; Jacques, 1992). Olesen (2005) argues that feminist research is not a passive recipient of transitory intellectual themes, generating innovative approaches to empower knowledge generation for a historically disengaged community of voices. I would suggest that we can apply that same distinction to researchers engaging with fields embedded in Indigenous contexts. At the crux of this argument is the ability of the dominant group in the scientific field’s to define the dimensions of difference and position themselves at the positive end of each dimension.
As discussed in Chapter Two, traditional approaches to organisation and management research are embedded within a discriminatory framework, which has defined non-Western research and practice as primarily inferior to the dominant, highly autonomous knowledge base of the Western worldview (Prasad, 2003; Said, 1979). The resultant vision that stemmed from this perspective in organisational research and practice was that actions not consistent with the dominant Western logic of institutional arrangements were deemed to be ‘inferior’ or ‘less efficient’ (Biggart & Delbridge, 2004). Certainly this is not a new conception. The phenomenon of ‘Orientalisation of the Other’ and ‘Occidentalisation of the modern West’ as embodied within dialectical processes (Said, 1979) is presented in Chapter One.

Although scholars such as Hofstede have represented some understanding of cross-cultural engagement in organisations, their work pays very little attention to Indigenous values or context. What such studies tend to neglect is the underlying metaphysical attitudes shaping an individual or collective view of self, identity and therefore the world (Chia, 2003; Fiske, 2002). In addition, cultural indices such as those presented by Hofstede often assume the equating of nation with culture and a stability of cultural difference, which becomes a complicating factor considering the effects of cultural diffusion and the dynamism of both national and ethnic shifts (Baskerville, 2003).

Hofstede’s (1980) cultural indices of power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism/collectivism, masculine and femininity has made and continues to make significant contribution to mainstream theory regarding studies of organisational cultures. Since its conception, however, he has adopted a more psychological approach of the word ‘culture’ distancing his framework from the reification of culture as an anthropological foundation for his work (Baskerville, 2003). A significant aspect of this adaptation was the inclusion of Confucian dynamism as a fifth dimension, which draws attention to a longer term orientation (Hofstede, 1988, 1991). In the subsequent version Chinese dynamism was later simplified to long-term orientation as the fifth dimension (Hofstede, 2001).

The inclusion of the fifth dimension was in response to concerns regarding the influence of the researchers own culture on the results (Hofstede, 1988), and certainly addresses some of the substantive and inherent problems to do with basic understandings of culture. However,
when subjected to analysis using an Indigenous perspective, for example one grounded in Indigenous Chinese cultural knowledge, Hofstede’s fifth dimension “suffers from a grave philosophical flaw” (Fang, 2003). Fang (2003) offers compelling criticism of Hofstede’s approach, which he argues presents to the academic community a one size fits all platform against which it is expected that all of the nuances of culture in specific contexts can be identified, categorised and analysed. I concur with authors such as Fang (2003) who call for analysis using an Indigenous perspective, one grounded in Indigenous cultural knowledge, an approach that captures the nuances of culture in specific contexts and taken-for-granted assumptions derived from Indigenous worldview.

B. The Difference that makes a Difference

At this point I highlight the ‘difference that makes a difference’ in an Indigenous paradigm: Indigenous knowledge as constituting Indigenous reality, grounded as it is within a specific socio-cultural context. The notion of practical knowledge (Chapter Two) offers a framework that engages a double-focus analytic lens that carries with it the capacity to construct a salient mode of social inquiry as a counter to the familiar dualism posed at the level of epistemology. This thesis argues for an Indigenous paradigm derived from an epistemology grounded in a culturally constituted knowledge base. An Indigenous paradigm provides the template for a culturally attuned response to mainstream organisational research, that is, organisational research derived from the logic which draws from a matrix of beliefs constituted by an Indigenous context, in this instance kaupapa Māori.

I view kaupapa Māori research as responding to a model of inquiry that offers very little substance when used to investigate Indigenous populations. In that model, researchers generally take “for granted the binary categories of Western thought, for accepting arguments supporting cultural relativity, for claiming an authenticity which is overly romantic and idealistic, and for simply engaging in the inversion of the coloniser/colonised relationship which does not address the complex problems of power relations” (Smith, 1999a: 26). The utility of an Indigenous paradigm is that it offers philosophical assumptions based on a logic

---

14 I have used a heading from Dension (1996). Although in this thesis the discussion focuses on the distinction between organisational culture and climate, I found the emphasis on difference to be useful.
of practice espousing an understanding of interdependence rather than foundational axioms
describes as the dominant meta-theoretical discourse we usually associate with organisational
research paradigms.15

In Table 1, I contrast the premises of Indigenous, positivist and anti-positivist paradigms. I
use this table to disentangle a pragmatic epistemology I associate with kaupapa Māori
research from the other two. I refer the reader to the references it builds upon and the
previous discussion. For the purposes of flow I do not expand on the positivist/anti-positivist
positions in my discussion as this was discussed in Chapter Two, other than to say that
regardless of which paradigm and methodological approach a researcher subscribes to,
dominant paradigms uphold and perpetuate hierarchical and formalistic criteria of authority,
representation and accountability that ground researchers in a logic that is not useful to
Indigenous worldviews (Bishop, 1996; Bryman, 1989; Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Goia &
Puitre, 1990; Henry & Pene, 1999). In this sub-section I continue and discuss the key
elements of a pragmatist epistemology that are central to this research.

A kaupapa Māori paradigm is identified as a challenge to mainstream Western academy as a
source of knowledge production and cultural capital (Henry & Pene, 2001). This sits well
with the logics derived from an Indigenous worldview, emphasising the social significance of
knowledge and therefore the cultural value of its production and dissemination. Therefore,
first and foremost, kaupapa Māori research is “a means of proactively promoting a Māori
worldview as legitimate, authoritative and valid in relationship to other cultures in New
Zealand” (Bishop, 2008: 441).

15 Rhodes (2000) offers insightful thinking regarding ‘thinking outside the hegemonic paradigmatic
frameworks’ offered by scholars such as Kuhn and Burrell and Morgan. His emphasis on a pragmatic ‘reading-
based approach’, as drawing on the discursive processes to elucidate organisational life, is a useful comparison
to my approach to narrative inquiry (Chapter Five). However, while Rhodes carefully extracts the notion of
paradigm from his ‘worldview’, I find it a useful representation that captures the orientations inherent in an
Indigenous worldview.
Table 1 - A Comparison of Epistemologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positivist Epistemology</th>
<th>Anti-Positivist Epistemology</th>
<th>Pragmatic Epistemology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
<td>• To know truth</td>
<td>• ‘There is no ‘truth’</td>
<td>• To endow experience with meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Law-like relations among objects</td>
<td>• Display unified culture</td>
<td>• Inter-dependent and inter-subjective relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Categorical</td>
<td>• Relativity</td>
<td>• Pragmatism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>• Scientific</td>
<td>• No basis for determining which accounts are better than others</td>
<td>• Experiential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Context-Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Context-dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Power-neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Power-laden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology</strong></td>
<td>• Nomothetic science</td>
<td>• Post-modern/Interpretive/Critical</td>
<td>• Relational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Modern/logico-scientific</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Dialogic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristics</strong></td>
<td>• General</td>
<td>• Particular</td>
<td>• Holistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Abstract</td>
<td>• Abstract</td>
<td>• Concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ahistorical</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Historical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Controlled</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Discursive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Strategies</strong></td>
<td>• Quantitative</td>
<td>• Qualitative</td>
<td>• Collaborative, participatory &amp; narrative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


“The only form of knowledge is experience” * (Albert Einstein)*

To use Bourdieu’s analogy of each field representing a ‘game’, the rules of the game are dictated by and the ‘players’ defined by the State, which raises the question that if we acknowledge distinct worldviews, how can we be sure that the integrity of an Indigenous Māori perspective is being maintained and broader socio-cultural concerns such as self-determination and social justice are being addressed for Indigenous peoples? In this regard, a primary consideration is the forum for producing, maintaining and distributing knowledge grounded in the cultural field from which it arises, and to which it must be meaningful.
In recent years there has been an intense focus by Indigenous communities on reclaiming Indigenous knowledge and practice (Dei, 2000; Iseke-Barnes, 2003; Kovach, 2005). The process of knowledge creation and dissemination is at its core influenced by the distinct philosophical basis in which it is embedded that has within its jurisdiction culturally oriented assumptions, rules, discourses and practice (Bourdieu, 1998; Flyvbjerg, 2001; Fuller, 1991; Sahlins, 1999). The appeal of practical knowledge is its attention to contextualised knowledge. While this thesis may focus on kaupapa Māori, for all Indigenous people similar principles may underpin research which gives them self-determination, values their world view, and ensures their own cultural practices are respected and maintained (Walker, Eketone, & Gibb, 2006).

Kaupapa Māori research maintains the right to control the research agenda, therefore Māori worldviews and practice become the accepted, legitimate norm (Walker, Eketone, & Gibb, 2006). As an Indigenous paradigm it offers an epistemology that assist Māori researchers to view the world and organise their research differently from a Westernised approach (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Smith, 1999b), paving the way for scholars to position themselves and their research communities within the discursive practices associated with their own logics. For example, Bishop (1996) undertook a study involving educational researchers and the role of power and control in research, using kaupapa Māori as the research framework. Bishop’s (1996) collaborative approach to research is a culturally situated research practice that provides for interconnectedness, commitment and engagement within an Indigenous Māori context. Thus, embracing the processes of knowledge construction as a collective enterprise (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

Deetz (2000) concurs, arguing that to overcome the privileging of certain forms of knowledge construction and distribution activities, we must as a community be able to define problems and examine cultural preferences from the perspective of a particular culture’s epistemological base. The kaupapa Māori framework addresses these concerns by applying Māori concepts to ensure that Māori protocols are maintained, for example the notion of whakawhanaungatanga, defined here as the process of identifying, maintaining, or forming past, present, and future relationships, which enables Māori to locate themselves with those present (Bishop, 1996; Walker, Eketone, & Gibb, 2006). Furthermore, it is a worldview that
recognises the mana, power/status and tapu potentiality for power of each participant while also acknowledging and ritualising the necessary relatedness of the participants (Bishop, 2008).

Bishop (2008) regards kaupapa Māori as a discourse of proactive theory and practice which is closely associated with the increasing political consciousness of Māori people, the basis of which is embedded in the notion of autonomy, operationalised in a kaupapa Māori approach as tino rangatiratanga, or self-determination (Bishop, 1996; Durie, 2001; Henry & Pene, 2001; Pihama, Cram, & Walker, 2002). The Indigenous position on self-determination in practice therefore is that individuals are free to determine their own goals and make sense of the world in their own culturally generated manner (Bishop, 2008). Such a position is consistent with Indigenous peoples’ concerns regarding a sense of identity, ownership and control of resources.

Tino rangatiratanga is often misinterpreted as a call for separatism or non-interference. However in reality it is a call for kaupapa Māori to operationalise Māori peoples’ aspirations to restructure power relationships to the point where partnership can be autonomous and interact from this position rather than from one of subordination or dominance. It is important to note that from a Māori worldview this self-determination is in relation to others, “with this notion of relations being fundamental to Māori epistemologies” (Bishop, 2008: 441). Importantly, from this we can ascertain that knowledge is reflexive and along that vein it is also relational, for as Bourdieu suggests “the stuff of social reality … lies in relations” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992: 15).

Kaupapa Māori research holds relationships and roles as central. A relational approach to research encourages reflexivity and recognition of the limitations of one’s own engagement and commitment to the value of open-ended inquiry. It also focuses attention onto the action implications of knowledge generation that link researchers and participants in participative and collaborative forms of inquiry (see Bishop, 1996; Heron & Reason, 1997; Reason, 1999). Therefore Māori protocols are key to social life, which are underpinned by the concept of whānau (Bishop, 1996; Bishop & Glynn, 1999). Whānau refers to family but particularly includes the idea of extended family, and to the idea of establishing relationships, and
connectedness between Māori. The practices of generosity, cooperation, and reciprocity are linked to the concept of whānau (Jahnke & Taiapa, 2003) which cements obligation and hence is a key to stability (Mauss, 1970).

III. An Indigenous Paradigm: In brief …

It seems almost a truism these days to assert that different peoples from different epochs, different cultures and even different formative contexts construct and hence perceive and experience different realities. This is because the objects of knowledge they become accustomed to and the attitudes they adopt vary from one individual situation to another. How these differences of perceptions have been brought about is of immense importance for our understanding of the diverse logics and priorities underpinning managerial strategies and actions (Chia, 1997: 701).

As per Chia’s commentary above, the utility of an Indigenous paradigm resides in its capacity to respond to the research questions that arise in the context of Indigenous organisations and to reflect Indigenous worldviews, as opposed to viewing practice and knowledge through a Western lens (Denzin, Lincoln, & Smith, 2008; Smith, 1999a; Steinhauer, 2002; Wilson, 2001). In this thesis I draw from the orientation and philosophical cohabitation of practical knowledge and kaupapa Māori. Consequently, we are directed automatically to different assumptions, practices and methods that situate Māori philosophy, values (ethics) and knowledge squarely in a central position. This is an approach to organisation research that will accord full recognition of Māori cultural norms, value systems and practices, and cultural legitimation of both the process and outcomes of research (Bishop, 1996; Henry & Pene, 2001; Smith, 1999a).

The ‘difference that makes a difference’ in my conceptualisation of an Indigenous paradigm is practical knowledge embodied by a pragmatic epistemology. An Indigenous paradigm has its own structuring assumptions, values, concepts, orientations and priorities grounded in Indigenous knowledge. I argue it provides a culturally attuned response to organisational research, the focus of which is on the pragmatic process of social interaction, drawing from an epistemology which is reflexive, relational and experiential. Epistemic reflexivity is a constant feature in research that requires a wider degree of participation between the researcher, the researched and the wider community (Chapters Four and Five). Chapter Five is where I further develop the relational dimension of this approach to research and Chapter
Four continues next to locate the field and experience of Māori business practice, further developing practical knowledge as a framework of analysis.
CHAPTER FOUR: SITUATING ANALYSIS – MĀORI BUSINESS PRACTICE

An Indigenous paradigm offers a means for making connections to the reality of different cultural groups, in this instance New Zealand Māori. It also establishes communication about knowledge production and distribution which is meaningful to that particular group (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Deetz, 2000; Jacques, 1992). The basis for my argument is that much of our understanding and application of socio-cultural factors in organisational analysis cannot be simply transliterated, transposed or transformed onto Indigenous contexts. When we consider paradigms as establishing parameters that inform knowledge acquisition and dissemination, the context of an Indigenous worldview has implications for the study of Indigenous organisations, and organisational studies in general.

The primary focus for this study on Māori business practice is the argument that we secure a framework that takes into account those taken-for-granted considerations, as derived from kaupapa Māori that motivate and guide practice. Section I begins by describing the field of Māori business in New Zealand. Section II outlines the key threads of analysis on which I base my approach to the fieldwork, drawing from Bourdieu’s sociological reflexivity and practical knowledge in organisational research, which I argue (Chapters Two and Three) enables a multifaceted analysis of Indigenous Māori business practice. Concluding remarks in Section III emphasise the connection between the pragmatic orientation of an Indigenous paradigm and the choice of narrative inquiry research method.

I. Situating the Field of Practice

The ‘golden age’ of Māori enterprise was at an end, but had the process of colonisation strangled New Zealand’s unique and arguably most valuable business asset? (Petrie, 2006: 276).

I begin this section with the final statement made by Petrie (2006) in her Book *Chiefs of Industry: Māori Tribal Enterprise in Early Colonial New Zealand*. Petrie highlights three important aspects regarding the field of Māori business from an historical viewpoint, which I suggest are significant to developing an understanding of practice. She draws attention to the
notion of ‘Māori enterprise’ or businesses operated by Māori. This is not a hugely groundbreaking discovery, but the concept of Māori business is a contested issue and it is one which has strong connections to identity. Petrie also alludes to an end of a golden age, which reflects the notion of temporality and importance of understanding the historical context in which Māori business has emerged. Finally, she recognises the role of the Māori economy as a valuable business asset.

A driver for this thesis is that Māori aspirations for the 21st Century are based in greater control over their own destinies and resources. Durie (2001) describes this aspiration as a search for self-determination and self-governance; that is, the realisation of Māori objectives. Contribution to and participation in the New Zealand and global economy is a vital ingredient in the achievement of these aspirations. In this section I present the context relevant to Māori business. I do so to reiterate the significance of Māori to the New Zealand economy and hence this research.

A. The Context

Over the last quarter of a century, the New Zealand economy has changed from being one of the most regulated in the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) to one of the least regulated. Today New Zealand has a market economy with sizeable manufacturing and service sectors complementing a highly efficient export-oriented agricultural sector (Ministry of Economic Development, 2008). New Zealand’s economy went through significant change during the reforms of the early 1980’s. Prior to this period of time, New Zealand operated primarily as a welfare state, relying on the agricultural sector and state secured jobs to maintain the economy (Evans, Grimes, Wilkinson, & Teece, 1996). However, post-1984, the Labour government introduced a philosophy of non-intervention and what was once a heavily regulated economy turned into a free market economy. During this process, import tariffs and agricultural subsidies were removed, and the economy restructured through deregulation, corporatisation and privatisation (Evans, Grimes, Wilkinson, & Teece, 1996).
The impact of such wide-ranging economic reform was both institutional and social. Institutionally, businesses in New Zealand had to operate in a different environment, and were faced with changing their competitive strategies (Corbett & Campbell-Hunt, 2002). Socially Māori, who predominantly occupied the heavily labour oriented industries, were hardest hit and poor economic conditions fell disproportionately hard on Māori (Gibbs, 2005; Lashley, 2000). Statistics have indicated that the Māori population occupies the lower socio-economic, education and health, levels and higher crime levels within New Zealand (Durie, 2001; King, 2003; Walker, 1990). Māori have also remained under-represented in full employment and self-employment opportunities (Zapalska, Dabb, & Perry, 2003).

An additional ‘side-effect’ of these times was the continual media characterisation of Māori in a negative light (Zapalska, Dabb, & Perry, 2003), particularly, in relation to crime statistics, poverty and business failures. The dominated are the least capable of controlling their representation. The media can collectively fabricate a social representation that, even when it is rather distant from reality, persists despite subsequent denials or later corrections. Most often, it merely reinforces spontaneous interpretations and hence mobilises prejudices and thereby magnifies them (Champagne, 1993). As Russell, a small business operator in the education and social service sector, noted much of the debate about Māori has been uninformed and responsible for derision towards Māori in New Zealand society:

… at a recent leadership programme someone mentioned that it was a pity that Pita Sharples is so angry because he’s got a lot to offer. They were referring to an unflattering and angry image presented in a photo in the NZ Herald … However, what is not mentioned is that of all the photo’s chosen to represent one of Māoridom’s best-known academic and political leaders they selected that one.

This is indicative of the process of symbolic violence which operates in and influences the field of Māori business. Symbolic violence is “the violence which is exercised upon a social agent with his or her complicity” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992: 167). Bourdieu explains this process as enabling certain groups occupying privileged positions in society to maintain and legitimate their positions. A consequence is that Māori communities and business ventures are seen in a less than flattering light.
Māori have never given up the struggle for economic redress, nor revitalisation of their culture and it has been the success of recent initiatives that Māori of today are witnessing a new wave of progress for Māori society. The past two decades have seen the significance of the Māori economy increase, partially due to the doctrine of development that became the core of Māori policy after the 1984 Hui Taumata (Māori Economic Summit). The hui, noted here as a gathering, provided a forum for the planning of pathways for Māori social, cultural and economic development. Among the implications was tribal development as the vehicle for Māori advancement (Tomlins-Jahnke, 2005) and the foundation for resources made available to Māori communities to look to themselves for development strategies. It marked an era where Māori established culturally attuned social programmes that have rejuvenated language and re-energised communities. Indeed, since 1984 there have been some well known success stories, such as the rise and increasing sophistication of Māori business organisation and the vitalisation of Māori language and culture.

On March 1 – 3, 2005 over 400 people gathered in Wellington, New Zealand for three days of intensive discussion and debate on ways to accelerate Māori economic development and create economic pathways for the generations ahead (Hui Taumata, 2005). The Hui Taumata 2005 saw the meeting of major social, cultural and economic actors in the field of Māori business come together, reflecting the growing significance of the Māori business economy as a major participant in the New Zealand and global economies. This has marked a period of mobilisation and strategic attention for Māori businesses, one that has highlighted the need for specific research into Māori business practices.

The Hui Taumata 2005 highlighted the potential for Māori development within three key themes: Developing Enterprise, Developing People and Developing Assets which offered a strategic direction for Māori development over the next twenty years. In particular, the Hui Taumata offered “visions of a skilled Māori workforce located in future-proof areas of economic growth and stability, developing generations of entrepreneurs, increasing assets through active participation in business and producing leadership in terms of quality decision ‘making’ and decision ‘makers’” (Tomlins-Jahnke, 2005: i-ii). Interestingly, and without intention (as they emerged through narrative) all three themes are firmly embedded in the design and analysis of this research.
B. Māori Business

When I first started my research, I was asked why I was focusing on Māori business “because aren’t we all the same?” At the time I argued that there were distinctions based on common definitions of Māori business, such as ‘by Māori, for Māori’ or the Statistics New Zealand definition for what constitutes Māori business requiring 50% Māori ownership and control. Traditionally, we have looked at characteristics of ownership and products or services that we can identify as being Māori oriented to categorise a business as a Māori venture. A more complex perspective would involve creating parameters of Māori oriented versus mainstream or perhaps even a combination, which presents the idea of a continuum. Māori business can be described as being value or whānau oriented (organisational culture, practice and the product/service being offered) with a distinctly Māori sense of community or a purely commercial based business. One does not preclude the other (Durie, 2003).

This assessment includes activities based on collectively owned Māori assets, businesses of self-employed who identify as Māori, commercial transactions involving Māori culture, services oriented to specific Māori needs, and housing owned by Māori (NZIER, 2003). Such an analysis draws attention to the range of Māori businesses from independent small business operators’ right through to the larger export oriented corporations and those that have emerged out of Treaty settlements. The enactment of the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975 established the Waitangi tribunal to inquire into and to make recommendations to the Crown in respect of both legislative and executive acts of government inconsistent with the principles of the Treaty (Brookfield, 1999). Subsequent settlements have provided the beginnings of redress and recovery, placing Māori developmental aspirations back into centre field. Settlements since 1992 have totalled $1,018,697,089 to twenty four different groups, including collective fisheries and forestry settlements (Office of Treaty Settlements, 2008).

The settlement process combined with the economic reform of the 1980s in New Zealand had significant implications for the growth and development of Māori business (Zapalska, Perry, & Dabb, 2003). The 1990’s saw much improvement with the underlying growth of the Māori economy responsible for exports of $650 million in 2000, generating 2% of operating surpluses despite accounting for only 1.4% of the value added to the entire New Zealand
In 2005-06 Māori commercial assets amounted to 1.5% of the reported value of the total New Zealand business sector, an increase from 1.2% in 2001 (NZIER, 2005).

Māori have significant stakes in the agriculture, fishing and forestry sectors of the economy. However, increasingly Māori are developing assets in tourism, intellectual property and the creative industry (NZIER, 2005). Today, Māori business is a growing profile in the New Zealand economy (Table 2). A report by Te Puni Kōkiri estimates that total Māori commercial assets are worth $16.5 billion in 2005/2006, an increase of $7.5 billion or 83% since 2001. Māori business accounted for the largest dollar value increase, which increased by $4.8 billion, or 83%. This increase is partly due to greater numbers of Māori employers and self-employed (without employees), the groups used to measure Māori business (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2008).

### Table 2 - The Māori Asset Base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Assets ($m)</th>
<th>Increase in Assets 2001-2005-06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori Trusts</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td>3,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori Trustee Land Assets</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwi Treaty Settlements</td>
<td>86*</td>
<td>188*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori Trust Boards</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori Businesses</td>
<td>5,708</td>
<td>10,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other**</td>
<td>1,354</td>
<td>1,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets</td>
<td>8,992</td>
<td>16,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excludes the $170 million each for Waikato-Tainui Raupatu settled in 1994/95, Ngāi Tahu settled in 1996/1998, and Māori Fisheries settlement in 1992-93. These are incorporated under net assets under other.

**Other: the figure reported here is the sum of the total assets of a variety of sources: Te Ohu kai Moana Trustee Ltd; Crown Forestry Rental Trust; Waikato Raupatu Lands Trust, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu; Poutama Business Trust; and Te Whānau o Waipareira trust. Information collected from annual reports between March 2005 and September 2006.

*Sourced from:* (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2008)
Given the focus of this research these categorisations of Māori business prompt consideration of the degree of variation regarding how a corporate organisation effects the principles of kaupapa Māori, as opposed to a Trust or Small business, or vice versa. I argue that the issue does not necessarily lie in the type of organisation, but rather in the kaupapa of the business, which I elaborate on in Chapter Six. However, we must also acknowledge Māori Trust’s or incorporated company’s who have profit, as well as socio-cultural imperatives included in their strategic charters. That is to say that, kaupapa Māori operates in all types of organisations, regardless of size or objective differentials. As an example, the following provides a brief case study of a collectively owned organisation.

Tuaropaki, is a Māori Trust that operates within the parameters of *Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993*, or the *Māori Lands Act 1993*. It is the result of a 1952 amalgamation of lands owned by members of the seven Mokai hapū – Ngāti Parekawa, Ngāti Te Kohera, Ngāti Wairangi, Ngāti Whaita, Ngati Moekino, Ngati Haa and Ngāti Tarakaiahi. These hapū have tribal affiliation to both Ngāti Tūwharetoa and Ngāti Raukawa. The Trust operates in four commercial arenas, temperature controlled agriculture, geothermal power generation, sustainable farming and communications (Tuaropaki Trust, 2009). The Trust's mission statement reflects kaupapa Māori in relation to its recognition of social, cultural and economic objectives:

- Be at one with our customary land and taonga.
- Provide sustainable wealth and benefits to the owners and their whānau.
- Support community initiatives.
- Meet the challenges of the global and local markets by exceeding stakeholder and customer expectation.

A key part of the Trusts operation is the return to owners, who they identify as being member’s of the affiliated hapū noted above, which they do through education grants, scholarships and kaumātua grants. The Trust had annual revenue of approximately $50 million in 2008, which made for a new profit for shareholders of $14million (Kennedy, 2008). Trust chairman Tumanako Wereta said it gave his people a beacon of hope and prosperity and in addition he states, “I know my grandchildren will be well looked after when I am gone” (Kennedy, 2008: 12).
The success of Māori organisation and management, based on the blending of traditional and contemporary business values is not new. Chapter Three discussed the how from the time of first contact with the Pākehā, Māori leaders responded to new demands, illustrating an eagerness to embrace new technologies and innovative practices, for example agriculture, which they adapted to suit their own social processes and modes of governance. Māori acquired new skills - in seamanship including whaling and sealing; agriculture and husbandry; commerce, such as marketing, financial management, tourism and other areas (Petrie, 2006). This consideration is a key thread throughout the narratives in Part Two of this thesis.

C. Research on Māori Business

Most of the research on Māori culture and society has been based in education and health (Bishop, 1996; Durie, 2001, 2003; Smith, 1999a), which is understandable considering the dismal statistical evidence of educational success and health for Māori. Today, however, we are seeing literature and research on Māori business emerge, particularly Indigenous entrepreneurship. The majority of Indigenous entrepreneurship research has focused on the Indigenous peoples of North America, particularly, Native American Indians and Canadian Inuit, as well as Australian Aborigines (Frederick & Henry, 2004). This domain of research has had the valuable role of reconciling the preservation imperatives of the traditional with the commercialisation objectives of innovation and the need to understand non-mainstream worldviews and values (Hindle & Lansdowne, 2007). While I do not dispute this approach to research, my emphasis in this thesis is the utility of a practice approach to research, in terms of engaging with a pragmatic epistemology of an Indigenous worldview, the consequential forms of practice and how these impact on business performance and hence outcomes.

A major research project associated with Māori entrepreneurship is the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM), which has consistently identified New Zealand as being an entrepreneurial nation (Frederick & Henry, 2004). The GEM investigates entrepreneurial activity associated with individual entrepreneur ability to identify and exploit opportunities. In 2006 the report identified Māori as the third most entrepreneurial people in the world. The GEM utilises the cultural dimensions developed by Hofstede (2001) - power distance,
uncertainty avoidance, individualism/collectivism, masculine and femininity - to use implicit theories of leadership to explore followers’ culturally endorsed perceptions of culture and leadership.

I have suggested in Chapter Three that these dimensions offer a fairly limited and arguably patronising vision regarding the dynamics of socio-cultural values, particularly when subjected to analysis using an Indigenous framework. Problems can arise when we attempt to jump all the way from generalised cultural characterisations to economic outcomes without taking into account all the intervening variables and the situational contexts (Pye, 2000). From an Indigenous perspective, the logics motivating mainstream organisational research processes are tainted with what Clifford (2001) describes as Western ethnocentrism. Signifying a particular set of assumptions, linguistic and descriptive conventions designed to ensure a natural preconception in creating a superior ‘us’ to an inferior ‘them’ (Agrawal, 1995; Said, 1993).

Zapalska et al. (2003) surveyed Māori business to ascertain the impact certain environmental factors (government policy and procedure, socioeconomic conditions, entrepreneurial and business skills, financial and non-financial support to business) have on performance. Their findings reflected some interesting facts regarding Māori business. Specifically, that most Māori businesses were directed through communal ventures that better fit Māori culture and tradition and of these the majority were situated in the agricultural and fishing sectors. Their study is valuable in that it provides some positive affirmation of Māori business and the role of environmental factors. However, the use of a mono-cultural notion of non-financial support and the misrecognition of the implications of imposed government structures onto Māori business are of particular concern.

I would also argue their use of a survey forces a prescriptive analysis of the socio-cultural process at play. For example, they describe the significance of family support and iwi families, which reflects a fairly mono-cultural interpretation of Māori practices. It ignores the significance of the multiple relationships within the concept of whānau, or Whakawhanaungatanga as the process of establishing relationships, literally by means of
identifying, through culturally appropriate means, your bodily linkage, your engagement, your connectedness and therefore (unspoken) commitment to other people (Bishop, 1996).

Importantly, however, studies such as Zaplaska et al. (2003) and Frederick and Henry (2004) do highlight the need for the examination of cultural imperatives of Māori business and economic development, which draws us into the scope of practical knowledge. Studies such as these tend to highlight the ‘something being unique and different’ about a Māori approach to business but they fail to elaborate, resulting in a superficial understanding of how Māori socio-cultural values inform their business practice. Māori business development requires an understanding of any unique characteristics inherent in how Māori view the world (NZIER, 2003). The challenge is how to translate that into business practice.

We need to be wary and ensure that any discussion linking Māori cultural practices to successful business practices should not ignore more sober and critical analysis. Current research in organisational studies suggests that what is required is a focus on organisational cultures, institutional transformation, development capacity and management practices to give sense and explanatory power to the worldview of Indigenous people and the organisations they choose to create (Puketapu, 2000; Wolfgramm, 2002). This new era of organisational research is driven primarily by a wish to address the prevailing ideologies of cultural superiority (or cultural and social neutrality) that pervade our social, economic, political and intellectual institutions (Bishop, 1996; Henry & Pene, 1999). This thesis is presented on the premise that a practice approach allows us to delve more comprehensively into highly contextualised interactions that impact on business outcomes. The discussion now turns to the framework of analysis on which I have based my research approach and field questions.

II. Practical Knowledge as a Framework of Analysis

This chapter began with a representation of the field of practice, which is the subject of this thesis. I have specifically located the Māori business as a field of practice with its own logics and “nested in a network of hierarchical relations with other fields” (Wacquant, 1989: 48),
presenting kaupapa Māori as a worldview imbued with its own logic, norms and practices. I argue, in the vein of Bourdieuan logic that the kaupapa Māori as a cultural field has a culturally situated structure of objective relations between positions of force that supports and guides the strategies of the agents who occupy the field. That is to say, the logic of kaupapa Māori is explicitly involved in how agents in the field make sense of the world, and therefore construct specific strategies that negotiate the social world (Bourdieu, 1977; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

In this section, I examine the pragmatic thinking evident in practical knowledge with regards its clarification of the continual process of engagement between field, habitus and capital. I do so in relation to the access these terms provide individuals (and collectives) to practical knowledge which is invested in our everyday ordinary activity through the specific strategies we enact (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). It is at this juncture that I focus explicitly on practical knowledge as key to the analytic framework of this thesis for looking at the micro-practices of the discursive interaction that occurs in social life. It is from this perspective that I approach the topic of Māori business practice.

A. Implications for the Field of Māori Business

In the preceding chapters I have conceived of an Indigenous paradigm that is grounded in the pragmatic orientation of practical knowledge and the logic of kaupapa Māori. The utility of practical knowledge as an approach to research provides a contextualised approach to research topics situated within custom, history and locality. As discussed in Chapters Two and Three context-dependence refers to the relation of ontological complicity between the socially constituted habitus, and the world that determines it (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Context adds a necessary and meaningful dimension to the perception or experience of practice, resulting in open-ended, contingent relations between actions and interpretations (Flyvbjerg, 2001). I draw from Hough (2006) in terms of multilevel analysis and Jarzabkowski’s (2004) approach to investigate practice empirically by proposing that practices operate on a cross level unit of analysis present in the interaction within and between actors, organisations and wider social contexts.
Practical knowledge focuses on social activity. Importantly it enables the relationship between knowledge, which gives shape, meaning and discipline to our interactions with the social world, and the knowing found in individual and group practice. Thus, practical knowledge concerns the primacy of the socially constituted sense of the game or le sens pratique (Bourdieu, 1977; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Practical sense operates as a ‘socially constituted sense of the game’ that guides our human behaviour, taking into account the context of the field, its structural arrangements and power derived from the volume and structure of the different forms of capital. That is to say “… habit is the embodied sensitivity to a sensitive world, and in this respect it provides for a field of behavioural possibilities in experience” (Ostrow 1990: 10 cited in Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992: 21n36). Drawing from Aristotle, Tsoukas and Cummings’ (1997) vision of practical wisdom involves knowing the right values and being able to put them into practice in concrete situations. Thus, being inherently value-laden requires human agents to acquire practical wisdom instead of merely scientific or craft knowledge.

As a consequence engagement with the field of Māori business is a simultaneous expression of the dynamic interaction between those distinctly Māori socio-cultural values, behaviours and structural arrangements that inform practice. The notion of practice captures the way activity shapes and is shaped by the society in which it occurs (Jarzabkowski, 2005), therefore my intentions are to ensure that my research questions satisfy the experiential logic of kaupapa Māori. This section continues to discuss the elements of practical knowledge that will be needed to interpret the narrative from the participants in the study.

Field of Relations

Bourdieu maintains that to think of the field or world is to do so relationally (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). An agent’s position in the field as the relative force held and exhibited by means of their strategic orientation (position-taking) by agents or objective structures that are participants in the field, determined by possession of certain species of capital/power. This commands access to the specific profits that are at stake in the field.
Social structure (the global or macro) and individual action (the local or micro), and conversely the structural arrangements and distribution of capital constitute experiences which inform the habitus (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Everett, 2002; Nash, 1990). This is representative of Bourdieu’s ‘double and obscure relation’ between habitus and field, whereby the relation of conditioning refers to the objective conditions of a given field structuring the habitus, and equally where the relation of cognitive construction situates the habitus as being constitutive of the field (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Thus, socially and culturally constituted ways of perceiving, evaluating and behaving become accepted as unquestioned and taken for granted. Such things may not be necessarily recorded formally but they are known to agents who engage within that field as being the way in which things are done, as self-evident and part of the natural order (Bourdieu, 1977).

In the context of kaupapa Māori this relational influence is reflected in the conceptualisation of cultural identity and the influence identity plays in the formation of social networks. In the tradition of Orientalism (as discussed in Chapters One and Two), just as Pākehā identity is constructed around factors, including Māori, Māori identity has been shaped by the actions and influences of Pākehā. There is a shared history, structured by nineteenth-century colonisation and twentieth-century assimilation, which has shaped the identity of each to the other (Barcham, 2000; Matahaere, 1995; Wetherell & Potter, 1993).

Historically, the Māori cultural field is located within a restricted field of production, with an emphasis on socio-cultural capital. In such fields, economic forms of capital play a lesser role than other non-economic forms. The interconnectedness between economic, social and cultural capital is clearly evident in traditional Māori society where every action, whether it be socially or economically motivated, was guided by the established frameworks of social relations that exist. Social processes are the foundations for protocol and relations that drove economic, social and cultural interaction and distribution of various forms of capital. In contrast, much of our business rhetoric is firmly situated as large scale fields of production, which emphasises economic capital is dominant. It is a space of play and competition in which the social agents and institutions attempt to determine what constitutes capital within that field and how that capital is to be distributed.
Uneven distribution is highlighted in research conducted by Oakes et al. (1998), which considered an episode of strategic change facing a public sector organisation in the Province of Alberta, specifically the Cultural Facilities and Historical Resources Division. A consequence of the Canadian government’s reengineering efforts to introduce accountability (through the implementation of a business plan) raised tensions by changing the distribution and relative weight of capital. It was a process that signalled the increasing translation of cultural capital into economic capital but also the absolute attrition of cultural capital, traditionally the field’s primary form of capital. This in turn changed the value, hence the power of the habitus (embodied know-how) of those in the field. In their study they posited that the introduction of an externalised business plan was viewed as symbolic violence and the control was achieved through the processes of legitimation and naming of language and capital.

Capital illustrates what is at stake. The distribution of capital within the field is closely connected to the power dynamics of the field. The value of each of these forms of capital are different in each cultural field, and the value placed on each will determine the power each has over the others and in shaping the structure and habitus of agents within the fields (Bourdieu, 1986; Bourdieu, 1989; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). This draws our attention to power, whereby individuals and groups exist in relations of dominance and subordination by virtue of uneven distribution of the various forms of capital (Brubaker, 1985).

Relations of Power

The concept of power is one of many approaches to analysing practice, because action is an exercise of power (Bourdieu, 1986; Bourdieu, 1989), focusing attention onto those power considerations that inform practice in the field of Māori business. Flyvberg (2001) suggests the analysis of power looks for a dense net of omnipresent relations and not only localised ‘centers’ and institutions, or entities one can ‘possess. In this research landscape, power emerges in a variety of contexts, but here I identify power in a symbolic sense as a power of ‘world-making’ (Bourdieu, 1989) and the field of power, defined by the structure of different species of capital (Bourdieu, 1977, 1986).
First, I focus on how the construction of knowledge, the distribution of that knowledge and what interpretations we place on it becomes an exercise of power within the field. This provides a context for examining the embodiment of knowledge as a source of worldly power, “a topic typically neglected by epistemologists and philosophers of science, who still tend to think of knowledge as a politically indifferent or ‘disembodied’ phenomenon” (Fuller, 1991: 301).

Certainly, the effects of colonisation and the associated power differential that has since the 1850’s placed Māori interests in a subordinate position in the field is a significant factor in this research. Rosaldo (1994) draws to our attention the inextricable connection between culture and power. Cultural hegemony, (the control of the intellectual life of society by purely cultural means) is crucial to political, social and economic dominance (Guiso, Sapienza, & Zingales, 2006; Said, 1993). Bourdieu’s concept of doxa reflects the importance of power. Doxa describes the system of classification which reproduces, in the dominant social logic, the instruments of knowledge that constitutes said logic of a given field (Bourdieu, 1977).

Bourdieu uses the term doxa to denote “what goes without saying because it comes without saying” (Bourdieu, 1977: 167). Doxa is experienced as those taken for granted social norms, language, categories and labels that influence both agents’ behaviour and the structure of the field itself. Doxa operates within the field providing a boundary of concern in which we can situate and bring to the forefront the logic, or ‘rules of the game’ that dictates practice (Bourdieu, 1977; Everett, 2002). For example, the generative nature of the habitus motivates action that is rooted in doxa and as a consequence we see practice reproducing the structure, distribution and efficacy of capital in the field.

Power is not only something one appropriates, but also something one re-appropriates and exercises in a constant back-and-forth movement in relations of strength, tactics, and strategies (Flyvbjerg, 2001). To understand this conception of power we must consider its relationship with knowledge. Knowledge is not neutral, but is intimately tied to the operation of power (Foucault, 1982). Knowledge is embodied within the agents in the field and therefore power is relational. It is here in this continuous negotiation that we find the roots of practical knowledge. In this way it can be seen that knowledge is constructed through
contexts of shifting power relations that involve varying degrees of distance and intimacy (Rosaldo, 1994). In this instance, when we privilege a Māori worldview, Māori custom is entwined within social processes derived from a logic which is different to Western ideology. As an agonistic approach to social relations it is one that recognises power for what is and has established the appropriate protocols to manage it. For example, in the case of pōwhiri, rendered here as a ceremonial welcoming there are several layers of protocol that must be adhered to in order to protect the tapu, or sacredness of the ceremony (Barlow, 1994).

B. The Questions Addressed in this Thesis

The questions posed and addressed by this thesis stem from the logic that improved and superior firm performance must also take into account the deeply rooted understandings of social organisation and cultural practices (Araujo & Easton, 1996; Granovetter, 1985; Smart, 1993; Zald, 1993). Chapter Two further developed the research agenda:

- Firm performance is not merely an outcome of economic activity, but is also a corollary of the value derived from combinations of distinct socio-cultural resources and capabilities.

A perspective that has guided this thesis’ theoretical assumptions is that we must pay attention to the relationship between economy and society. Chapter Three articulated my conceptualisation of an Indigenous paradigm in the context of kaupapa Māori, in particular recognising that the context of an Indigenous worldview has implications for the study of Indigenous organisations, and organisations studies in general. In this chapter I have outlined the assumptions that have guided my research questions, which are critical to the analytical framework that I apply to examine the discursive interaction within the Māori cultural field.

In the following discussion I present the fieldwork questions for this thesis and discuss how practical knowledge defines the questions that inevitably lead to the contexts and choice of ‘strategies’ from which practice emerges, presented in Parts Two and Three. The field provides a boundary of concern within which the structures evident in the field, forms of
capital and the habitus exist and interact in a dynamic and inter-related manner, through which social life is sustained and structures are reproduced or transformed. I ask the following question in terms of how practical knowledge enacts Māori business (Chapter Six):

1. What does an Indigenous [kaupapa Māori] perspective of practice offer our understanding of organisational practice?

In understanding practice in a culturally specific field, such as Māori business, we view the field as the critical mediation between practices of those agents who operate within it and the surrounding contextual conditions (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). A researcher draws on a pragmatic epistemology as part of the existing vernacular for understanding human action and enabling an infinite number of ‘moves’ or ‘strategies’ to be enacted (Flyvbjerg, 2001). In spite of the usual connotations of the term, strategies need not rely on an element of intentionality, indeed opportunities to maximise benefits in the field may be unconsciously chosen (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

Social actors do not merely interpret the world they live in but also transform it. Bourdieu argues that this process occurs because the occupants of positions in the field seek, individually or collectively, to safeguard or improve their position and possession of their preferred form of capital (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). This also includes the prescribed level of value or power (Bourdieu, 1977). Practice is inevitably evoked within the bounds of the contextual discursive interaction that arises as a consequence of competition amongst agents for social resources. The strategies of agents depend on their position in the field and in the distribution of the specific capital (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992), therefore I ask the following question in terms of what strategies Māori make use of to inform and enhance their firm performance:

2. What strategies do agents in the Māori cultural field enact in business?

The answers to the questions posed by this thesis are not simple. The contemporary Māori worldview is a product of deeply embedded Māori traditions, knowledge and practice. It is also a combination of local non-Māori and global intrusions, of which colonisation and the
resulting resistance by Māori has certainly played a defining role. This study will provide an opportunity for gaining greater insight into the dynamics of Māori business practice derived as they are from social practice and systems of exchange distinctive to Indigenous Māori knowledge and ways of knowing.

III. Narrative Rationality

The positioning of this thesis within the parameters of an Indigenous paradigm inevitably evokes a research orientation that simultaneously accounts for sociological, political, economical and philosophical evaluation and reflection within an Indigenous context. An underlying tenet of my research approach has been motivated by calls from the Indigenous community to act from a research design and methodology that will accord full recognition of cultural norms, value systems and practices, and cultural legitimation in both the process and outcomes of research (Bishop, 1996; Denzin, Lincoln, & Smith, 2008; Kovach, 2005; Smith, 1999a). My conceptualisation of an Indigenous paradigm, drawn from the pragmatic orientation and philosophical cohabitation of practical knowledge and kaupapa Māori, provides the paradigmatic basis that has formed the methodological construction of this research, which in turn has driven the choice of research strategy.

In Chapter Five I argue that it is the narrative form and its associated rationality which is the best medium for locating experience and thinking practically. As a research strategy narrative is familiar and ubiquitous in its utility in constructing and representing the rich and messy domain of human experience and interaction (Bruner, 1991). Narrative inquiry, provides for the consideration of both the role of the researcher and the construction of the research object, and thus has an experiential quality that captures the pragmatic orientation of kaupapa Māori. Chapter Five, therefore continues this discussion and presents narrative inquiry as a culturally appropriate method to address research questions derived from the Māori cultural field.
CHAPTER FIVE: WHAKAWHANAUNGATANGA - CULTURALLY SITUATED RESEARCH

Narrative inquiry addresses Māori concerns about research into their lives in an holistic, culturally appropriate manner because storytelling allows the research participants to select, recollect and reflect on stories within their own cultural context and language rather than in the cultural context and language chosen by the researcher (Bishop, 1996: 24).

This statement by Bishop encapsulates the defining premise of my approach to narrative as an expression of practice. It reflects an important consideration of narrative in its capacity to represent the metaphysical expression of Māori ways of life, customs, practices and institutions which are central to Māori culture. Certainly, it resonates with the strong cultural preference Māori have for narrative forms of communicating knowledge (Bishop, 1996; Roberts et al., 2004). However, what is crucial in understanding narrative’s utility in Indigenous contexts is its capacity for engaging research in a specific cultural worldview and discursive practice. It is from within these worldviews and discourses that the research participants function, make sense of their lives and understand their experiences (Bishop & Glynn, 1999).

The purpose this chapter is to detail narrative inquiry as a culturally situated research strategy, exploring its connection with social relations and dialogue embedded as they are within the context of kaupapa Māori. I have constructed this chapter in five sections. I begin with a brief explanation of narrative inquiry as the research method. Section II examines narrative as a culturally situated research strategy and details the fieldwork as it was conducted over a two year period. How the narrative is represented and interpreted is presented in Section III, and in Section IV I discuss the implications of narrative inquiry in terms of issues of validity and the challenges of coherency. Finally, I conclude this chapter by highlighting the circularity and recursive nature of narrative.

16 Although each iwi has its own history, myths, proverbs, dialect, customs and practices, they share common cultural, genealogical tradition and knowledge, which was delivered through narrative mechanisms including waiata (song) kapa haka (dance), whakairo (carvings) and whāikōrero (tribal speeches) (Roberts et al., 2004; Royal, 1998; Salmond, 1997).
I. Research Orientation

Chapter Two and Three presented the theoretical framework embedded within an Indigenous Māori context that has occupied a central position in the empirical investigation for this thesis. A major emphasis in my search for an appropriate method was one that would provide an avenue for authentic engagement with kaupapa Māori, one that could articulate, with integrity, the historical narratives and symbolic meanings, based in social processes entwined around ritual, myth and cosmology of Māori society. It was narrative’s use of language and text, enabling us to make sense of individual experiences and social interaction that are central to human practice (Bruner, 1990; Flyvbjerg, 2001; Tsoukas & Cummings, 1997), that appealed to the pragmatic orientation of kaupapa Māori and practice.

At a pragmatic level, language—the words used and meanings associated—is an integral part of social practice intrinsically linked to a group’s way of life. Thus, a fundamental aspect of this study is the dialogue with individuals and community from within the Māori cultural field that reflects an on-going social dialogue and practice of the field (Flyvbjerg, 2001). Events and exchanges are given meaning and significance according to the part they play in our experiences (Bryant & Lasky, 2007). This research demonstrates the utility of a method that creates a multi-voiced narrative as a way of gaining insight into the role of cultural values in Māori business practice. In this section, I present narrative as a research strategy that I utilise to convey the ‘local capacity for accruing stories’ of experience (Bishop, 2008; Bruner, 1991), particularly practice grounded in kaupapa Māori.

A. Narrative Inquiry

Narrative meaning functions to give form to the understanding of a purpose to life and to join everyday actions and events into episodic units. It provides a framework for understanding the past events of one’s life and for planning future actions. It is the primary scheme by means of which human existence is rendered meaningful (Polkinghorne, 1988: 11).

As Polkinghorne suggests, narrative is focused squarely on the study of human behaviour, requiring a temporal and contextual exploration of the meaning systems that form human experience. At it’s basest level narrative inquiry is an interdisciplinary method that is capable
of taking into consideration the complexities and diversity of social life (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Genette (1980 cited in Tsoukas and Hatch, 2001) argues that narrative can refer to three separate things: the written or spoken narrative statement, the events and their relationships that are the subject of the narrative, or the act of narrating.

The use of narratives has grown in recent years reflecting the blurring of genres in the social sciences (Cunliffe, Luhman, & Boje, 2004). As a domain of research, narrative draws from many fields, such as literary criticism, linguistics, psychology, gender studies, education, anthropology, law and history (Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zilber, 1998; Rhodes & Brown, 2005). The utility of narrative as a research method can be viewed in an organisational context as a mode of communication and way of knowing and interpreting the world (Cunliffe, Luhman, & Boje, 2004). Indeed, narrative technique is increasingly employed as a “way of discussing diverse levels of meaning”(Grubbs, 2001: 378) in organisational research.

Czarniawska-Joerges (1995) defined three narrative approaches in organisational contexts: narrating organisations, collecting stories, and organising as narration. The narration of organisations reflects research that is written like a story and where chronology is a main organising device. As a consequence there are a variety of terms associated with narrative, which are also gaining greater cadence in organisational research. For example, Grubbs (2001) used a literary form of allegory as a narrative device to examine the symbolic aspects of change across an alliance of public sector organisations. Boje (1991) makes use of storytelling wherein organisations are viewed as collective storytelling systems in which the performance of stories is a key part of members’ sense making.

Each of these perspectives of narrative has been relevant to my work. From an organisation studies viewpoint, epistemologically speaking at least, narrative sits in a subjectivist domain, meaning the researcher is essentially a co-creator with participants of the research outcomes. A compelling stance, which locates research as a continuous collaborative act, where research outcomes are ideographic representations of the lived experiences of the participants (Bryant & Lasky, 2007). However, I subscribe to the perspective offered by Cunliffe et al. (2004) who suggests that although ‘story’ and ‘narrative’ are often used interchangeably in narrative research, they are not the same. Narratives do not necessarily require the characters or a
beginning-to-end plotline. Thus, I position narratives as being constituted by stories, metaphor, allegory, and other forms of narrative devices.

In the end, I do not deliver a narrative in the traditional sense of Czarniawska-Joerges because I am not creating an organisational case study, nor am I telling a story of organising as narration. My interest in narrative for this thesis is based upon the requirements of an Indigenous paradigm to situate the research process within the field of culturally constituted knowledge. It is narratives’ preoccupation with the way we organise our experience and memory (Bruner, 1990) which resonates with the pragmatic orientation of kaupapa Māori, and in particular the weaving together of the three threads of narrative offered in this thesis (discussed in section II of this chapter).

More specifically, I suggest it is the different analytical stance offered by the third thread of narrative in this thesis. Whakawhanaungatanga, which provides the contextualised narrative of business practice situated by the experiences and practice of the research whānau illustrates movement towards a more dynamic utility of narrative using kaupapa Māori as the culturally appropriate lens. Narrative inquiry therefore is a culturally situated research strategy capable of capturing the complex detail of Māori tradition and practice. It then follows that we have specific domains of human knowledge and skill supported and organised by ‘cultural tool kits’ that are in the main organised narratively to represent the rich and messy domain of human experience and interaction (Bruner, 1991; Swidler, 1986).

B. Locating the Narrative

Bishop explains that traditionally “Māori as an oral culture devised methods to pass on the multiplicity of knowledge that any culture gathers and constructs about itself. Story was one of the common ways of imparting knowledge” (1996: 25). I have chosen narrative inquiry as the research strategy for this thesis given this mode of inquiry is described as a way of understanding experience as “stories lived and told” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000: 20). It would be too simple and indeed a misdirection to conclude that narrative is the most appropriate strategy given the history of Māori oratory. To do so would ignore that Māori no
longer live in an exclusively oral culture, where metaphor and story are central to knowledge creation and cultural transmission. However, it has to be recognised that Māori culture has also evolved and adapted to external influences and Māori today, whilst sharing an affinity with storytelling also engage with written text. As I use it, narrative as a research strategy in an Indigenous paradigm necessarily encompasses the use of language, verbally and textually.

The utility of narrative as a research method didn’t occur to me until I began the fieldwork phase of this research. The initial intention of my research approach was to create a configuration of ‘case studies’ around the concept of Māori business (how it is defined and discussed), Māori business development, and ideas of social, cultural and economic capital. To that end I developed a ‘discussion framework’ (Appendix C) and consent form (Appendix D) in accordance with the University of Otago Ethics approval process. At this point I proceeded with the intention to conduct unstructured interviews, directed by a series of discussion points. However, it was during my initial forays into the field that I recognised that to represent the richness and diversity of detail I needed to avoid the laissez-faire of non-directive interview and the interventionism of a questionnaire (Bourdieu, 1999; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

Chapters Two and Three have outlined the challenges posed by traditional research methods into Indigenous contexts. The consequences of having researcher constructions of knowledge, language and practice imposed onto Indigenous peoples through research has been vigorously debated (see Ibarra-Colado, 2006; Iseke-Barnes, 2003; Kovach, 2005; Smith, 1999a). Indeed, kaupapa Māori research is identified as a culturally constituted approach challenging and critiquing inappropriate ideologies of superiority, power relations and social practices that disadvantage Māori (Walker, Eketone, & Gibb, 2006). It is here where epistemic reflexivity offers a mechanism to counter power’s constitutive effects on the narrative process and construction. Epistemic reflexivity sanctions the investigation and problematisation of the taken for granted social constructions of reality located in the varying practices, interests and motives which constitute different communities’ sense making (Johnson & Duberley, 2003).

I had by virtue of being ‘me’, imposed my own construction of the field onto the research. However, it is not something I could avoid. As, Jacques recognised, “we write from a specific
collection of social identities, which condition one’s ability to interpret social experience” (1992: 595). This inevitably led to a critical, ongoing and dynamic negotiation in terms of my sense of Self in relation to this research, which I discuss in Section II of this chapter. Here, however, I reiterate the process of narrative as those efforts associated with sense making that are socially constructed, bound by the language of a given community and open to new forms of interpretation and new ideals. I re-focused or more precisely, I stepped back and allowed a participatory research approach that encouraged dialogic discourse to emerge (Deetz, 1996), not only in the constitution of the field itself, but also in what is deemed as relevant by those actors who engage within the field (Bishop, 1996; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Deetz, 2000; Flyvbjerg, 2001).

The difference of my approach to a non-directive interviewing or questionnaire lies in the epistemological standing of narrative inquiry. Bruner (1990) argues that stories are especially viable instruments for negotiating meaning, based upon an ontological understanding of multilayered perspectives of reality and the primacy of ‘agentic’ attributes of social acts (Bryant & Lasky, 2007). In this sense the construction of the research account acknowledges what Clandinin and Connelly (2000) suggest: the narratives of participant and researcher become, in part, a shared narrative construction and reconstruction through inquiry. Section II identifies and discusses the research strategy of this thesis, grounding the joint construction of meaning and collaborative narrative within the culturally situated context of kaupapa Māori.

II. Culturally Situated Research

A central tenet of this research is that the social, political, historical, intellectual and cultural legitimacy of Māori knowledge is acknowledged and taken into account (Bishop, 1996). This requires guidelines for research that provide respect for and protection of the rights, interests and sensitivities of the people being studied (Smith, 1999a; Te Awekotuku, 1991). The narrative process allows the field to be culturally situated to enable the stories to be provided by the research participants (Bishop, 1996). Russell Bishop explains the notion of whakawhanaungatanga as a culturally constituted metaphor for conducting research within an Indigenous Māori context:
Whānau means extended family. Whanaunga are relatives/relations, those members of your whānau with whom who have an inextricable, bodily link. *Whakapapa* is the mechanism used by Māori people to establish familial relationships, with whom one has these inescapable, bodily links. *Whanaungatanga* literally means relationship by whakapapa, that is blood-linked relationships (the suffix ‘tanga’ has a naming function). *Whakawhanaungatanga* is the process of establishing relationships, literally by means of identifying, through culturally appropriate means, your bodily linkage, your engagement, your connectedness and therefore (unspoken) commitment to other people (italics in original) (Bishop, 1996: 215).

This is not to imply that approaches to Indigenous research should be based on the idea of exclusivity, rather that the research process would be conducted in a culturally appropriate way to qualify as an Indigenous methodology. This section outlines the three interconnected elements to this concept which I argue is congruent with the key features of an Indigenous paradigm which draws from the orientation and philosophical cohabitation of both kaupapa Māori and a pragmatic epistemology: Establishing whānau relationships; creating a participant driven research orientation; and, inclusion of the researcher’s involvement as lived experience.

A. The Research Whānau

Importantly I did not consider it my role to determine the parameters of the cultural field for this research. The strategy I engaged with when approaching the ‘field’ was akin to the process of snowball sampling (Berg, 2001) and theoretical sampling (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). This was primarily because the research population in this project was not immediately identifiable due to the questions around how individuals identified as Māori. These modes of sampling aim to build on the connections of a specified group of respondents and create an interconnected research network. However, what became increasingly evident was that I felt levels of responsibility beyond creating a ‘network’.

The configuration of the research network and my role in it was grounded by my whakapapa as much as by my academic knowledge, if not more. Whakapapa is a genealogical connection or a mental construct that layers human descent lines and relationships (Roberts et al., 2004). The notion of whakawhanaungatanga captures the connection and collaborative engagement of a research whānau, rendered here as myself as the researcher and the participants, both individually and the community of hui, or gathering (Ryan, 1997). Therefore, the concept of
research network was grounded by the collectivity of the research whānau and the mechanisms or ‘rules of the game’ that determined practice (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

The research whānau provides a culturally distinctive way of understanding the research relationship and one which certainly resonates with Bourdieu’s concept of epistemic reflexivity and the way researchers position themselves in the field (Bourdieu, 1977; Bourdieu, 1999; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). I view the conception of the research whānau for this research as particularly important given the fundamental tensions associated with power relations in the research process. Epistemic reflexivity provides an avenue for us to include the reflexivity of the research whānau as it uncovers “the social at the heart of the individual, the impersonal beneath the intimate, the universal buried deep within the most particular” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992: 44).

Early on in the research I was fortunate in obtaining the guidance of a kaumātua, a person who I define here as a respected elder and ‘keeper of knowledge’ (Barlow, 1994), with, in Bourdieuan terms, significant social and cultural capital. My kaumātua shared whakapapa to my iwi and he became one of my supervisors. Our relationship was not one that merely captured a sense of guidance or supervision, it was through him that I was able to approach many of the participants for the research whānau and attend hui. He understood the importance and significance of sharing knowledge in a way that was beyond the parameters of this thesis topic, often, ‘getting his point across’ by sharing a story about his experiences, and encouraging me to do the same.

I believe this enabled me to step back and ‘let things happen’ in a way that made sense to the research whānau, as opposed to trying to conform to a pre-constructed mode of inquiry. Even something as simple as conduct during the research discussion is dictated by the rules of social and cultural practice embedded within kaupapa Māori. The excerpt below illustrates how the principle of manaakitanga, noted here as the nurturing of relationships, informed the research protocol. It is a part of a discussion between Bob and myself that captures the difference of expectations regarding the researcher and participant relationship in the research process.
Diane

… like research. If I went to do normal interviews, I would normally buy lunch or coffee. But with Māori when I’m in their space, I have to accept their hospitality and accept it graciously. Western methods would say that I would have to be very separated and objective from that and it took me a while to get used to it.

Bob

You would be taking away my responsibility and taking something from my core.

Bob has an extensive background working in the public sector and in particular with iwi and hapū activities. As discussed in Chapter Three, the notion of whānau, which refers to family but particularly includes the idea of extended family, is a key tenet of kaupapa Māori research. It is central to the practice of establishing relationships, and connectedness between Māori.

Kaupapa Maori, therefore situates the relationship as the guiding philosophy of this research, which in this instance nurtured the relationship through the expression of hospitality, generosity and mutual respect. The research whānau embodies the process of whakawhanaungatanga by using the social and cultural processes that are embedded within whānau relations and using them in the research context to describe the relationship between the researcher and the researched community (Bishop, 1996). This is not to suggest that every time we conduct research in Indigenous contexts, we expect to be wined and dined. What it does suggest is that for Māori, once the relational perspective that defines whānau is established there are specific norms and values that guide practice.

Who, When, Where

It was through the three years of my active engagement, of a continuous cycle of negotiation and interaction within the field, that the emergent narratives became clear. This thesis is the
product of multiple strands of narrative, the collection of stories, metaphors and experiences of myself and those individuals and collectivities that constitute the research whānau. The narrative emerged from the interactions between agents operating within the Māori business field.

I conducted taped discussions with twenty-two individual participants (Appendix E), who had engaged in the practical operation of the field of Māori business. These discussions ranged from one to several hours. All discussions were conducted between December 2004 and June 2006. Of these participants ten were business owner operators, five worked in Māori oriented corporations or government agencies, two for private sector corporations and five were in government mainstream agencies. The table below (Table 3) identifies the industry sectors for each participant.

Table 3 - Industry Sector of Individual Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Sector</th>
<th>Participants (as per Appendix E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Sector – Tourism (4)</td>
<td>Delia, George, Karla, Witikanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Sector – Māori business development (3)</td>
<td>Brandi, Martin, Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial &amp; accounting (3)</td>
<td>Jenny, Patrick, Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwi Corporation (4)</td>
<td>Bob, Janice, Tracey, Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative, communication, business consultant, retail, tourism (8)</td>
<td>Carly, Emma, Julie, Mikaere, Nancy, Russell, Rueben, Jacob</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I also draw from the public discourse that emerged from four hui on Māori economic development I participated in between 2005 and 2006 (Appendix F). Finally, I draw from several focus groups and interviews with Māori business owners and representatives from various mainstream business organisations, such as the Otago Chamber of Commerce and Employers Association. This research was conducted as part of a project entitled “Building Business Partnerships: Closer Collaboration between Māori and General Business
Communities”, which was part of a collaborative effort between the Hui Taumata Taskforce and Business New Zealand and was undertaken in over the months March to July 2006.

It is here where the ‘doing of research’ in a traditional sense loses efficacy and where narrative inquiry as a research strategy gains credence. The process of engaging with the research whānau did not follow the clear cut approach where the aim is to “speculate, discover, and document, as well as provisionally order, explain, and predict, (presumably) observable social processes and structures that characterise behaviour in and of organisations” (Van Maanen, Sorensen, & Mitchell, 2007: 1145). Practical knowledge, guided by a pragmatist epistemology and epistemic reflexivity, locates theory and method as being highly inter-related in practice. The ‘doing of research’ is simultaneously empirical, as it confronts the world of observable phenomena, and theoretical, as it necessarily engages hypotheses about the underlying structure of relations that observations are designed to capture (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

By allowing this reflexive ‘space’ during the fieldwork stage I encountered the fusion of theoretical construction and practical research so seriously advocated for by Bourdieu and others (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Flyvbjerg, 2001; Lather, 1986; Van Maanen, Sorensen, & Mitchell, 2007). The more links and the more varied the links between the two, the more promising the research. One function of research then is to generate the kind of data that can be used in the theorising process itself, thus allowing a study to progress as a cognitive or sense-making venture that unfolds over time (Van Maanen, Sorensen, & Mitchell, 2007). The result is a research relationship based on a sense of shared meaning of co-constructed narrative. The remainder of this chapter outlines the practicalities of this research process in terms of how I went about gathering, analysing and representing the narratives.

B. Participant driven research

Narrative inquiries do not – indeed, cannot – start from explicit theoretical assumptions. Instead, they begin with an interest in a particular phenomenon that is best understood narratively. Narrative inquiries then develop descriptions and interpretations of the phenomenon from the perspective of participants, researchers, and others (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 137).
The concept of whakawhanaungatanga allows for the co-joint construction of meaning and the facilitated creation of collaborative stories predicated on mutual respect and commitment to the outcomes of the research. Indeed, narrative supports collaborative engagement within common fields of practice (Robichaud, Giroux, & Taylor, 2004). This approach reorders the relationship between the researcher and participants from one which focuses on the Self and on the researched Other, to one of collaborative research participants sharing common worldviews (Bishop, 1996). Bringing to the fore a focus on co-operative forms of research, conducted “with people not on people” (Reason, 1999: 208). Bishop (1996) describes this as a process based on the establishment of interconnectedness, commitment and engagement within culturally situated research practices.

The data collection process of this thesis has involved an endless to and fro movement that was “arduous and lengthy” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992: 108). Bishop (1996) argues that in the context of Indigenous research, drawing from kaupapa Māori, the research process does not involve distinct stages of gaining access, data gathering, data processing and theorising. Rather, an image of a koru, spiral, is suggested as one that describes the process of continually revisiting and guiding the research processes that occur. Key features of this participatory approach are its account of experiential knowing and the co-involvement of research stakeholders in process (Heron & Reason, 1997).

The Gathering of Narratives

Narrative Inquirers do not claim to document reality, but to capture individual interpretations of reality as well as shared social constructions among a given community (Dodge, Ospina, & Foldy, 2005: 289).

As Dodge et al (2005) suggest, in the first instance a narrative approach is capable of reflecting a non-homogenous view of reality, acknowledging that we are dealing with individual agents (including my own) interpretation of the social world. Secondly, narratives are useful for revealing shared social constructions among a given community. Narrative inquiry locates research into Māori contexts in a holistic, culturally appropriate manner “because storytelling allows the research participants to select, recollect and reflect on stories within their own cultural context and language rather than in the cultural context and
language chosen by the researcher” (Bishop, 1996: 24). Here, I outline the steps I took to gather the narratives in relation to the sets of stories, allegories, experiences and practices shared by the research whānau.

Narrative stories imitate life and present an inner reality to the outside world; at the same time, however, they shape and construct the narrator’s personality and reality. “The story is one’s identity, a story created, told, revised, and retold throughout life. We know or discover ourselves, and reveal ourselves to others, by the stories we tell” (Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zilber, 1998: 7). The connectedness between myself and the participants brought with it a significant sense of obligation and responsibility to and even authority within the Māori cultural field. When I first started engaging with Māori cultural literature during the latter part of 2002, I came across the following description of a form of Māori exchange by Marcel Mauss:

Speaking of the hau, the spirit of things and particularly of the forest and forest game. Tamati Ranaipiri, one of Mr. Elsdon Best’s most useful informants, gives you quite by chance the key to the whole problem. ‘I shall tell you about hau. Hau is not the wind. Not at all. Suppose you have some particular object, taonga, and you give it to me; you give it to me without a price. We do not bargain over it. Now I give this thing to a third person who after a time decides to give me something in repayment for it (utu), and he makes me a present of something (taonga). Now this taonga I received from him is the spirit (hau) of the taonga I received from you and which I passed on to him. The taonga, which I receive on account of the taonga that came from you, I must return to you. It would not be right on my part to keep these taonga whether they were desirable or not. I must give them to you since they are hau of the taonga, which you gave me. If I were to keep this second taonga for myself I might become ill or even die. Such is hau, the hau of personal property, the hau of the taonga, the hau of the forest. Enough on that subject’ (Mauss, 1970: 9).

I didn’t understand it. I knew Mauss was describing the value system that governed the nature of the gift, in a gift economy, where in essence, hau must be returned to the original gift giver in some form, to provide the balance of life (Mauss, 1970). I knew what the words in themselves meant, but the meaning of the story as a whole was lost on me. It wasn’t until two years later when finalising my participant’s contributions to the narrative that I reflected more deeply. Re-reading this story I now see how the practice of utu, or balanced exchange, and the idea of the hau offers culturally situated insight to the role of narrative inquiry, which provides a basis for what Salmond describes as reciprocal exchange - wānanga atu, wānanga mai, whakawhitihiti whakaaro (your wisdom for mine, as we cross our thoughts together) (Salmond, 1997).
It became apparent very quickly that a process of narrative inquiry far surpasses the notion of interview. Primarily this is because it provides opportunity for those actors within the field to share their lived experiences and discursive practice (sharing their hau) in a way that acknowledges their history and knowledges that are embedded within an Indigenous Māori worldview (Bishop, 1996; Smith, 1999a). Thus taking into account, and holding as valuable the interaction, the co-creation that occurs (Tripp, 1983). This is indicative of an agonistic community’s attention to difference and vigorous discussion between declared opposed interests. Consensus is not reached at the expense of plural or minority interests, but looks for a commonality constructed out of debate and disagreement, based on the right of presence of diverse interests (Sen, 2006).

Key features of this participatory approach are its account of experiential knowing and the co-involvement of research stakeholders in process (Heron & Reason, 1997). A participatory approach avoids the mutually exclusive relationship between researcher and researched and requires a certain level of social proximity and familiarity, thus avoiding participant objectivation (Bourdieu, 1999). I allowed each individual to share whatever they wanted to tell me in regards to Māori business practice. I did ask some questions, but more in response to points the participants raised, which urged the narrator to say more about particular aspects of the event and exchanges that took place (Riessman, 1993) and allowed for meanings to be expanded upon. It was through this cycle of talking and listening that the narrative became a product of multiple voices.

C. Reflexivity - My ‘lived’ involvement

A reflexive approach positions an intellectual and theoretical framework as the basis for the research topic and it must be a collective enterprise (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). This alludes to a major point in the process of narrative, and one central to the role of epistemic reflexivity: the role of the researcher’s habitus (Johnson & Duberley, 2003). Indeed it would seem that epistemic reflexivity must relate to how a researcher’s own social location affects the forms and outcomes of research as well as entailing acceptance of the conviction that there will always be more than one valid account of any research (Johnson & Duberley, 2003). Thus, I subscribe to the notion of plurivocality advocated by Grant, Hardy, Oswick
and Putnam (2004) which they argue accesses an epistemology that acknowledges the limitations of ‘what I think I know’, and provides space for different approaches and readings of organisational phenomena.

Simply telling my story is not adequate either as it ignores the impact that the stories of the research participants has on my stories. Therefore, I acknowledge the participatory connectedness amongst the research whānau and its role in promoting “a means of knowing in a way that denies distance and separation and promotes commitment and engagement” (Bishop, 1996: 23). Supporting the perspective that through reflection, sense-making is informed by my own and others’ ideas, illuminating what has been experienced (Reynolds, 1998).

Researcher position in the field is connected to who they are (Bourdieu, 1991b; Jacques, 1992). I came to the field as a novice, in terms of my lack of knowledge and previous engagement with the Māori cultural field; but also as an Indigenous researcher whose whakapapa, in terms of my genealogical connection, positions me within the field. In research involving whānau, researchers are not free to assume any position they think appropriate. Positions are generated by the structure of the whānau and the ‘control mechanisms’ constituted within the whānau (Bishop, 1996). So, rather than positioning myself as the genial narrator, as an Indigenous Māori researcher, my whakapapa and sets of experiences situates me as both observer and participant in the research whānau. I am a member of the community from which the narrative, its meanings and utility stem from.

That this awareness emerged at the same time as my journey of self discovery as an Indigenous Māori individual is no accident. My increased awareness as I engaged with, learned from, and shared with members of the Māori business community supports the pragmatic contention of knowledge as experience (Bourdieu, 1991b; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Flyvbjerg, 2001). Certainly, it was a catalyst for my shift of focus onto an Indigenous paradigm as I recognised the distinct epistemological and ontological assumptions guiding Indigenous research needed a research strategy that not only facilitated culturally situated outcomes, but also made sense to the Māori community.
My involvement as researcher meant that I had to engage with Māori understandings as to what constituted knowledge and processes associated with knowledge construction. Indeed, a crucial aspect of the research process for this project is the tensions associated with an Indigenous researcher, still undertaking her own personal journey of cultural rediscovery, investigating a topic based in an Indigenous context from a background dominated by a Western-centric education system. As a researcher my “personal biography” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003: 29) has influenced my approach to the theory, method, analysis, ontology, epistemology and methodology. It illustrates how the practice of narrative shifted my role as that of omniscient narrator and summariser to that of a kind of facilitator. I have represented this third form of reflexivity as synthesis because it goes beyond the methodological in that the researcher is not seen as an autonomous, objective, assessor (Johnson & Duberley, 2003).

III. Crafting the Narrative

The narrative approach provides a forum for Indigenous peoples to construct their own ‘interpretive repertoires’ (Wetherell & Potter, 1993) which incorporate historically evolved discourses within their own frame of reference, logics and language, as opposed to that of the researcher or their associated field of inquiry. Given the context of this research an important consideration is the narrative’s capacity to represent the metaphysical expression of Māori ways of life, customs, practices and institutions which are central to Māori culture.

The process of crafting two years worth of dialogue and textual documentation into narrative composition was difficult. I was in a constant state of flux, negotiating the challenge between representing the story as told by the community and writing a doctoral thesis, which typically follows a linear progression through facts, figures, findings, heading and sub-headings to focus the audience’s attention. Ultimately, however, I came to a point in crafting the narrative where my central concern was not so much how the text was constructed. Rather it became how the story unfolds reflecting the ‘construction of reality’ (Bruner, 1991) that constitutes the experiences of the research whānau. This section explains how the narratives were constructed, analysed and interpreted for this thesis to ensure that the framework meets the criteria of analysis for practical knowledge.
A. Making Private Words Public

The process of composing narrative, from the sharing of multiple stories, experiences and opinions from the research whānau to actually writing up the story was difficult. Particularly so given narrative requirements for maintaining the authenticity of the experience being shared. Difficulty occurs due to the translation or interpretation that occurs through even the “most literal form of redaction (the simplest punctuation, the placing of a comma, for example, can determine the whole sense of a phrase)” (Bourdieu, 1999: 621). These are significant issues associated with this form of research strategy, which I address in Section IV. Here my aim is to describe the process of writing, specifically, how I aimed to maintain the integrity of kaupapa Māori in terms of the stories and experiences being shared in the co-joint construction of the narrative.

The Narrativising Process

What I would consider to be primary information was my handwritten notes, a verbatim transcript and the tape recording of each individual discussion. Information that I would categorise as secondary were my notes and documentation from the various hui I attended. Composition requires familiarity with the material with which one is working and my primary techniques were reading and listening. The interaction between participants and researcher influences the data. This influence is hard to detect in a first reading. As such, further meticulous work of sensitive reading or listening is required for gaining understanding pertinent to the research questions (Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zilber, 1998). I regard the reading and listening I am referring to as dialogic, recognising that narrative is dialectical by its very nature, which fulfils the participatory and experiential aspect of pragmatism.

My aim, through this process of reading and re-reading, listening and re-listening, was to portray the story beyond the words. Narrative material requires dialogic listening to three voices: the voice of the narrator as represented on the tape or in the text; theoretical framework, which provides the concepts and tools for interpretation; and a reflexive monitoring of the act of reading and interpretation (Bakhtin, 1981 cited in Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zilber, 1998). Therefore, my representation of narrative offered the three
strands of prose aimed at capturing the dynamic interaction and constant negotiation of the narrative and its meaning, between the researcher and the research group, and the field within which we are embedded.

The first strand of narrative is episodes of reflexivity wherein ‘I’ present ‘my’ own experiences and interpretations, which are written into the text. The interactive discussion between ‘us’, which incorporates conversational dialog between myself and one other individual participant provides the thesis with the second strand of narrative. In these instances I’ve noted the exchange as a verbatim narrative excerpt. This process took a great deal of time. For each participant I constructed a story about their experience in the field of Māori business. Each narrative was constructed as a self-contained whole to ensure the participants could affirm and add further commentary or change the narrative to reflect their thoughts more clearly, an opportunity many of them participated in.

I did find that there was some similarity to the narratives, but these similar strands emerged of their own volition, which I then composed into the third whakawhanuanganatanga narrative. I view it as the contextualised narrative of Māori business practice situated by the experiences and practice of the research whānau, representing reflecting the collaborative sense of researcher and participants being together in the midst of the narrative. The emphasis is on the narrative as a mechanism to draw out the contextual and power dimensions central to the construction process as opposed to the development of a large-scale theoretical system.

Several times, I found myself drifting back into the scientific mode of representing ‘truth’ as I saw it, only to find that as I read over the constructed narrative and re-listened to the tapes, it didn’t ‘feel’ right. As Flyvberg (2001) argues, a practical approach to the social sciences requires a focus on context, the ability to get close to the people under study, and a focus on the minutiae and practice that make up the basic components of life. Narrative, he argues, allows researchers to counter the inherent problems associated with the study of human activity where “every attempt at a context-free-definition of an action, that is, a definition based on abstract rules or laws, will not necessarily accord with the pragmatic way an action is defined by the actors in a concrete social situation” (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 42). As discussed in
Chapter Four the narrative form and its associated interpretive rationality is the best medium for thinking practically, placing emphasis on intuition and experience.

Bruner (1991) refers to the notion of hermeneutic composability, wherein the best hope of analysis is to provide an intuitively convincing account. As I began to compose the narratives, it soon became apparent that the way the stories were presented in and of themselves created the diversity and richness of narrative. Trying to ‘force’ a specific format or framework onto the narrative of each member or community group of the research whānau simply didn’t work. Each person told their own stories, and stories within stories. To impose a specific format and maintain consistency I would lose the essence of their narrative. For example, *Martin* drew from his own experiences to explain his conception of practice in the field:

For example, a café, like the Tuna café. You go there and everyone knows it’s Māori. Why? The people behind the counter they say kia ora. They get into you, you know, ‘Geez five minutes late’ or it’s just in the way the talk to you and include you. You go to another café and everything might be perfect with the food service and location but it’s different. They have a worldview and their illustration of their worldview might not be necessarily written down in nice little words and a mission statement or anything like that. This is the way they do things. Everybody knows, you’ve got to go to the Tuna café man! Oh what’s on the menu? It’s not about the menu. It’s about the people. Māori worldview is important as it is reflected in ‘how you do your stuff’

I could have easily represented that story with a succinct statement such as the field is represented by its people. I could have supported that statement with little quotations “It’s about the people. Māori worldview is important”. But what we miss in that approach is a story reflecting humour, a sense of belonging and kinship amongst the people who work in the Tuna café and their customers. We also miss that it is predominantly the Māori customers who ‘get’ the meanings of the ‘hassles’. We also don’t get to attach the story to the personal experience of *Martin*, based on his extensive travels and understanding of different peoples around the world. *Martin* reflected on the fact that other cafes may offer similar products, but
what is important is the Māori worldview and all that it encompasses informs the practice of the Tuna café staff. To have forced this experience into a categorisation might have have captured the sets of relations between the people involved in the story, but missed the significance of those relationships.

B. Interpretation of the Narrative

Narrative inquirers do not seek to produce a grand narrative. Rather the aim is to represent as authentically as possible the story told in dialogue with multiple voices, from multiple contexts. Narrative is interpretive and narrative materials can be read, understood, and analysed in extremely diverse ways. A narrative inquiry approach recognises that efforts and processes associated with sense making are socially constructed, bound by the language of a given community and open to new forms of interpretation and new ideals (Bruner, 1991; Bryant & Lasky, 2007).

In analysis my aim was for interpretation to be as true to the experience as possible. While traditional methods rely on systematic inferential processes, usually based on statistics, narrative work requires self-awareness (reflexivity) and self-discipline in the on-going examination of text against interpretation and vice-versa (Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zilber, 1998). Therefore, as a research strategy it can be painstakingly slow, requiring attention to subtlety, nuances of language and contexts, and social discourses that shape what is said and what cannot be spoken (Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zilber, 1998). In this research the narrative is idiosyncratic, culturally specific to the degree of cultural consciousness of the participants and non-generalisable beyond the context of the whānau (Bishop & Glynn, 1999).

Features of Narrative Analysis

A key feature of narrative analysis is to maintain the integrity of interpretation of the plot (Ricoeur, 1980), or ‘intentional stance’ which reflects why the story is told, how and when it is by the participants (Bruner, 1991). I view the process of narrative interpretation as not
merely being just the word, or the sentence uttered. Narrative analysis offers an open-ended, contingent relationship between contexts, practice and interpretation. It is this that reminds us to read the story, as opposed to the words, to capture the experiences being shared in the narrative. It is the story being told, the meaning being conveyed by the individual participants and research whānau that is of primary concern in interpretation. What was shared, the stories told are not inert and one-dimensional constructs to be written down and codified as analytical constructs.

Rather, the approach I took when organising the narratives resonates somewhat with an existential approach to textual organising in which the objective is to avoid capturing “human experience in deadening abstract concepts, and logical systems that flatten rather than deepen our understanding human life” (van Manen, 1997: 17). As Griffin (1993) states narratives capture a coherent relational whole that gives meaning to and explains each of its elements and is, at the same time, constituted by them. This supports the notion that human activity is not reducible to a set of hard and fast rules (Bourdieu, 1977; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Flyvbjerg, 2001), that can be identified as a template for research involving human behaviour.

In this thesis, the social, cultural and temporal space within which the narrative occurred is informed by kaupapa Māori. Using Geertz’s notion of metaphorical parade, Clandinin and Connelly (2000) emphasise the importance of understanding our position in the parade and the knowledge of how our position shifts as the parade moves temporally. This resonates with Bruner’s (1991) notion of narrative as being diachronistic, which he describes as representing the narrative as a ‘mental model’ which presents patterns of events over time. This perspective is embodied in the characteristics that are distinctive to the Indigenous paradigm outlined in this thesis and in which I situate the framework of analysis (Chapter Four).

Narrative engages with the complexity of human experience and the multiplicity of reflected interpretations where none is privileged beyond the sense in which it can be contextually verifiable (Bishop, 1996; Flyvbjerg, 2001). The art of connecting practice to context is through interpretation. One way I maintained that was to ground each narrative in the context of kaupapa Māori embodied in the community of the research whānau. During each
discussion, I begin with an introduction and explanation of the ‘theme’ or what I now describe as the plot of the narrative. I then let them speak about their own experiences in the field of Māori business. An important element of this process was the opportunity for mihi, noted here as a form of introduction and a way to establish connections between ourselves and our whānau, to establish the connection between myself and the participant. It would be simplistic to note this as a trust gaining exercise; rather I see it as whanaunatanga, being strongly connected to collective responsibility captured by the ethic of belonging and traditional way of thinking about relationships (Bishop, 1996).

An experience early on in the research process taught me an invaluable lesson. One participant stated that they could only provide me with about forty-five minutes of time and then proceeded to share whakapapa and make small talk for the first forty minutes. Based on my previous research experience of structured case study interviewing I was becoming increasingly concerned with the fact we did not seem to engage at all with my research topic. After an hour, when I thought I’d have to pack up and leave, we had a broad discussion around the topic area, but importantly directed by the participant. The discussion continued over a meal and was enriched by other whānau members. In hindsight those first forty minutes were in fact the most important. It was during this time where the participant and I shared our whakapapa, and she could then be assured of my intentions with the knowledge and experiences she was sharing with me. It is in this context that Bourdieu’s notion of social proximity and familiarity provide two conditions of ‘non-violent’ communication (Bourdieu, 1999). Bruner (1991) captures this perspective in terms of the interpretation of narrative approach acknowledging the background knowledge of both the narrator, research whānau, audience and how each interprets said background knowledge.

An Indigenous paradigm anchors this thesis in a specific research perspective in which the researcher negotiates the conversation between the subjective (internal mind) and objective (external domain) worlds. I recognise that the inherent relatedness of my role and process of Self-identity as researcher, as a co-producer of knowledge and agent of the field in question, is central to the developmental and diagnostic elements of this thesis. In constructing narrative it is of vital importance that we understand the role of the researcher who traditionally has taken the stories of the participants and reconstituted them (Bishop, 1996).
A consequence of human agency and imagination is the implication of what gets included and excluded in narrative, and what it is supposed to mean (Ricoeur, 1980; Riessman, 1993). I see my role as gradually allowing the narrative to unfold from the diverse, complex and sometimes conflicting stories that people, documents and other evidence told me (Flyvbjerg, 2001). This refers to what Flyvbjerg calls a ‘polyphony of voices’ which provides space for a diversity of opinions and representations to be heard as opposed to just one dominant version. The resultant narrative is a reflection of the stories told by the participants but the analysis proceeds from my interpretation and mode of representation and through a particular theoretical lens that is a product of my own creative process. Indeed, it was in the continual negotiation of experiences and reflections, by myself and the members of the research whānau that this method took more precise shape.

Unlike traditional research analysis, narrative is freed from having to be presented as a one dimensional reading (temporally and contextually) where everything is said to everyone. Indeed it is the fluidity of the narrative composition and interpretation which negates the search for an objective set of measures of validity and paves the way for a situation where multiple interpretations may be claimed. In terms of narrative, interpretation took place in the community. I have focused on the shared experiences of the researcher and research whānau combined with the historical and contextual similarities told from different viewpoints that have emerged from the overall threads of this research.

IV. Reflecting on Narrative Inquiry

All forms of representation of experience are limited portraits. Simply stated, we are interpreting and creating texts at every juncture, letting symbols stand for or take the place of the primary experience, to which we have no direct access. Meaning is ambiguous because it arises out of a process of interaction between people: self, teller, listener and recorder, analyst, and reader. Although the goal may be to tell the whole truth, our narratives about others’ narratives are our worldly creations … What might have seemed nowhere in the past is likely to be somewhere in the present or future. Meaning is fluid and contextual, not fixed and universal. All we have is talk and texts that represent reality partially, selectively, and imperfectly (Riessman, 1993: 15).

Within the field of organisation studies, engagement with narrative methods is identified as providing for a broader epistemological scope of organisational knowledge reaping substantial analytical benefits (Rhodes & Brown, 2005). Validation, the process through
which we make the claim for trustworthiness of our interpretations, is the critical issue. Trustworthiness and not truth is a key semantic difference: the latter assumes an objective reality, whereas the former moves the process into the social world (Riessman, 1993). This research is not a quest for scientific or absolute truth in human reality (Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zilber, 1998; Rhodes & Brown, 2005). Rather, it is to achieve as closely as possible real life situations and views directly in relation to phenomena as they unfold in practice (Flyvbjerg, 2001).

Bruner (1991) refers to the narrative whole as it refers to particular happenings achieved through embeddedness within some sense of genre, that is, the genre of the narrative as a representation of human activity. Simply put, what story is it we wish to share? Different parts of the interpretation create a complete and meaningful picture that makes sense and is plausible to the extent it is capable of convincing the audience and research community. Coherence can be evaluated both internally, in terms of how the parts fit together, and externally, namely against existing theories and previous research (Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zilber, 1998). However it also relates to the coherence between global (overall goals of the narrative), local (what the narrator is trying to effect in the narrative itself) and themal (content – themes being repeated and identified as important) (Riessman, 1993).

Narratives are a version of reality whose acceptability is governed by the conventions of the field from which it stems (Bruner, 1991). While I accept both the authority and responsibility for the representation and interpretation of narrative, I cannot claim free rein over retelling a narrative. It was not up to me, as the thesis writer, to hold onto the stories, because in the spirit of hau to keep them would be dangerous. Not only because it is illicit, but because it comes orally, physically, and spiritually from a person, therefore it retains a magical and religious hold over the recipient. The experiences and knowledge shared by the participants to this research are valuable taonga, connected to their their whakapapa and wairua or spiritual essence.

My obligation did not end with the signing of consent forms, interpretation and representation of the stories told. Therefore, in writing my primary consideration has to be the integrity of these narratives given the obligation to operate in a kaupapa Māori knowledge space, thus
context is of central concern. One way in which I maintain this is to ground each narrative in
the context of the value systems of kaupapa Māori which are embodied in the community of
the research whānau. A key point here is that narrative seeks meaning that is derived from
Indigenous participants immersed in their own cultural processes for negotiation of meaning.

The process through which we make the claim for trustworthiness of our interpretation is the
critical issue. I have aimed to achieve as closely as possible real life situations and views
directly in relation to phenomena as they unfold in practice (Flyvbjerg, 2001). Ultimately it is
the research whānau, the intended audience and community of researchers which renders it an
authoritative account (Deetz, 2000), and therefore narrative must also stand the test of
verisimilitude and veracity of the research. I draw from a process of consensual validation
(Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zilber, 1998), regarding the views, conclusions and sense
making in the eyes of a community of researchers and interested informed individuals.

A. Verisimilitude & Veracity

The function of the story is to find an intentional state that mitigates or at least makes comprehensible a
deviation from a canonical cultural pattern (Bruner, 1990: 50).

Prevailing concepts of verification and procedures for establishing validity rely on realist
assumptions and consequently are largely irrelevant to narrative studies (Riessman, 1993).
Narrative is not meant to be read as an exact record of a phenomenon in question, therefore
there can be no set of formal rules or standardised technical procedures in analysis
(Flyvbjerg, 2001; Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zilber, 1998; Riessman, 1993). Triangulation
through the communal sense of knowledge creation of the research whānau, direct
observation at hui and documentation achieves some degree of verification. However, we can
also determine narrative verisimilitude and veracity (Bruner, 1991), which are the platform
on which narrative inquirers seek to make the case of persuasiveness, correspondence and
coherence in judging authenticity. Verisimilitude is “a style of writing that draws the readers
so closely into subjects’ worlds that these can be palpably felt” (Adler & Adler, 1994: 381),
while veracity judges success by asking how well the research depicts what or whom it is
claiming to represent.
Adler and Adler (2008) support the concept of verisimilitude, specifically in classical ethnographic texts, arguing it gives them enhanced resonance, increasing their claims to validity and reliability. Atkinson (1990) also suggested that verisimilitude responds to the criteria of empirical plausibility and it is its correspondence to depictions advanced by other written accounts that heightens the audiences’ sense that the research is grounded in reality. In this thesis I highlight verisimilitude and veracity as providing a reasonable 'epistemic utility' for those who share a pragmatic (rather than an instrumentalist or empiricist) interpretation of knowledge.

V. The Never-ending Story

Narrative inquiry is a way of understanding experience. It is a collaboration between researcher and participants, over time, in a place or series of places, and in social interaction with milieus. An inquirer enters this matrix in the midst and progresses in this same spirit, concluding the inquiry still in the midst of living and telling, reliving and retelling, the stories of the experiences that make up people’s lives. Both individual and social (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000: 20).

This chapter has made explicit the intentions and procedural principles that were put into practice during the conduct of this research to ensure that the audience is able to reproduce in reading “the work of both construction and understanding that produced them” (Bourdieu, 1999: 607). Bishop (1996) asserts that narrative inquiry or collaborative stories as a method to researching Indigenous Māori communities provides for methodological rigor and cultural appropriateness. Bruner (1990) also places narrative as necessarily normative in that it provides for cultural legitimacy. In more recent work Bryant and Lasky (2007) explored narrative as serving to give cohesion to shared beliefs and to transmit values. In employing narrative inquiry as a research strategy guided by an Indigenous paradigm the issues of meaning, interpretation and representation are addressed in the socio-cultural context of the phenomena or field being researched.

A written document appears to stand still; the narrative appears finished. Although many scholars emphasise the beginning, middle and end to a narrative, this thesis reflects research, not as a linear flow to design, but rather requiring a more fluid composition. The narrative like life is “a continual unfolding in which the narrative insights of today are the chronological events of tomorrow ... narrative inquirers know in advance that the task of
conveying a sense that the narrative is unfinished and that stories will be told and lives relived in new ways” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000: 166). Therefore, I have deliberately emphasised a ‘circularity’ of the research process that reflects the continuity of Bishop’s (1996) koru, spiral regarding knowledge. This is in contrast to common conceptualisations of time as being chronological (linear though time) sequence, consequential sequencing (one event preceded another, although links may not be chronological) or episodic (stitched together by theme) (Riessman, 1993).

Importantly, narrative contains specific experiences based on actors and events, from their past, their current experiences (Flyvbjerg, 2001) and I would also include, based on my fieldwork experience, future expectations. Therefore, the conduct of this research involved a continuous cycle of data gathering, analysis, and interpretation, wherein each stage was informed by what was already known from previous studies, the research literature, interviews, and field experiences. To illustrate this mutability of the research process, I have represented the framework of this research schematically (Figure 3). In practice, much of the clarity associated with the process of fieldwork involved a constant cycle of negotiation within and between the foundational conceptions of Indigenous paradigm, kaupapa Māori and organisational practice, which I use as a basis for the narrative in Part Two of this thesis.
Figure 3- The Research Process
(adapted from Denzin and Lincoln, 2003 Riad (2004)
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Part Two - Raranga Kōrero

Raranga kōrero serves as a symbol for Part Two of this thesis. Raranga evokes strong feelings of unity and the weaving together of people and, spiritually, the weaving together of all of creation into a single cosmos. This avoids what Marsden (2003) identifies as risk of compartmentalising and isolating facets of Māori reality. Kōrero refers to the spoken word, and kōrero paki means storytelling. Therefore, Raranga Kōrero, refers to the gradual weaving together of many narrative strands, involving the narrative being told over four chapters (Chapters Six to Nine). The theoretical concepts discussed in Part One are used as a basis for the narrative chapters leaving room to engage with complementary and conflicting research as it emerges within the narratives.

As Bourdieu maintains, it is impossible to create rigid boundaries about what constitutes the field, and “…concepts have no definition other than systemic ones, and are designed to be put to work empirically in systematic fashion. Such notions as habitus, field and capital can be defined, but only within the theoretical system they constitute, not in isolation” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992: 96). An Indigenous paradigm shares and subscribes to this holistic view, refusing to tolerate separation between elements of the social field. Kaupapa Māori is a multifaceted, sophisticated and intergenerational system of beliefs and values observed and lived, which forms the nexus of social practice and systems of exchange distinct to Māori ways of knowing and knowledge. My aim here is to describe the processes embedded within the threads of the social fabric which are constitutive of Māori society. These processes are not discrete but rather constitute the total social phenomena that all kinds of social, cultural and economic institutions find simultaneous expression in (Mauss, 1970).

The Narratives

I am concerned, then, with viewing attitudes from within the culture. To do this, the writer must unmask himself for he can only interpret his culture to another in terms of what the institutions, customs, mores and traditions mean to him. From there I must ask, ‘Is this a view held by my Māori people generally? Do their actions, their words, their oral traditions express the same general attitudes which I find in myself?’ (Marsden, 2003: 2).
This research is dialogical in that it includes voices other than my own and those of existing literature to be represented. In this part of the thesis I am offering a narrative account of the stories shared by people who have had experience in the field of Māori business. I regard narrative as culturally appropriate given the rich history of distinct tribal narratives delivered through story, metaphor and shared experience (Chapter Five). In this instance, the utility of narrative is its construction around specific individuals and environmental characteristics within which the tribe as a collective and Māori as individuals were embedded. Importantly, I am not trying to depict kaupapa Māori in a normative sense. Rather my aim is to represent the research whānau’s narrative of how kaupapa Māori and its associated logic and cultural values influence their socialised experiences in the context of business.

In writing these narratives, I found there was an evolving organic process at work, a developmental writing process that moved the narratives from rudimentary notions of form (the first drafts), to the form that is finally realised in these chapters. Key dynamics of Māori business practice emerged from the discussions. Some members placed more emphasis on elements of identity and leadership, whereas others found stronger connections with relationships or valuing firm resources. I am wary of labelling these dynamics as themes or categorisations along the lines of Glaser and Strauss (1967), or Eisenhardt (1989). Rather I continue to hold on to the contextual aspects of the kaupapa Māori, capturing the fluidity of changing positions and dimensions of power. I have presented the narratives within those dynamics suggesting that the context of kaupapa Māori provides for culturally constituted forms of practice, which lead us to strategies enacted in an organisational setting.

While this thesis is grounded on the acceptance of alternate worldviews it would be imprudent not to acknowledge that Māori share many attributes with other peoples who are not from Christian or Islamic civilisations. To that end, in the following chapters, and where relevant, I draw attention to other cultures who share similar cultural affectations with kaupapa Māori. In particular, other Indigenous peoples, such as the North American Indian, and East Asian cultures, such as Japanese, Taiwanese, Indian and Chinese to craft a Māori perspective that is more cogent and real.
Chapters Six through Nine reflect a coalescence of the three strands of narrative as per my own episodes of reflexivity, the interactive discussion between ‘us’ which captures dialogic encounters within the research whānau, and whakawhanuangatanga that offers the contextualised, localised narrative of Māori business practice situated by the experiences and practice of the research whānau. I draw attention to the discussion presented in Chapters Two and Three where the difference between Indigenous and Western conceptions of business is highlighted. In these chapters I focus on the distinctive properties embodied by kaupapa Māori that informs business practice. This in itself makes for many opportunities and challenges, where practice is influenced by traditional and contemporary factors. However, this thesis argues that a process of reconciliation harmonises and gives weight to cultural context through cultural exchange (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 1997), which lead to opportunities and innovative management practices. Therefore, I provide an analysis of Indigenous and Western business practice in Chapter Ten.

*And for the Audience ...*

Clandinin and Connelly (2000) identify an intimate connection and inherent tension between matters of voice, signature and audience in presenting narrative form. I use these as guidelines in the construction of this thesis to capture the struggle of trying to include one’s own voice in the midst of an inquiry that is designed to tell the participants storied experiences and to represent their voices, all the while attempting to create a research narrative that will speak to the audience’s voices. It is important to note of course, in contrast to the logic of dominant methods that I am not attempting to address a universal audience. Raranga kōrero presents a weaving together of the narratives, but falls short of offering itself as a grand narrative. I focus on the constructed nature of people and reality, emphasising language as a system of distinctions which are central to the construction process, therefore situating this work in contrast to grand narratives and large-scale theoretical systems (Deetz, 1996). That is to say, I do not, and neither would any of the members of the research whānau, wish to put our voices forward as being the voices that speak for all of Māoridom.
CHAPTER SIX: [HI]STORIES OF PRACTICE

This chapter addresses the research question - *what does an Indigenous [kaupapa Māori] perspective of practice offer our understanding of organisational practice?* Kaupapa Māori represents a worldview that operates in a highly contextualised, pragmatic orientation which renders the importance of the relations of power as being of paramount importance (Chapter Three and Four). More specifically, I ask how the dynamic interaction between field, habitus and forms of capital in the context of kaupapa Māori informs practice. In keeping with a philosophy of practice I present this chapter as the narrative construction of the specific properties and characteristics of the field as depicted by the research whānau. I view this chapter as the gateway to the narrative and sets of stories shared by the research whānau; our understanding and conceptualisation of practice in the field of Māori business. This is in keeping with an Indigenous paradigm where it is taken for granted that kaupapa Māori is the epistemological base of productive inquiry.

To identify the cultural antecedents of contemporary Māori business, I begin with a discussion of the kaupapa of Māori business in Section I, where the narrative presents the historical context for Māori business and the cultural framework informing practice. Next, Section II discusses the metaphysical juxtaposition between the physical and philosophical sense of Māori business situating people and their activity as a key feature that has emerged in this narrative. Section III details the three necessary and internally connected moments (habitus, field and distribution of capital) that construct the field of analysis for Māori business practice. Finally Section IV presents Māori business practice in the context of kaupapa Māori, highlighting specific forms of culturally constituted forms of practice, which lead us to strategies enacted in an organisational setting (Chapters Seven, Eight and Nine).

I. The Kaupapa of Māori Business

*Emma*

In terms of practice we can have the broad philosophical framework, but organisation by organisation, or community by community, or tribe by tribe we
also have to have the next level of discussion and that is: What is the tikanga that supports this philosophical framework? The values which are the philosophical framework shape practice.

*Emma’s* point *what is the tikanga that supports this philosophical framework. The values which are the philosophical framework shape practice*” is significant. Tikanga means method, plan, reason, custom, or simply the right way to do things (Marsden, 2003). When I thought about how I aimed to articulate the parameters of the field of Māori business, I immediately thought of *Emma’s* comment. In it, she exposes what I see as the critical strands of practice, derived as they are from the philosophical framework of kaupapa Māori, in its engagement with other cultural fields. *Emma* draws attention to the dynamic interaction required within the field between the agents who are at once grounded in the field by their possession of a specific configuration of properties that reinforce their practice in the Māori field. This is commensurate with practical knowledge and its form of sociological or pragmatic epistemology which describes the engagement of individuals in practices as responses to cultural rules, contexts and objective structures of the field (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

Marsden (2003) highlights the interconnection between kaupapa and tikanga, where any course of action is guided by the appropriate kaupapa, or logic for that situation. The research whānau supported the notion that there are distinct practices based in Māori beliefs that are reflected in how Māori businesses conduct business. Therefore, a key argument is that Māori business practice is influenced by Māori cultural norms guided by mātauranga Māori, or Māori epistemology. Dei highlights the primacy of Indigenous knowledge by referring specifically to the “epistemic saliency of cultural traditions, values, belief systems and worldviews” (2000: 114), reflecting that kaupapa Māori is the prevailing worldview or paradigm that drives expectations and practice in the field of Māori business.

When considering the questions associated with Māori business practice, we are drawn to engage with the kaupapa of Māori business. This inevitably leads us to ask ‘*what is Māori business?*’ The answer to this question was contested throughout the fieldwork by the research whānau, for example *Peter* stated that there is an inherent “danger of creating a
homogenous identity of what is a Māori business...although the values of it though I think are quite universal ... practice may be quite different.” I argue that in order to respond to Peter’s concerns and avoid the essentialisation of what constitutes Māori business we need to focus on practical knowledge, as an approach that calls for an understanding of human beings, conceiving of people as defined by their social, cultural and historical circumstances (Tsoukas & Cummings, 1997). This section begins by briefly discussing the challenges of constituting Māori business and introducing the cultural framework used to inform Māori business practice.

A. Context of Māori Business

The histories of Māori society are histories that detail the use of power by the Pakeha to establish governance over Māori, of unsuccessful attempts by Māori to share or join in with that power, and the consequent loss of what Māori valued (Sharp & McHugh, 2001). Brandi, draws from her experience in working with Māori business development, to reflect on the interaction between Māori and Pākehā as founded on tensions arising from our socio-historical relationship:

There’s definitely this underlying resentment from non-Māori that Māori are getting these hand outs and hand ups. They ask ‘why can’t you just do it for yourself like I did’. They don’t realise the impact of colonisation through generations. When you have your land base which is your biggest asset taken from you that has implications for seven generations of any culture, no matter what culture. Not just Māori culture … They don’t understand.

While colonisation is not a main character in this thesis it is still an important contextual element given that its processes played a significant role in the demise of the economic and social stability of Māori (Durie, 2001; Jackson, 1992). Said refers to a ‘many-sided imperial experience’ declaring that “if you happen to have an imperial background, the imperial theme is a determining one” (1993: 77). Whether it is through anti-imperialist resistance or pro-imperialist apology, the centrality of the imperialist vision influences the creation of cultural
identity. Janice also notes that fundamentally, “Māori were meant to be an assimilated society.” Chapter Three provides detail regarding how Māori were deprived (via legislation and force) of their social mechanisms that helped them to order the world (Petrie, 2006) and maintain control over resources such as land.

Māori response has been tempered by periods of different forms of resistance (Bishop, 2008), although it is important to note, that Māori resistance to Western cultural hegemony is not an isolated occurrence. In fact it is a process re-enacted wherever relations of domination, whether material or symbolic, operate (Wacquant, 1989), where those who dominate in a given field are in a position to make it function to their advantage, but they must always contend with the resistance, political or not, of the dominated (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). This is particularly significant given the context of our discussion grounded as it is within the domain of kaupapa Māori and Māori having control of what constitutes legitimate knowledge and practice in the field of Māori business.

Today, Māori businesses operate in a framework of institutional arrangements that are grounded and therefore influenced by New Zealand’s colonial history and the emergence of bi-cultural policy development during the 1970’s (Maxwell, 1998). There is an element of doxa operating, which perpetuates the dominant political and economic orthodoxy, and of particular import is the role of the State in enacting a form of symbolic violence. That violence plays a fundamental role in the reproduction and naturalisation of the social hierarchy is central to the creation of roles of domination and subordination evident in the processes of colonisation (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Said, 1993). I return to the question of “What is a Māori business” as an example of the consequences of this symbolic violence.

From the outset, the tensions associated with what have traditionally been ‘labelled’ and categorised as Māori business made many members of the research whānau uneasy in defining Māori business. The thought of defining and by implication determining what constitutes a Māori business was not something we wanted to engage with. Traditional depictions of Māori business are based around common definitions of Māori business, such as ‘by Māori, for Māori’ to empower and secure tino rangatiratanga, meaning the ability of self-determination (Bishop, 2008; Durie, 2001). Alternatively, purely quantitative definitions
like that imposed by Statistics New Zealand, such as requiring 50% Māori ownership and control, provide a means of measurement and accounting for the State agencies. A discussion about these approaches to definition between Nancy and myself captures the sense of unease regarding applying a quantitative criteria on to what constitutes a Māori business:

**Diane**

I don’t know if you’ve heard or seen this definition of Māori business but New Zealand Statistics have the definition of Māori business as being 50% owned by Māori. That is a government definition of Māori business. If you had to think about it how you would define a Māori business?

**Nancy**

I wouldn’t even want to go down that track.

**Diane**

Yeah there’s tick the wee boxes and then there’s the other thought … I feel there is a real danger of diluting the real essence of Māori in business if we have this sort of criteria or list.

**Nancy**

It’s just, to me, it’s being Māori and the values that you pour into your mahi and the way that you do it.

Our discussion captures the effects of misrecognition and therefore the symbolic violence perpetuated by the current focus of finding a one size fits all label or unilateral categorisation of Māori business. The research whānau argue that the creation of artificial boundaries around what constitutes Māori business marginalises the cultural field and leads to a meta-narrative that constrains activity. This undoubtedy raises a number of issues concerning the
associated privileging of ‘dominant interests’ over and above issues such as self-determination and social justice for Indigenous peoples.

At the forefront, there is the concern that we may be denying whakapapa to those business owners who identify as Māori but are not considered to be a Māori business based on the criteria set by definition. This concern highlights the second issue which is the danger of creating homogeneous and essentialised conceptions of Māori identity and characteristics of business practice. Thirdly, by creating arrangements of guiding principles we run the danger of romanticising the concept of a Māori business. The final concern is the creation of a set of criteria which perpetuate hierarchical and formalistic criteria for authority, representation and accountability and is therefore not aligned with a collective and holistic Indigenous world view. Therefore, in terms of determining what constituted Māori business the research whānau focused on the practical, reflecting the utility of practice as a culturally appropriate framework providing a platform on which to understand Māori business.

B. Cultural Framework Informing Practice

*Jenny*

We are Indigenous. We have our tikanga. We have our wairua. We operate more spiritually. But there are parts of what we do which is actually the same as everybody else.

*Jenny’s* comment reflects the research whānau reference to the cultural framework of kaupapa Māori as being significant in understanding business practice. It is an argument grounded by the field of Māori business, and a tradition of knowledge and knowing, which is illustrative of Indigenous systems of practice. Contrasting priorities and perspectives of knowledge helps us to understand the fundamental difference in attitudes between Eastern and the dominant Western attitudes towards knowledge, action and performance (Chia, 2003). For example, the Chinese argue that humans are fundamentally relational both in our own sense of identity and also in our ability to consider our relationship to, and interactions with, the external environment (Weiming, 1985). Similarly, we position Indigenous Māori
knowledge as having a cultural precondition for thinking more broadly, diffusely and holistically as opposed to the narrow specificity of Western oriented knowledge frameworks (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 1997). Therefore, Māori business is identified as a business that conducts itself using a Māori cultural context as the guiding framework, which necessarily includes the conscious and sub-conscious presence of kaupapa Māori.

In Māori society relationships provide for what MacIntyre (1981) identifies as a shared sense of community within which a range of social practices operate that are given meaning within a particular community’s traditions. Chapter Three outlined what constitutes traditional social processes that govern practice in the context of the pragmatic orientation of kaupapa Māori and where agents in the field, both individually and collectively, have a sense of how to act in situations without continually having to make fully conscious decisions (Bourdieu, 1977; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

Accordingly, social practice is located within the unity of a person’s life, which can be conceived of and evaluated only as part of a whole (MacIntyre, 1981). For MacIntyre, the capacity to make sense of the world or field requires narrative and narrative requires historical awareness. In my reverence for kaupapa Māori and the traditional cultural values that have informed practice through the ages, I am careful not to suggest that the only way forward for Māori business practice is a return to the traditional. Bob was very specific about the need for Māori to acknowledge the past, but also maintain a focus on the future in business:

I don’t suffer sitting there in a conversation that assumes that everything we need to do today should be grounded in the strategies employed in the same way they were in the past.

Māori social organisation predates colonisation and there is ample evidence of the success of traditional approaches to exchange based on the social processes of the time (for example see Petrie, 2006; Salmond, 1991). However, Māori have always adapted to new technologies, new environmental events and new peoples. The realisation that time is a crucial component
in understanding human activity leads us to a vital dynamic of pragmatic epistemology central to kaupapa Māori worldview.

Practical sense prerecognises the individual and collective history of agents through a complex temporal dialectic that “reads in the present state the possible future states with which the field is pregnant” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992: 22). Practical knowledge draws on a multilayered ontological understanding which reveals an opportunity to go beyond the immediate situated context in which knowledge is embodied by the generated repositories of an actor’s past, present and construction of a possible future. The past, present and future intersect and interpenetrate one another, locating kaupapa Māori as existing through the continual transformation and negotiation of social activity over time. A comment by Witikanga illustrates that this is particularly so in terms of the context of relationships:

We think naturally past, present, future – it just what we do. We still talk about the past, particularly when you introduce yourself. It’s never about just you. It’s about who you are in relation to everyone, and you recognise they judge you based on who you are and where you’ve come from and who you belong to. And when you think about the future you do actually think about one or two generations ahead.

Witikanga’s statement illustrates how Māori take for granted processes involved in the transformation of the relationships they have been and are involved in, and the possible shared future of those relationships (Beadle & Moore, 2006). When the future is highly unpredictable, one can only learn and progress continuously by recourse to the learned strategies that were effective in one’s own adaptive success in the past. So we can say that social organisation in Māori society is neither static nor homogenous, but rather emerging and adaptive to fluctuating environmental conditions (Barcham, 2000; Mauss, 1970). The comments below by Peter and Jacob highlight the agonistic nature of Māori society and the flexibility related to social construction of Māori society:
Peter

Even considering structural arrangements such as, whānau, hapū and iwi, the fluidness of hapū depended on their strategic interests and access to resources. For example 200 years ago there was some conflict between Ngāti Raukawa, Te Āti Awa. Ngāti Toa has got a very strong Ngāti Raukawa and strong Te Āti Awa whakapapa from different hapū. When they had the battle some Māori went to Ngāti Raukawa and some went to Te Āti Awa.

Jacob

If you go way back to the days with Tūpuna and how they operate and led, they were very flexible. They were very, very adaptable. Strategic partnerships were really quite important. They married for the purpose of strategic partnerships, arrangements. They sided with another iwi or they sided with the English in some cases for strategic reasons. What they had to do was to actually re-form themselves in a different way to address different issues.

The construction of selves in terms of collectively oriented behaviour (Markus & Kitayama, 1994), within a kaupapa Māori framework illustrates the significance of interdependence as a powerful notion influencing action. This notion is embodied in kaupapa Māori by the flexibility and the connections between individuals and collectives of whānau, hapū and iwi, which allowed for a variety of re-groupings in the face of social, political, or economic stress (Petrie, 2006). It is the organising framework of the collective reality (Markus & Kitayama, 1994) embodied by kaupapa Māori, which involves the deeply embedded cultural values, belief systems and tikanga. We draw attention to the idea of knowledge and its relationship to decision-making and action in the context of kaupapa Māori. A brief interaction between Bob and myself captures the intrinsic role of cultural values and knowledge in practice:

Bob

In the tikanga that we have here the practice and the value that goes with it still exists. I’m carrying that here (pointing to heart) it’s not something that is divorced from me. I’m carrying it, my own sense of accumulated knowledge.
**Diane**

Which is what Māori business practice is, because practice is practice regardless, but it is being Māori and how you make sense of this and how you relate to others around you. That is what I would say is core of how we would actually start discussing this idea of Māori business practice.

**Bob** and I had been discussing the intrinsic nature of Māori values and how they informed our practice. The research whānau recognised that the contemporary use of kaupapa Māori is imbued in culturally specific value orientation of practice, which is embodied by traditional Māori cultural norms and beliefs. Indeed, as **Julie** describes it “Māori business is a values-based thing.” A statement capturing our key argument which is that the distinction lies in the philosophical framework which informs practice.

The place of culture and importance of tikanga Māori in the context of business practice is better understood by a broad discussion on Māori values (Tomlins-Jahnke, 2005). According to Marsden (2003), Māori have no terminology for the word ‘value’, however he situates its utility in the word taonga, noted here as something treasured as an object of good or value, which can be tangible, intangible, material or spiritual. In this context of taonga as value, there is a whole range of cultural elements bequeathed by tūpuna, ancestors as legacy (Marsden, 2003). Therefore, in this discussion I am using the notion of values as those social principles, goals or standards held by a society to be desirable or useful (Tomlins-Jahnke, 2005). In so doing, I also recognise that ‘value’ is connected closely to conceptions of power, in terms of how individuals and groups are continuously implicated in reciprocal but asymmetric relations of power, which has implications for what is of value.

The utility of value is in the way it engages with the specific cultural systems of belief that inform practice embedded in kaupapa Māori. Māori don’t have just four or five different values. Rather, a multitude of values are interconnected and have multiple meanings. Indeed, value as a term can be used to suggest that there are distinctive preferences in practice. As **Jenny** suggests “what sits within a business … or what sits with an individual, is the values. Your wairua, and of course tikanga is a fundamental part of that … if you are aligned with that part of you, that will be part of your vision.” The wairua, or essence of the business is
about how those connecting values are practiced and experienced. The role of Māori cultural values was viewed as ‘being the glue’ in terms of how they informed Māori business practice as well as providing a sense-making function.

Kaupapa Māori is an Indigenous system of knowledge connecting the common ideas and cultural knowledges of Māori peoples concerning the everyday realities of living, shaping the community’s relationship with their surrounding environments. That includes the knowledge based on the cognitive understandings and interpretations of the social, physical and spiritual worlds (Dei, 2000; Marsden, 2003). It is a point I briefly refer to now because it captures the relationality and interdependency between the different forms of knowledge as reflected in the “Three Baskets of Knowledge’ (Chapter Three). As a reminder, practical knowledge or Aristotle’s phronesis is the combination of technical and craft knowledge into practical wisdom (Chapter Two). Kaupapa Māori, given its highly contextualised and pragmatic orientation, necessarily draws these three strands of knowledge together. This is a culturally distinct facet of the Māori worldview captured by Bob:

> As I get older the less I find the need to draw into the technical or academic. I find more and more to draw from inside myself to find what needs to be presented. I’m talking about for want of a better term the cultural and social aspects of how I behave, as opposed to engaging my intellect.

I develop this thread of narrative further in the following section, particularly the important relationship between Māori cultural values and forms of knowledge, and therefore practice. To do so I locate the centrality of human agency in terms of focusing attention onto what people do and those sets of relations that drive their actions.

II. It’s about People: …

The question ‘what is Māori business?’ raises two important issues regarding the structural implications of defining what constitutes a Māori business and construction of the Māori identity. In practical knowledge, grounded as it is in a pragmatic epistemology informed in
this instance by kaupapa Māori, we are necessarily drawn to the centrality of experience and therefore people. Therefore here I wish to focus less on the physical characteristics of operational activity and more on the people who are responsible for its operation and their whakapapa. Whakapapa, using Barlow’s (1994) dual depiction is the genealogical descent lines of all living things, and a basis of the organisation of knowledge.

As noted earlier, each field has its own logic, as different forms of capital impose their own relations of power on the field. We argue that the interpretation of the social world by agents in the Māori cultural field is of primary concern. Therefore while the question ‘what is a Māori business?’ inevitably focuses onto Māori cultural values it also draws attention to how Māori business people identify themselves in what they do. A point Mikaere and Patrick engaged with:

_Mikaere_

The face of a business is really its people. So it doesn’t matter whether you’re selling scones or diving for pāua or developing Māori strategy for an organisation. What I tend to make my assessment on is the āhua so how that person behaves in terms of the cultural tikanga they use.

_Patrick_

Businesses don’t do business. People do business. It’s all about relationships between you and your whānau; you and your staff; and, you and your customers and suppliers.

Their comments provide emphasis to a key thread of this narrative; it’s about people, what they do and why they do it that way, drawing the agent and their experiences, skills and strategies back into centerfield. A perspective that Western orthodoxy tends to avoid, resulting in areas of tension between Māori and Western frameworks of organisation. For example, statements made by Māori participants in the Hui Taumata research project (Hui Taumata Project, 2006: 35) reflected that “there is a sense that even merely identifying as a Māori business alienates you from the business community,” and “there was no connection
with being Māori. It was you’re just in business,” negating the significance of cultural identity in Māori practice. However, the location of this research sits firmly within the ‘practice’ approach, which focuses upon the way agents interact with the social and physical characteristics of context and relations of power in the everyday activities that constitute practice. Using their specific sets of skills, language, norms and dispositions, agents make decisions by interpreting their social world and acting strategically and creatively (Illouz & John, 2003).

A. What they do …

Our narrative above has identified Māori values as being important in relation to their influence on business practice, the extent of which depends on the nature of the business, product or service, and the people involved. For some businesses it will be an obvious point of differentiation in the market place. An example is Tohu wines, a Māori owned vineyard producing a Māori branded wine. Tohu, meaning sign or signature, reflects that the wine produced is viewed as evidence of the strong spiritual connection to everything produced and grown by Māori as custodians of the fertile soils of Aotearoa, New Zealand (Tohu Wines Ltd, 2009). Tohu wines uses this branding as a key point of what differentiates them from other New Zealand winemakers. Thus Māori identity and those sets of values derived from our worldview are at the forefront of business practice. For many other Māori businesses the presence of a Māori worldview may be exposed in different ways. It does not necessarily have to be reflected in the obvious but rather can be intrinsically present in everyday action, perception and behaviour.

This draws attention to the question of what cultural values will the business prioritise in terms of what business practices will be useful to obtain goals. A business that engages with kaupapa Māori would have distinct operational processes that reflect the importance of and inter-relatedness of Māori cultural values. Carly provided an example: human resource management would require an appropriate culturally attuned response to managing termination of employment. The resolutions to this type of conflict would have to protect the mana, noted here as prestige or status of the people involved as well as the organisation, so it doesn’t have a destructive or negative effect in their history.
The ‘meanings’ of Māori practices in mainstream organisations also need to be understood. In 2005, the New Zealand Department of Corrections was involved in a dispute with a Pakeha female probation officer who complained publicly about an incident which occurred at a poroporoakī, or farewell, for male offenders who had completed a violence-prevention programme. The officer had been verbally warned for refusing to move behind men at the ceremony, as required by Māori protocol. In October of 2005 the Department dismissed the officer after finding she had repeatedly breached Corrections' code of conduct by speaking to the media without authorisation (Binning, 2005). This example highlighted a labour dispute that situated gender discrimination issues up against Indigenous rights issues, a conflict which arose out of miscommunication of Māori cultural values and practices. As Karla commented it was a conflict that would perhaps not have happened had the parties been adequately informed:

The role of the women in the pōwhiri is not lower status. They are being protected by the men because they are tapu … Also the pōwhiri can’t start until the women gives the karanga, in which she acknowledges and gives them the ‘go ahead’ so to speak. So it is not a status thing at all.

Māori customs are entwined within social processes derived from a logic which is different to Western thought and practices. That’s not debateable. The research whānau, however, was critical of the transposing of Māori practices onto a non-Māori logic, which is a consequence of the cultural tensions discussed earlier in Chapters Three and Four. Karla also provided another example of a lack of integrity and therefore authenticity in practice:

For example, when Māori employees start with organisations, sometimes they are given a pōwhiri, particularly in government organisations. A potential problem is where this ceremony is viewed as ‘a nice thing to do’. When the key point is that the whānau are getting ready for this individual to work in your organisation, it acknowledges that all parties have expectations, but the whānau is expecting that the organisation will nurture and tiaki (look after) them. That engagement as an employee from a Māori point of view acknowledges and expects a wider support group, both internally and externally to the organisation.
and that it has to be this way to ensure they make an effective contribution to the organisation.

The use of pōwhiri is tapu for welcoming ceremonies. It is a formal and ceremonial welcoming of guests to an event or business, however many organisations ‘cut and paste’ parts of the pōwhiri to meet their needs. This damages the cultural integrity and authenticity of the social processes surrounding the pōwhiri, which we, as many others would argue, is unacceptable, particularly when they could title it a whakatau (which is noa, or not tapu) and a less formal welcome. It is a term that effectively allows them to achieve the same ends without denigrating a ceremony rich with values and meanings for Māori.

The question about where Māori business best sits, in a cultural or in a business context, is perhaps the crux of the matter. We tend to say one or the other, but in reality many Māori businesses operate with both in mind, therefore it is not our case that kaupapa Māori offers an approach superior to that of non-Māori, or Western cultural frameworks. A critical point offered by Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars (1997) in relation to East Asian cultures is the reconciliation process between Western values and technologies with their own, which has formed the basis of their competitive success. It would be fair to say that changes in the modes of organisation, production, distribution and sources of growth have seen increased attention to innovative practice in East Asian nations (Hershock, Stepaniants, & Ames, 2003; Yusuf, 2003). At the same time, in the West, there has been a shift towards gaining greater understanding of non-Western models of business (for example House, Javidan, Hanges, & Dorfman, 2002; Womack, Jones, & Roos, 1990). A consequence of which is a complementarity of practices emerging from the varying blends of East and Western conceptions of capitalism. We suggest that kaupapa Māori holds that same potential to develop the synthesis between Māori and non-Māori, whilst at the same time preserving those values that are intrinsic to the Māori cultural field. As Peter stated:

We’ve got our culture and values and the way we do things. When we’re in our place that’s how it’s done. Our tikanga. So we practice that within the context of our business which makes us quite different culturally from other business.
Our understanding of the contemporary field of Māori business is as an inherently relational entity, with many opportunities and challenges. It is how Māori face these opportunities and challenges which are at the core of how Māori business will develop in this new millennium. In his role as an educator and counsellor Russell relies on the holistic perspective of kaupapa Māori and refers to “the idea of relatedness ... everything works as part of a system. Māori pick things up pretty quickly in business because they can see connections really quickly. This is because it comes with the Māori worldview that everything is connected.” The high context and interdependent nature of kaupapa Māori, coupled with a sense of respect for authority and consensual nature of decision making creates the relations of contested positions of power, which are key components of practice in an agonistic community.

As Peter points out above, a relational perspective is in the “way we do things .... Our tikanga.” Māori business practices are quite different culturally to other businesses and that distinction can be an expression of what Peter considers to be “universal values, respect for people, hospitality, the manaakitanga, nurturing people, caring for people and communicating face to face.” It is the shared stories and experiences of Māori people that make it easier to connect with other peoples. In that context Russell suggests that “Māori trust a lot quicker and get to the heart of the matter,” which means there are certain things that don’t have to be discussed because they are taken as given. Part of that experience is expressed in a particular way in the intrinsic tikanga, which is how Māori values are imbued in everything we do, as a part of life.

B. ... and why they do it that way.

An important aspect of practice in the context of kaupapa Māori is the relationship between Māori cultural values and forms of knowledge. Bob describes the field as “not necessarily Māori. It is a worldly field and we engage with it. How we choose to engage with it is the ultimate task.” It is knowledge of the field in which people evolve that allows us to best grasp the roots of their point of view (in a field) from which their particular vision of the world (and of the field itself) is constructed (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). This brings us to the question of ‘what sort of knowledge do Māori practitioners need’ given their embeddedness in a pragmatic worldview that accepts multiple systems of knowledge (Chapter Three). First and
foremost the research whānau accepted the requirement for general business knowledge. Explicit knowledge is that knowledge which is codifiable and transmittable in formal, systematic language (Nonaka, 1994), and as Delia suggests, documented generalised business knowledge is requisite for Māori business:

If you look at it like a triangle and you have three sets that need to integrate together. You have the person, and their Māoriness. You have the community, which includes the non-Māori business community. You also need business skills, such as accounting and marketing. If you don’t have one of those you’re weaker. It’s like a three legged stool, if you chop off the leg you’ll fall over.

Much of our current research in management studies has been preoccupied with the creation and accumulation of knowledge in its explicit representation (Chia, 2003), and we would accept it as a requirement for general business practice. However, as discussed in Chapter Three systems of Indigenous knowledge are experientially based. We would describe Māori business practice as being informed by an ‘epistemology of practice’ (Cook & Brown, 1999). Cook and Brown’s (1999) perspective contributes to our understanding of Māori business by recognising that not all of what we know in interacting with the world lies in our knowledge; some also lies in our actions or practice. It has become common to consider knowledge in the context of both individuals and groups, and even tacit terms where, for example, knowledge is associated with skills or ‘knowhow’ (Cook & Brown, 1999; Spender, 1996). It is in the relationship between these seemingly separate forms of knowledge that practical utility resides. A conversation between Rueben, a small business owner and myself illustrates the role of tacit knowledge for Māori practitioners. We were discussing how he operationalises kaupapa Māori in his business activities:

**Rueben**

I try to get across to my staff that we are a whānau and that when customers come into the restaurant, I want them to feel that relationship.
Diane

How do you do that?

Rueben

Yeah, well mainly during their induction, when we are going through the steps of what to do in the restaurant.

Diane

So you have it written down … in a manual?

Rueben

It’s not about what I say necessarily, but about what I do. How I interact with them. How I interact with the customers. I hope they are seeing that and understanding the kaupapa.

Diane

Which means?

Rueben

I’m still formulating my Māori worldview taking lessons from the past and working out what they mean to me. So it’s hard to put into words … I’m not just here to feed you. You are not just here to serve customers. When you come into my restaurant you are not just here to eat food. There is this intrinsic thread of manaakitanga and being whānau that sort of sits over everything.

In this discussion, we were asking how the logic and values embodied by kaupapa Māori informed Rueben’s practice. It raised an interesting point regarding how much of what knowledge Māori practitioners rely on is in fact tacit knowledge, drawn from the cultural
context of their life and experience. A pragmatic epistemology captures the mutually enabling relationship between knowledge, which gives shape, meaning and discipline to our interactions with the social world, and the knowing found in individual and group practice (Cook & Brown, 1999). I argue that this then informs the simultaneous construction of Māori knowledge frameworks from both an individual and collective perspective, through the continual transformation of social activity. The habitus designates the manner of constructing and understanding the logic that guides practice, specific to the field, a point highlighted by Emma:

At the same time it is important to recognise the collective ideology is evident in Māori society, although a deeper understanding of Māori culture uncovers a level of individualism. However, one individual cannot hold all the answers. Individuals are important, but the momentum is collective.

Given its basis in kaupapa Māori, business practice therefore relies on the complementarity of explicit/tacit and individual/communal forms of knowledge. There is an inherent sense of Māori values influencing all aspects of the field but there are subtle nuances as to how they are translated or applied depending on the individual or communal influences of agents. Māori agents in the field, either individuals or groups, clearly make use of knowledge, both explicit and tacit, in what they do, but not everything they know how to do is explicated solely in terms of the knowledge they possess (Cook & Brown, 1999). That is to say, some aspects of Māori business practice are intuitive and reliant on the tacit forms of knowledge and knowing.

A commitment to historical awareness is therefore important for making sense of the present situation, which in turn creates a chain of continuity for the future. Every step of an individual’s actions is to cultivate innate competency and to progress. In the field of kaupapa Māori qualified or skilled people occur from experience. As Nancy suggests “a lot of my work experience has been learnt from working on the marae from when I was eight. Like an apprenticeship that is driven by cultural learning.” An apprentice or crafts approach to learning in a community resonates somewhat with the notion of community of practice, which was established by Lave and Wenger (1991) based on the premise that individuals
learn by participating in shared activity. However, the concept of communities of practice has long been situated in the domain of organisational learning and does not explicitly connect to the context and power considerations of the learning process (Fox, 2000).

This brings us to how abstract explanations operate in terms of understanding human activity beyond the rationalist propensity for rule-based logics (Dreyfus, 2004), given the intention of practical knowledge is to focus more broadly on how people acquire knowledge and skills. The Five Stage Model of Adult Skill Acquisition offered by Hubert and Stuart Dreyfus presents both dependent and independent action in their proper context and focuses attention onto qualitatively different ways of acting and performing (Dreyfus, 2004; Flyvbjerg, 2001). In regards to practical knowledge and in reference to the previous conversation about tacit knowledge between Rueben and myself it is particularly useful for understanding the link between human knowledge and context.

Kaupapa Māori takes into account both the collective and the particular and pays attention to practice (what they [Māori agents] do), which is about knowledge and what is of value in terms of the knowledge prized within the field and who is considered qualified to be a possessor of particular knowledge. Thus the processes of knowledge acquisition, action and performance are deeply hierarchical because of the recognition that learning is by experience. The kaupapa of Māori business is culturally constituted within the Indigenous Māori worldview, which draws us to a specific configuration of properties (field, habitus and capital) that reinforce practice.

III. Field of Analysis

In the context of Māori business, practical knowledge allows us to gain insight into the arbitrary conditions of the production of the social structure and of those dispositions and attitudes that are related to it (Calhoun, LiPuma, & Postone, 1993). Bourdieu identifies three necessary and internally connected moments when engaging with the construct of field for analysis (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). At its core, the question ‘what is Māori business practice’ is about being Māori, which we have identified is an expression of an individual’s
perception of ‘being’ that has developed from a specific cultural history. Therefore, although Bourdieu’s approach to analysis pays attention in the first instance to the notion of fields and power, I begin analysis by focusing attention onto the habitus.

A. “We want to be who we are” – Mikaere

Mikaere

… values are critical, if you lose those, we’re like anybody else. We could be a Pakeha business and we don’t want to be that. We want to be who we are.

Mikaere’s statement “We want to be who we are” captures the essence of kaupapa Māori business practice, particularly when we relate who ‘we’ are as agents who inhabit the Māori cultural field as the socialised embodiment comprehending of a practical knowledge and social reality. As a key aspect of his consultancy services Mikaere believes that people, and their networks, are central to Māori business development. Indeed, the research whānau held that first and foremost, the field is represented by its people and by the energy, skill and knowledge they bring to the field in both an individual and communal capacity. This commentary reminds us that it is the ‘collective enterprise’ of the people within the field who determine what logic constitutes the field (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Our attention is then directed to the contextual and power considerations concerning the identification of ‘we’ as Māori and the way ‘we’ choose to engage in the field of Māori business.

The research whānau determined that the core of Māori business is about what values and practices are brought to the business by the owners and employees. In taking a practical knowledge approach to this research we subscribe to the logic that has located identity as central throughout this narrative. Bourdieu’s logic of habitus refers us to the ‘unconscious taking in’ of rules, values and knowledge, which produce and influence practice. So it seems as little surprise that when we address the questions surrounding Māori business we are drawn to issues of what it means to be Māori within the field.
The desire to have a definitive identity, as determined through the habitus, distinct from others is not merely confined to the individual, but also extends to groups forming the basis of a collective identity based on commonly shared factors, such as language, historical experiences and beliefs. Different cultures have different means of determining the very nature of experience and this is important when considering how the distinct conceptions of individuality conform to the fundamental nature of independence or interdependence. A Māori view of the Self typically conforms to Markus and Kitayama’s (1991) interdependent construal of the Self, which views the Self in relation to surrounding contextual factors and tied to the implicit normative tasks that various cultures hold as social norms (Chapter Three).

How Māori cultural values are interpreted, understood and lived by is a very personal thing and is influenced to a great extent by our own socialised experiences, which reflect our position in the field. Rueben expressed this in his comment about the idea that Māori business is “... is beyond self definition. It’s about who you are.” Indeed, as Karla, Carly and Tracey’s comments illustrate Māori identity is inextricably tied to who we are and where we come from, which is a defining point in how we perceive and understand the world.

**Karla**

I identify with being Māori because I know where I come from. I know *who* I’ve come from.

**Carly**

I think its good to have strong base of experience and it’s really exciting for me to say - here I am. I am in New Zealand. I am Māori and this is my contribution.

**Tracey**

Personally I’ve always used Māori values no matter where I’ve gone. No matter what job I’ve had, and I believe that that’s what’s always assisted me in getting to whichever level I’ve ever needed to get to.
These comments reflect that knowing who you are and how you fit into the world order is crucial for human beings to be able to function in order for social life to be sustained and structures reproduced or transformed (Brubaker, 1985). Consequently, a prescriptive approach to what constitutes being Māori is not truly reflective of the kaupapa Māori. Therefore, the first challenge of this narrative is to supersede the idea that Māori is a homogenous construct. Being Māori in the 21st century reflects a heterogeneity that puts paid to the notion of a single cultural stereotype that accounts for differing sets of meanings and understandings of values held by various groups (Tomlins-Jahnke, 2005). Māori business practice is not one homogenous ‘lump’ of ways to do things. Constant adaptation to changes in the social economic and political context means that the range of variation of experience is diverse (Tomlins-Jahnke, 2005), a point supported by Peter and Karla:

**Peter**

There are the underlying generic issues about our identity, culture, whenua and te reo and the substance of us, as a people. We’ve all got those issues, but how we might particularly think of it or like from valley to valley, literally city to city whatever, will depend on the individual history of that group and their engagement with colonialism. And how they view it and how they’ve been treated and how they’ve come out the other side.

The fact that we’re Māori doesn’t mean we’ve got same ideas we’re all bloody different. It’s as simple as that.

**Karla**

What is Māori it is different to different people and tribes.

What Peter and Karla are saying is that being Māori means many things, situated in different landscapes, histories and genealogical backgrounds. However, ūrangaawaiwae toi taketake, noted here as that sense of belonging and connection to Māori cultural values draws us back
to that sense of a shared community of practices, grounded in social relations. The contextualised construction of Māori identity takes into account the thoughts, feelings and actions of others, therefore recognising the fundamental connectedness of human beings. As Emma describes “It’s not just a business, it’s my life, it’s my community, and it’s my marae,” which asserts the Māori habitus as inclusive of the individual, and the subjective as a simultaneously social collective (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

This point is highlighted by Markus and Kitayama (1991) wherein identity is constrained by the patterns of social interactions characteristic of a given culture. In the context of kaupapa Māori, Māori view their conceptualisation of self as the product of a certain whakapapa reflected in a long genealogical chain of being. The responsibility that goes along with that realisation and the mana, noted here as the position of power in the field provides the appropriate jurisdiction and behaviour of its members, as expressed by the following comments:

**Russell**

Once you’ve been connected in some way there is an understanding that a relationship exists and you have responsibilities and acknowledge it in some way.

**Sarah**

I think it sort of operates on a more informal level. We’re Māori and so there’s immediately this element of trust and rapport that we can build on.

**Martin**

For instance individuals don’t own a Māori corporation or don’t belong to a marae based on subscriptions, but they do have ‘ownership’. That ownership is not reflected in a share that’s translated into a dollar value. There is a relationship there and it’s the meaning of the relationship that’s more important than having dollar shares in it. The ability of shareholder to have a say in or
attend meetings in a corporation is based on how many shares they hold. My ability to go over there is because of who I am.

Each of these comments reflect how the construction of a sense of Māori self influences the feelings of responsibility or actions required in specific situations. We are considered to be constituted by our practice and there is no apriori self that subjects itself to the constraints of community life. Rather individuality and the construction of self is realised in community or as MacIntyre (1981) contends it is community that gives purpose (telos) to human life.

B. Taonga - Forms of capital

Māori have been agents of social organisation pre-contact and so practices of engaging with social, cultural and economic systems of exchange are deeply embedded. As Tracey suggests the “sooner we look at the collective perspective of cultural, social, environmental and economic, is when Māori can start to feel comfortable about how things should be developing for us and for our tamariki in the future”. Tracey draws on her experience of iwi development and her comment acknowledges the holistic approach to those important strands of taonga, or capital particularly in an intergenerational sense.

As with any business operation, the possession of economic capital holds with it the potential capacity for producing profits out of accumulated resources, which are of value to particular markets. The value derived from economic capital is related to the level of control they have over their assets, such as Māori land and resources.17 In the context of kaupapa Māori and the associated social organisation, in this instance marae, hapū and iwi based businesses, the possession of economic capital is often determined by the settlement process surrounding the Tiriti o Waitangi (Treaty of Waitangi). These settlements provide Māori iwi with a significant capital base, the expectation being that through the return of resources Māori people can realise greater levels of economic self-sufficiency and develop their own tribal resources, as

---

17 Māori assets are predominantly in the primary industries, such as agriculture, forestry, and seafood, but increasingly industries associated with knowledge and cultural resources, such as tourism.
discussed in Chapter Four. Ngāi Tahu and Tainui for instance, have grown their treaty settlements, from $170 million each in the mid-nineties to $600 million.

The research whānau engaged the notion of social capital as ‘collectively-owned capital’, which is instituted within differentiated communities (Bourdieu, 1986), in this instance by a Māori community, whānau, hapū, iwi. This emphasises the importance of recognising and managing the inter-dependency and therefore relationality between Māori agents in the Māori business field. The concept of cultural capital, in this context was also alluded to by the research whānau as providing the means of creating and understanding Māori ways of knowing and knowledge, which then influence Māori business practice. Māori ways of knowing and knowledge refers not just to traditional Māori knowledge but also to contemporary Māori and non-Māori knowledge. This is knowledge that goes beyond mental capacity to practical aspects of business practice, entrepreneurial activities and leadership. We make an important connection here to the pragmatic epistemology which is a central facet of kaupapa Māori which naturally draws together both tacit and explicit knowledge.

Many of the narrative contributors discussed the forms (and associated value) of capital in an inter-connected sense.

**Rueben**

The reason why I’m in business is … the long term economic gains are there in the background. But the main reasons are to provide some type of template of success for my children and other members of whānau. Actually it is the rationale but also the support for … I don’t think I could be where I am today in business without my whānau.

**Nancy**

We maintain those values in the way in which we work. That is easily accepted offshore, because it’s a new way of doing business. People are more receptive then, it's like showing your hand; this is who we are, we’re not afraid to say this is who we are, these are our values, what more can we tell you. They get to
know you as a person who’s made a difference .. and touched you. That’s the biggest thing. It's being able to win the trust of somebody when you're doing business. And I think that’s something that we can do; some of us can do really well, as Māori operators.

Rueben and Nancy's comments reflect the intrinsic interconnection between economic, social and cultural capital. Rueben's statement illustrates the connection between social capital and the ability to succeed economically in business. While Nancy's comment provides an example of how Māori make connections between cultural capital and a way of achieving success in business.

Understanding the different forms of capital is requisite to understanding the structure and dynamics of differentiated societies as agents negotiate the relationships between and power of distinct forms or ‘species’ of capital. Bourdieu’s (1977) depiction of this phenomenon emerged in his accounts of the behaviour and practice of Algerian peasants who had earned economic benefits outside their traditional village based field of production. Their attempts to convert that economic capital into social and cultural capital were made difficult by the traditional normative structure and habitus. At the same time, the introduction of a cash based system undermined the customary patterns of practice based on accumulated social debt.

Historical evidence suggests Māori were more successful than the Algerian peasants with regard to their acceptance of an imposed commercial system (For example see Petrie, 2006). Chapter Three outlined successful commercial ventures operated by Māori pre- and post-Tiriti o Waitangi, or Treaty of Waitangi. However their success was compromised by the symbolic violence perpetuated against the Māori cultural field through the process of colonisation. Capitalism and its underlying characteristics engaged with existing Māori systems of exchange and as Calhoun (1993) argued, when capitalism enters, traditional barriers to conversion of forms of capital are undermined. Bourdieu (1992) provides the analogy of a battlefield, in which participants vie to establish monopoly over the species of capital effective in it, that is to say holding the position of authority and therefore the power to decree the hierarchy and conversion rates between all forms of capital in the field of power.
The main advantage of Bourdieu’s conceptual account of different forms of capital is that the distinctiveness of each form of capital is recognised. At the same time the social connection and potentiality of conversions between them are also kept in view (Smart, 1993). For example, many members recognised the need to be profitable as a business enterprise, but questioned the dominant focus on economic rationality.

Tracey

My biggest bones here is here’s the bottom line but where is it taking us? You’ve also got to ensure that right around that peripheral you’re doing that holistic respective of where we should be going.

Martin

Value is money value and not other types of value. And that’s the problem. The measurement of success is how much you’ve got in your bank account. And I’m not saying that’s a bad thing, it’s a nice thing.

A key point of the research whānau was that Māori business practice is about achieving that balance between economic, social and cultural capital. In the discussions I found there was an inherent sense of the holistic nature of the way Māori make sense of their systems of exchange. Every action, whether it be socially or economically motivated was guided by social processes that drove Māori systems of exchange (these are the three core concepts but the idea of a culturally constituted system of exchange would easily incorporate spirituality and nature).

C. Mana Motuhake

The terminology of mana motuhake has been associated with tino rangatiratanga, in terms of a sense of Māori self-determination and autonomy (Durie, 2001). I subscribe to the notion of mana motuhake in the manner of it as “another expression used to describe power and control” (Durie, 2001: 220). In this sense I use it as a dimension that captures the way in
which control and authority is distributed within the Māori field. The demarcation of power between Māori and State, particularly, given the Māori cultural field is hierarchically positioned with other fields in which the State is the dominant field. Here we are looking at the relations between the positions of power occupied by the agents or institutions who compete for the legitimate form of specific authority.

Applying Bourdieu’s definition of field as a ‘simultaneous space of conflict and competition’ (Bourdieu, 1991b; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) we can see in the New Zealand business environment that the State is perhaps the most dominant player in the field. The State is a player of the ‘game’ whose institutions, discourses, practices, technologies and general organisation provide it with the means to create legitimate authority (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977). The field is dominated by sets of embedded institutional arrangements that were effectively designed by a colonial settler government to facilitate faster assimilation. In reference to Said’s (1979) notion of Othering, this places Māori (values, traditions, practices) in an inferior position.

The most dominant form of structural arrangement is the framework of institutional arrangements, such as government agencies (for example, New Zealand Trade & Enterprise, Department of Labour, Tourism New Zealand), business corporations, and the banking infrastructure, all of which are informed by ‘mainstream’ perspectives and practices. We also included the education system derived as it is by pedagogy with its roots in the colonial British education system and the media due to the considerable influence it has in shaping societal attitudes (in that they shape government policy and response to Māori business needs) that influence the practice of Māori business.

Government policy plays a significant role in the field of Māori business, by defining certain characteristics of Māori business and networks in very quantitative and technical terms. A lack of understanding and reflection of kaupapa Māori in government policy and decision-making has a dramatic impact on the capability of Māori businesses, specifically because they do not conform to the parameters established by the framework in which they operate. There are several examples:
• Government agencies are typically divided into areas where responsibilities for social, cultural or economic development tend to work in isolation from each other. This is in contrast to kaupapa Māori, which takes a holistic approach incorporating social, cultural and economic development.

• The banking industry is also an important institutional arrangement that impacts on the development & growth of Māori business, through its policies, practice and attitude towards Māori land as collateral. For example, as Delia points out "Māori who are part of communal lands ... can’t borrow on huge assets that they now own through Waitangi Treaty claims. They can’t borrow money and that because it is communally owned land. To me it’s just outrageous. That’s just absolute set up to bloody fail."

• The media is another interesting structural arrangement in New Zealand that can be as strongly damning in its representation of Māori and Māori business as it can play an important role in creating positive models. The role of the media in shaping perceptions of Māori identity and practice is probably at present not truly understood. However, we seem to be inundated by negative imagery, and as Delia suggests often Māori successes are hidden away whilst any failings are trumpeted across the front page as “... you have a media that portrays any Māori that does anything bad in business or in government or tribal affairs .... slammed across the media and ... they’re looking for heroes and villains but Māori are the villains always.” There is so little positive imagery being reported it feeds a myopic social and commercial view that constraints a Māori business.18

The research whānau determined that the relations between positions of power in the field were decidedly skewed against kaupapa Māori. The institutional arrangements and their supporting mechanisms do not recognise Māori forms of organisation and practice. In general it was felt that legislation and economic regulation had been imposed that ‘changed the playing field’ to suit those in power.

---

18 There are, however, some very good publications and media forums such as Māori TV and Mana magazine which offers a more positive and realistic account of the field of Māori business.
**Martin**

Looking at Māori business practices over a period of time we can see that meeting market requirements have always been a primary consideration. We didn’t make a rope because we wanted to make a rope. We made it because there was a need for it. The difference then was that we could make it our way and sell it to people who wanted it. Now we have all these structures that dictate who can produce, how they produce and where they can sell. Generally making it easier for them and more difficult for us.

**Martin’s** comment reflected the sentiment shared by the research whānau which viewed the homogenous application of the regulatory environment as creating the sense of tension and barriers to Māori business development. A consequence highlighted by the Hui Taumata 2005 (Chapter Four) was that Māori businesses failed to engage with State sponsored institutions, severely constraining their potential for development. However, in New Zealand a somewhat unique bi-cultural institutional framework has evolved, which has seen the development of government agencies such as Te Puni Kōkiri and Poutama. Other equally important entities in the Māori cultural field are Māori oriented entities such as the Federation of Māori Agencies (FOMA), Māori Trusts, Māori business networks, iwi corporations, and hapū and marae enterprises that draw from the logic of a Māori worldview. These agencies were specifically designed to meet Māori needs and traditional systems of exchange (kaupapa Māori, tikanga, whānau relationships) find a place in these institutions.

These agencies are important structures within the field as they can contribute to the legitimacy of Māori values and mainstream practice. In this instance the authority to produce and authorise certain discourses and practices derived from both kaupapa Māori and mainstream views, the ultimate aim of which is to find the appropriate constitutional arrangements that will enhance the standing of both (Durie, 2001). This is an analysis made possible by revealing that Māori business practice takes place in social, cultural, economic (including political) fields of struggle. The notion of field allows us to incorporate the categorical differences in historically or culturally distinct instances (Calhoun, 1993), in this context kaupapa Māori.
The adage ‘By Māori, For Māori’ is an important foundation for discourse surrounding tino rangatiratanga, the natural right of self-determination for Māori peoples, in that it invokes a sense of autonomy, responsibility and direction determined by Māori for their own prosperity. As noted by Carly "the really important part of tino rangatiratanga, ... how do we determine how we go forward? Ultimately it’s a grass roots thing and it’s owned by the people that create it". The research whānau, wholeheartedly supported the underlying premise of that maxim, however, it was also recognised that no one person or even a collective, could ‘go it alone’.

IV. A Kaupapa Māori Perspective of Practice

The research whānau took a very firm stance when it came to discussion about Māori business and competitive practices, disregarding romantic imagery of Māori business and acknowledging a more holistic approach to value creation. In that context we determined that the emphasis is not on making a specific judgement about whether a business or organisation is Māori. That is something that is not negotiable or debatable - it just is. Business practice is business practice and the average New Zealand business experience is probably no different to the average small Māori business. I argue that the important difference occurs in practice. More specifically, in the instance of this research, it is the context of kaupapa Māori that allows us to highlight the notion of culturally constituted forms of practice.

A primary argument of this narrative is that each culture brings with it cultural nuances that influence practice in subtle and not so subtle ways. Kaupapa Māori, in drawing from a pragmatic epistemology necessarily engages a whole set of power/knowledge relations. In this narrative it has been the link between knowledge (both individual and collective) and human action in organised contexts that I argue provides a valuable framework to understand historical, social, cultural and economic contexts organisational forms and management practice (in their historical, social, cultural and economic contexts). I use this point as a platform for addressing the research question - What does an Indigenous [kaupapa Māori] perspective of practice offer our understanding of organisational practice? Specifically, I offer some conclusions on Māori business practice as identified by the several strands of narrative that comprise this chapter.
A. Culturally Constituted Forms of Organisational Practice

In relation to organisation and management thought, knowledge informs strategy and in keeping with the overarching premise of this research, the highest form of knowledge is phronesis, practical knowledge. Kaupapa Māori as expressed through business practice is viewed as very important in relation to the capability and potential outcomes for improved firm performance. Returning to Mikaere’s statement “We want to be who we are”, I propose that at its core this means ‘when we are who we are, we can make the decisions we want to make regarding our practice’.

Practical knowledge puts agent and their experiences, skills and strategies back into centerfield. In recognising kaupapa Māori as a field, with its own logic and distinct forms of taonga, or capital that impose specific relations of power on the field, the interpretation of the social world by agents in the Māori cultural field is of primary concern. That is, to develop a comprehensive understanding of Māori business practice we argued that interpretation of the social world must be delivered by those inhabitants in the Māori cultural field. The kaupapa of Māori business is very much grounded in the interaction required within the field between the agents who are at once located in the field by their possession of a specific configuration of properties that reinforce their practice. Therefore the question ‘what is a Māori business’ inevitably draws attention to cultural values and how Māori business people identify themselves in what they do.

To understand Māori business practice, I suggest it would be imprudent to rely solely on the physical characteristics of operational activity, but rather the role of cultural values and how they are operationalised in a business context must be included. In the context of Māori business it is the simultaneous expression of dynamic interaction between those distinctly Māori socio-cultural values, behaviours and structural arrangements that inform practice. Section Three outlines Bourdieu’s analytic apparatus of field, habitus and forms of capital in the context of kaupapa Māori, offering a refined three tiered relational notion of social structure that provides access to the distinctiveness of fields, each with its own history, logic and agents (LiPuma, 1993). I begin with the habitus as a level of analysis that seeks to
understand the habitus of agents acting in the Māori cultural field and the different systems of dispositions they have acquired by internalising social and economic conditions.

Māori business practice can be better understood when viewed as enacted in a symbolic struggle over the definition of individual and collective Māori identity which imbues Māori agents in the field with specific forms of capital and habitus. As Bourdieu (1977) explains the embedded structures within the field influence the habitus, or the way in which individuals develop attitudes, values and dispositions and vice-versa. The Māori habitus is the embodiment of those structures (Māori and non-Māori) embedded in the field, but we also see the habitus as contributing to the field in this instance endowing it with sense and value derived from kaupapa Māori. To that end, we have taken a wide-ranging viewpoint regarding the role of identity, constructed as it is on a platform of values, attitudes, experiences, behaviours, both internal and external to kaupapa Māori and its impact on business practice.

Characteristics of value may be reflected in Māori business practices, but understanding and accepting Māori values in the context of mahi, or work and life is even more important because they are a very personal thing. Māori identity is reinforced when practice in business advances Māori aspirations without compromising the values and practices that are fundamental to ‘being Māori’ (Puketapu, 2000). Values and an understanding of them in practice influence the way that you operate, and the way that you want to share your experiences and learn from others. This was viewed by the research whānau as an important consideration in terms of leadership in the field of Māori businesses, which is discussed further in Chapter Seven.

The second level of analysis is the position of the field vis-à-vis the field of power. How powerful, for example, is the economic field vis-à-vis social or cultural field? An important consideration for us here is how the social structure contains the established practices (and therefore power) to use for action. For kaupapa Māori the established orthodoxy of political and economic order is perceived as particularly significant given the context of our discussion, grounded as it is within the domain of what constitutes legitimate knowledge and culturally constituted inter-capital exchange.
A key argument is that Māori business practice is influenced by Māori cultural norms guided by mātauranga Māori, or Māori epistemology, itself in turn guided by a highly contextualised orientation which renders the importance of the relations of power and multiple systems of knowledge as paramount. However, when discussing the value attached to and management of capital, we are not suggesting that Māori business prioritise social and cultural capital more or less than other businesses. Conversely, we do not attribute a pure profit motivation to other non-Māori businesses. However, there are certain dynamics surrounding the allocation of value to some distinctly Māori social and cultural resources which influence their practice, as discussed in Chapter Eight.

The third moment of analysis consists of taking into account the objective structures of relations between the positions occupied by the agents or institutions who compete for the legitimate form of specific authority. In this instance the authority to produce and authorise certain discourses and practices derived from both kaupapa Māori and mainstream views. A key theme to our narrative discussion is that Māori business operates in a field that engages necessarily with stakeholders and structural arrangements that include Māori and non-Māori.

The research whānau highlighted the synthesis between mainstream and Māori values and raised the challenge of creating processes and systems to operationalise in practice the synergies between Māori philosophical values with mainstream. This approach, we argue, requires structural change and willingness for both fields to move forward together, engaging with and between Māori and the non-Māori environment for the purposes of sharing culture, meanings, understandings, and practices. Thus, a core tenet of Māori business practice is the building of sustainable and meaningful relationships, which is discussed further in Chapter Nine.

V. In Brief

In this chapter I have presented the narrative construction of the field of Māori business and identified specific properties and characteristics that undergird the logic of Māori business practice. Chapter Two discussed the constraints of traditional approaches to understanding
firm performance, the key levels of analysis ranging from an emphasis on industry structure to firm specific effects and more recently the role of individual actor. The next three chapters each engage with the second of the field questions “What strategies do agents in the Māori business field enact?” In Chapter Ten I argue that Māori business operates within a distinctive form of socio-economic rationality that provides a wider utility, leading us toward the provision of richer information in decision-making and improved firm performance. First, however, in Chapter Seven we are drawn to the practice of leadership compatible with the cultural identity and telos of practice that includes Māori and Western. Chapter Eight examines the micro context of intra-firm complementarities between social, cultural and economic capital, particularly in the context of a culturally constituted system of exchange. Finally, Chapter Nine presents narrative discussion that captures the macro inter-firm configuration of relationships and networks, both formal and informal that influence Māori business practice.

It is important to note that the approach to this thesis is derived from an Indigenous paradigm (Chapter Two and Three). It is an approach predicated on countering the decontextualised and power neutral basis of organisational practice as portrayed through the Western cultural lens. It challenges the concepts of organisational practice founded on western philosophical traditions governed by conscious and rational thought. Therefore, the intention of these chapters is not to provide an in-depth account of theory and practice. Nor is it to attempt empirical verification for theoretical definition, or ‘labels’ on which we can attach a ‘Māori-fied’ version. The Japanese term nihonteki keiei, or Japanese style management reflects this notion in terms of emphasis on culturally specific practices. Business oriented customs are meaningless unless we understand the cultural context (Alston & Takei, 2005). Therefore, the following chapters are not claiming universally appropriate and applicable models, rather they demonstrate the different approaches to business practice that may represent kaupapa Māori.
CHAPTER SEVEN: KAUPAPA MĀORI LEADERSHIP

The purpose of this chapter is to address the research question - *what strategies do agents in the Māori cultural field enact in business?* Specifically, we are looking at those strategies arising from a convergence of practice where the Māori habitus is dominant, which offer potential avenues of improvement in firm performance. I argue that habitus is an attractive notion for considering the behaviour of actors in the field of Māori business, not only due to the focus on embodied practice, but also its attention to their social origins. A key question then is how the Māori habitus (both the individual and collective as discussed in Chapters Three and Six) informs practice and in particular strategies of leadership, through the “different systems of dispositions they have acquired by internalising a determinate type of social and economic condition” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992: 105).

In keeping with a kaupapa Māori approach, I look to history in order to develop an understanding of contemporary kaupapa Māori leadership. As discussed in Chapter Three, Māori organisation and entrepreneurial activity during the period of colonisation, whether it was in farming, flour mills or shipping fleet operations (Petrie, 2006; Salmond, 1997), required a form of traditional leadership based on the social processes of the time. Chapter Three outlines what constitutes traditional social processes that governed leadership in Māori communities. *Emma* draws from the practice of Hone Heke, a rangatira of Ngā Puhi who was renowned for his fierce fighting abilities and business acumen, to illustrate that notions of Māori industry and leadership are not new:

> It can be argued that Hone Heke, who lived during the 1800’s, was the first Māori industrialist and capitalist because after he returned from Europe and seeing the factories of Britain and France, he embarked on a campaign of industrial expansion. He was seen as a conqueror and warlord, because he brought thousands of slaves back to Ngā Puhi and worked them to death, something he couldn’t do to his own whānau. That would have stepped over the boundaries of rangatiratanga.
Hone Heke’s methods were adapted from the industrial nations and adapting them to his cultural context. Rueben sums this up in his comment that “a lot of Māori businesses say ‘that’s not the way Māori do business today’. Well I say that’s not the way they do business now, but in that period of time it was successful.” Therefore, I reiterate the point made in Chapter Six regarding the continuous evolution of cultural fields, in particular Barley and Kunda’s (1992) reference to management practices being a reflection of the interaction between what people are doing in different communities and the zeitgeist of what is happening in society.

Rueben also states that “Māori businesses operate in a contemporary context and a good leader in Māori business has to understand that. Be able to work within that context and the rules that are in there.” This comment leads us to a second point in Emma’s story, which is that Māori leaders must be able to operate in ‘cultural exchanges’ between Māori and Pākehā, and even within the Māori community. Hone Heke was a person of chiefly status, or rangatiratanga, a title that has attached to it cultural values of mana, or prestige (Barlow, 1994). It is those cultural values, imbued by the logic of kaupapa Māori that provided the parameters of Hone Heke’s practice, of what was and was not acceptable to the Māori community of that time.

In relation to kaupapa Māori leadership we must understand that Māori business practice is constituted by the cultural values and strategies that are a consequence of locating a sense of cultural identity within kaupapa Māori and the role of contested positions of power and authority, which is evident in agonistic communities. To that end, in Section I, I introduce the argument that leadership must be understood in its social context and therefore its socially constructed nature (Ford, 2006; Jarzabkowski, 2004; Knights & O’Leary, 2006; Knights & Willmott, 1992). Section II, engages with the tensions and syntheses that offer unique challenges to Māori leaders in the field of business. We are drawn to an examination of the practice of leadership compatible with the cultural identity and telos of practice that embodies kaupapa Māori. Finally, Section III presents leadership strategies as culturally constituted forms of practice, in the context of kaupapa Māori.
I. Challenging Major Themes in Leadership

Leadership in practice draws from definitional concepts that are widely accepted and provide for unity of purpose and vision, based on an ontology of leaders, followers, and shared goals that facilitate managing, co-ordinating, and motivating the community to achieve specific goals (Drath et al., 2008). Yukl’s (1989) definition of leadership as a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that includes “influencing task objectives and strategies, influencing commitment and compliance in task behaviour to achieve these objectives, influencing group maintenance and identification, and influencing the culture of an organisation” (Yukl, 1989: 253). However, both Indigenous Māori and Western conceptions of leadership are distinct and grounded in different cultural frames of reference, for example as Peter states “we’re not just like a business. An entity like this is you know it’s perpetual, it will go on from generation to generation.” Peter’s statement reflects the inter-generational focus his organisation, which is oriented towards Māori communally-owned entities, embodies. In this context cultural values as derived from kaupapa Māori allow us to view Māori leadership as having some distinct differences to a Western approach.

The intention of this section is to challenge the mainstream orthodoxy of leadership that tends to locate culture, in this instance derived from kaupapa Māori, as either irrelevant or essentially as a national variable. However, as Warner and Grint (2006) suggest in their investigation of American Indian leadership, it is not about replacing one orthodoxy of leadership with another. This, they argue, is an important element of research involving Indigenous cultural context, which requires an understanding of cultural values that is constitutive of the various socialised categorisations, or habitus of people, such as communities, social classes, ethnic groups, genders, ages and religions. I begin by outlining a conceptual space for reconsidering the nature of leadership in order to adopt an understanding of leadership that is congruent with alternative paradigms, and in particular kaupapa Māori.

A. Major Themes in Leadership

Typically, the Indigenous approach to leadership has been interpreted by non-Indigenous observers as being contrary to the positive characteristics of economic behaviour (Warner &
Grint, 2006). Any association with communal techniques in leadership represented a lack of innovation and an incapacity for leading that constituted a barrier to successful organisation and management. Indeed, it was deemed antithetical to Weber’s ‘spirit of capitalism’ involving individualism, the respect of profit and rational approach to problem solving (Fukuyama, 1995). The disparity between the two conceptions of leadership is hardly surprising given that each frame of reference positions the individual agent differently. The rational, utility-maximising individual is very different to the interdependent construction of the Self construed in relation to surrounding contextual factors discussed in Chapter Three and Six.

Given the Western orientation of the leadership literature, much of its immediate discourse is ethnocentric, reflecting leadership only from the country of origin (Alves, Manz, & Butterfield, 2005; Scandura & Dorfman, 2004). Indeed, a common criticism of leadership theory has been its conceptualisation of leadership in an international context. Many definitions position themselves as global but in fact neglect to account adequately for cultural context (Adler, Brody, & Osland, 2001). This leads us to an important consideration in regards kaupapa Māori leadership: the notion of leadership as culturally contingent as opposed to being universally endorsed (Warner & Grint, 2006).

Earlier traditions of leadership research and theory were often reduced to the assumption that an organisation or institution could only have one individual leader (Warner & Grint, 2006). This gives rise to a particular tension when mainstream conceptions of leadership, primarily derived from a Western ideological stance, invalidate or ignore these alternative styles of leadership in favour of their own individualist conceptualisation. Chapter Two presented the challenges of viewing organisation and management thought through a Western cultural lens. The field of leadership theory and practice is no different, with scholars advocating for a shift beyond applying the method of natural sciences to human action (Stacey, 2007; Svensson, Wood, & Mathisen, 2008). Certainly, this argument is not new. Knights and Willmott (1992) argued that developments in the domain of leadership theory moved somewhat to appreciate the dynamics of leadership in practice. However, they suggested that it did not go far enough in terms of analysing the social structures and existential dimensions of leadership processes.
They argue that the field lost sight of how leadership is socially constituted both as practice and an objective of analysis.

Leadership theory contains numerous definitions, with very little consensus between them (Grint, 2005; Knights & Willmott, 1992). Alvesson (1996) argues that language is too ambiguous and meaning too context-dependent to provide for a delimited and clear definition of leadership. However, regardless of this disparity there is some degree of consensus amongst leadership theorists on the attributes necessary to realise effective leadership. A key concern of mainstream research has been to identify features of effective leadership behaviour, that is to say the possession of specific traits (Knights & Willmott, 1992). Most often success is attributed to sets of extraordinary abilities such as intuition or persuasiveness (Yukl, 1989).

The trait approach emphasises the personal attributes of leaders, for example self-confidence, energy, initiative, emotional maturity, stress tolerance and, with respect to interests and values, pragmatism and a results orientation. The domain of behavioural leadership shifted emphasis from what leaders are (traits) to what they do (behaviour). This is a field that has aimed to identify leader behavioural patterns around what they actually do on the job (Yukl, 1989), with an emphasis on the nature of their activity and the classifications of their roles. The situational and contingency leadership approach recognised the importance of contextual factors such as leader authority and discretion, the nature of work performed by the followers and their attributes, and the external environment (Yukl, 1989). The major contribution in this domain has been the broader consideration of leaders’ interactions with the wider environment.

The next evolution in leadership theory, transformational and charismatic leadership, again shifted focus from leader behaviour and situational factors to leadership as a process, albeit a dynamic and complex one. Of particular significance is the recognition of collective identity and the reciprocal nature of the leadership process (Conger, 1999). Transformational leadership refers to the process of influencing major changes in the attitudes and assumptions of organisation members, through their empowerment. Charismatic leadership suggests that
leaders engage in behaviour that results in followers attributing them with extraordinary qualities that affect transformation (Yukl, 1989).

Grint (2000) reveals that the problem of these traditional approaches is that they maintain the constraints of essentialism and determinism. The trait approach concentrates on the qualities of the individual as essential and universal aspects of leadership regardless of diverse contexts. The situational and contingent approach perceives context to be essential but the qualities of the leader to be less relevant, therefore there is no universal style of leadership as it will change depending on context. In terms of leadership theory and practice this has led to a tendency to focus on individual leaders whose traits propel them to positions of authority over a business or community (Warner & Grint, 2006), thus maintaining an individualistic perspective of leadership (Knights & O'Leary, 2006).

Given the context of this thesis, it is important to consider key cross-cultural leadership theory developments to provide an appropriate frame of reference. Certainly, Hofstede's (1980) conceptual cultural dimensions have had an enduring legacy in this debate, as has the Global Leadership and Organisational Behaviour Effectiveness (GLOBE) program. One of the most well-known and comprehensive efforts at understanding cross-cultural leadership, the longitudinal, multi-method GLOBE research project encompassed sixty-two cultures (House, Javidan, Hanges, & Dorfman, 2002). The GLOBE project is heralded as illustrating the intimate connection between culture and leadership (Scandura & Dorfman, 2004). However, as identified in Chapter Four, it is a program designed and operationalised by researchers embedded within the Western oriented perspectives of research theory and practice (Alves, Manz, & Butterfield, 2005). I would also agree with Fiske (2002) that programs such as the GLOBE conflate specific kinds of social relations under one monocultural umbrella and ignore contextual specificity.

B. An Alternative View of Leadership

Grint (2005) offers a fourfold typology that does not claim universal coverage but encompasses significant elements of leadership definitions:
• Leadership as Person (It is WHO leaders are that make them leaders).
• Leadership as Result (It is WHAT leaders achieve that makes them leaders).
• Leadership as Position (It is WHERE leaders operate that make them leaders).
• Leadership as Process (It is HOW leaders get things done that makes them leaders).

I find these conceptions of leadership useful in my attempt to locate kaupapa Māori leadership within a deeply contextualised analysis of meaning that calls for a structural analysis of leadership as mediated by relations of power (Knights & Willmott, 1992). The focus then is on the use actors make of different practices that structure their environments to attain various personal and strategic ends. More recently attention has been paid to this void in the domain of ethical leadership (Knights & O'Leary, 2006), discourse of leadership and post-structuralist feminist approaches (Ford, 2006), and Indigenous cultural modes of leadership (Warner & Grint, 2006). Each of these has adopted an alternative to the dominant field of leadership that responds to the essentialism/determinism debate (Chapter Two).

This thesis adopts an Indigenous paradigm drawn from the philosophical cohabitation of practical knowledge by means of its pragmatist epistemology and kaupapa Māori, which necessarily situates human action, practice as a central dynamic. From this perspective we view kaupapa Māori leadership as both displacing the dominant foundations of what constitutes leadership theory and practice for organisation studies and opening the field up to alternative models and understandings. Grint’s (2000) constitutive approach to leadership locates leaders as those who actively shape our interpretation of the environment. That is, they shape the challenges, goals, competition, strategy, and tactics of the field in question.

From a social constructionist perspective the argument is that leadership is about neither an essential individual nor an essential context. Rather it is an outcome of interpretation, wherein leadership and the context in which it is practiced are mutually constitutive (Knights & O'Leary, 2006). This highlights the significance of how a ‘cultural ideal’ (Markus & Kitayama, 1994) shapes experience and expression of the self and therefore practice. It is
here in the narrative that we turn to leadership in the field and management of our Māori businesses. It is at this juncture I refer to a discussion held between Janice and myself regarding the notion of leadership in kaupapa Maori:

**Janice**

There is a difference between cultural leadership, business leadership and good business management. It takes me a while to work out what perspective people are coming from. For example if they place themselves high culturally, I find it difficult to determine whether they are also good business leaders.

**Diane**

I think this may change as we get more Māori in management positions who are well educated, very confident in Māori identity, and probably speak te reo. They are going to emerge as middle to senior managers and they are not going to be shy in positioning themselves as being confident in Māori culture and I am a good business manager or leader. We’ll see more of a convergence between the two.

**Janice**

And I think when that happens I think there will be a whole heap of ruptions.

**Diane**

In what way?

**Janice:**

To me we’ve only had the clash (publicly) between Māori and Pākehā. We haven’t had the clash between Māori and Māori. As you say a lot of the ones I’m exposed to are high cultural leaders and you’re going to get a new lot who are cultural/business leaders and those two haven’t met yet.
Janice has the unique opportunity of working with many different levels of Māori leadership in iwi development, and her commentary illustrates the strength of locating oneself culturally and socially which are significant narrative threads of this chapter. In Section II, I offer these as heuristic devices to illustrate the distinction between Western models of leadership practice and an alternative mode of understanding leadership in the context of kaupapa Māori. The objective is to describe leadership with regards firm performance using the culturally constituted lens of practical knowledge.

II. Discussion: Culturally Constituted Leadership

Māori leaders locate themselves in the cultural field in relation to the agonistic social process of kaupapa Māori indicative of contesting positions of power and authority. Peter contends that kaupapa Māori leaders are evaluated by the business community “those people working with us ... whether we offer a quality product, good service, and good practices. That’s how they’ll view us.” In addition, the Māori community will also be placing expectations on leaders. Both therefore have a significant role in how Māori understand and practice the notion of leadership.

The approach to practical knowledge contends that social reality is produced as an emergent product of decisions, actions and cognitions of individual consciousness, drawing attention to the ways agents negotiate the social world (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Māori leadership is influenced to a great extent by our own socialised experiences, which reflect our position in the field. Therefore the conceptualisation of a cultural identity for Māori and the notion of contested leadership are crucial variables in examining the roles, obligations and responsibilities of Māori leaders.

A. Locating Cultural Identity in Leadership

An emergent narrative thread was in regard to who the agents in the field identify as leaders. In New Zealand there is a very visible level of Māori leadership, which plays an important role at the national political and tribal corporation level (for example see Diamond, 2003).
However, the research whānau consistently referred to another level of leadership driving the Māori community, which is equally important, but often overlooked. This level of leadership is that associated with people at the ground level; those who keep the fires burning and maintain the integrity of the marae and whānau. The following story is a bricolage of narrative shared by the research whānau, drawing together many strands of different stories.

The story of whānau business experience and leadership is a similar one throughout the research whānau. Particularly the role of our parent’s generation, who not only had to operate businesses to survive, participate in developing whānau and iwi initiatives, but also raise families. It is from this context in which we have been exposed to the domains of business and iwi, an experience which has instilled in us, from a very early age the language of both. We grew up with an innate sense of appreciation for a special approach to business practice that captured both the economic and socio-cultural elements. We were able to have education and mentoring from both Māori and Pakeha heritages. As a result we all became very experienced in engaging with the dynamics around marae and iwi development because they became a part of everyday life.

Our parents worked tirelessly for Māori people with a very personal and traditional approach to leadership. The leadership of today is not the same as the leadership of yesteryear. The fact our parents and other people of their generation mortgaged their own assets to help establish their iwi initiatives to the benefit of the whole community. Who would do that today? Take that risk. That does not mean that leadership of today is in any way less dynamic or hardworking, but Māori need to respect that sacrifice and hard work, which in many cases would have been thankless and it would have involved fighting the system the entire way. The leadership and activities of people like our parents set the platform for all the good work that is being achieved today for Māori.

Yet in all of this achievement they see themselves as being ‘behind the scenes’, always emphasising the roles of others.
This story represents the processes of socialised experiences (instilling an innate sense of a special approach to business) and embedded relations (within iwi and whānau) that are important features that constitute cultural identity specific to kaupapa Māori. In addition, the last statement, about being behind the scenes, reflects the Māori cultural value of whakaiti, which is contrasted with whakahihi, being humble or modest and arrogant or conceited respectively (Holmes, 2007). This reflects an important trait of Māori leaders, that of self-deprecation and modesty, which are particularly important in agonistic communities. Often, the idea of having a humble leader is ‘rubbed’ by mainstream thinkers who advocate a strong and charismatic leadership role. However, as Jenny reflects on the role of kaupapa Māori leadership as:

Our ability to help people get to that connection sooner rather than later. More organisations are trying to get that hearts and minds connection. I think those things are spiritual nature, in terms of the wairua of people and where they come from. If you can get a respect for that, then you’ll get people operating quite differently.

Māori leadership involves a humility and respect for the wairua of the community that is supporting your leadership. In taking a kaupapa Māori perspective, leadership embodies trust through creating and living whanaungatanga – Julie “Could be the faces are Māori or the kaupapa is Māori” – or creating relational linkage – Russell “Good leadership have this idea that we are all in this together. A bigger understanding that everyone’s on board and we are heading in the same direction. My values and company values align with the workers values.”

A focus on relations is evident in East Asian cultures, for example in the Japanese term marugukae, which refers to the totality of relations as a strong value guiding business orientation in Japanese business (Alston & Takei, 2005). From a kaupapa Māori viewpoint, leadership requires leaders who can position themselves within the field as represented through their whakapapa, informing relationships and practices in dealing with others.

Leadership in the Māori business field must have a realistic vision of a Māori worldview. As Brandi states Māori leadership is realised “when tikanga Māori is not compromised and where economic development is realised. It is leadership being able to have a holistic
approach to business ... and people that are prepared to stay committed and not compromise their standards; their values; their culture.” There are subtle and not so subtle norms derived from kaupapa Māori that guide the expectations placed upon Māori leaders. Therefore, Māori leadership must have the capacity to use all the resources that are available and manage within quite an intricate set of relationships.

Many Māori are conscious of a Māori ‘Self’ and a New Zealand ‘Self’ with cultural nuances attached to both. As with Kondo’s (1990) notion of fragmented self and Shotter’s (1997) social construction of our inner selves, there is a relationality in terms of interactive moments between people at play which informs their interaction with each other and with non-Māori. There is recognition of the interpenetration of self and group in respect of the history of one’s community (D. Hall & R. Ames, 1999; Weiming, 1985) which creates the condition where it is important to know how and where you position yourself within the field. This goes beyond the physicality of identifying a tribal area and familial connections to incorporate what individuals bring to the field in terms of knowledge and experience. At its core it’s about what constitutes the Māori identity as drawn from kaupapa Māori.

A truly empowered Māori business field includes a dynamic combination of Māori and non-Māori people who operate and influence practice. It includes Māori who have been immersed in kaupapa Māori their whole lives, to Māori who identify as Māori but are not comfortable in Māoritanga, or Māori culture, to Māori who don’t identify with the Māori cultural field at all. The research whānau held that the issue is about how we as a society choose to accept or understand different cultural dynamics, which from any perspective opens the door to a wider pool of opportunities. Therefore, we can argue that the Māori cultural field in situ holds the experiences and practices of agents with varying degrees of business acumen and understanding of kaupapa Māori.

Carly discussed the overall tensions faced by Māori leaders in terms of negotiating two worldviews and their associated logics and practices. We identified with Peter Senge’s (1990) notion of creative tension, in terms of having to find a way to bring different realities together.
You have that creative tension which I think would come from the sort of Western or mainstream approach and perhaps those values or approaches that are categorized as a Māori centred approach.

The role of leadership in Māori business has to include the recognition of different values and acknowledge that they themselves will be judged from two different perspectives. Māori leaders have to engage with long term goals, strategies and objectives to address creatively the tensions and synergies that exist within and between fields. Therefore, the type of leaders needed to develop and nurture Māori business are people who are very good with tikanga Māori, languages and culture but who are also very good with issues of general business management. It is incumbent on kaupapa Māori leadership to work to maintain the integrity and values important within Māori and non-Māori frameworks. In this context, we are drawn to the modes of leadership best suited to addressing and optimising creative tension between fields. Māori leadership requires a strategic focus using kaupapa Māori and its associated logic and value system to be able to drive business and entrepreneurship, fostering balance between cultural values and practice.

B. Practice: Contested Leadership

The question of what constitutes leadership is at its core focusing on individual positioning, which leaves out the followers and “without followers you cannot be a leader” (Grint, 2005: 19). Kaupapa Māori leadership is a collective endeavour in the context of the relationality within the field. As Russell comments it is about “bringing people with you. It’s like the first fish you catch toss it back. Acknowledge the mana. Acknowledge that you are part of the system that gets you there. No-one is successful on their own.” He calls this “the synergy of how we can help each other do well at this, rather than we are in competition.” Russell’s comments depict the dynamics of the Māori cultural field, reflecting the relationship between individual and communal objectives.
As identified in Chapter Two, Three and Four, given its basis in kaupapa Māori, Māori business practice relies on the complementarity of explicit/tacit and individual/communal forms of knowledge. Māori leadership implies a level of individuality that makes indirect decisions but there are still collectivities of relationships, people you are responsible for and accountable to. How individuals or collectives construct their identity provides a sense of knowing and understanding of their place in the world and the relationships they have with others or between groups. However, as Sarah expresses in her comment below, understanding Māori business practice is not helped by being afflicted with the banner of communal or collective leadership:

**Sarah**

You can’t tell me that when they saw a warring tribe on the war path, that the rangatira and everybody sat down and had a chat about it. One person made that decision. They were all teams, it was collective, but that person always worked on the basis that they had the backing of everybody else and they were always in touch with their people. I think somehow we’ve got that collectivism wrong.

Much of the rhetoric around this concept involves a cumbersome notion of collective societies that implies a sense of all having a say in decisions being made. It ignores individual relationships and responsibilities. We do agree that an important element of what constitutes Māori identity is embedded in a collective point of view (Holmes, 2007). As Emma states “the idea of whānau being perpetually wedded to whakapapa is post-colonial and is a reaction to the imposition of Pākehā individualism.” In reality, as individuals, Māori are very political about which whānau, hapū iwi, they affiliate to. Emma continues “… look at our metaphors. Our whānau metaphor is very strong. But we have enough Capulet-Montague stories in our history to know that our families were riddled by internal conflict.”

Māori social organisation is a contested type of structure, where leadership stems from the community in which it is embedded and imbued with authority. Chapter Three described Māori society as an agonistic community in which our shared identities relate not to shared perspectives but to a shared process of contestation (Owen, 1995). The notion of contested leadership in the context of kaupapa Māori leadership emerged from comments, such as those
made by Jacob—“there are understood leaders within certain collectives of people”—and Karla—“leadership stems from these people who have the respect of their rohe, runanga, iwi and hapū.” Certainly this is not a new perspective of leadership. Warner and Grint (2006) discuss American Indian traditions of leadership as akin to heterarchies, where leadership is related to the requirements of the community and rooted in situations rather than individuals.

Finally, in understanding the social processes surrounding agonistic communities I return to the earlier comment by Janice regarding the “... the clash between Māori and Māori. As you say a lot of the ones I’m exposed to are high cultural leaders and you’re going to get a new lot who are cultural/business leaders and those two haven’t met yet.” Leadership in the field of Māori business is not necessarily about one or two stand out personalities. Rather it is the participation of people who are leaders in different parts of the field, each with different strengths, experiences, contacts and networks. However, as Tracey states, “one person shouldn’t be everything and so ... we shouldn’t all just be driving to be leaders forever and a day. We should lead to get a certain perspective of the job done, and then step down for the next person to take over.” This draws us to the issue of succession planning in the field of Māori business.

**Brandi**

When I look around at those I consider in the Māori leadership sort of realm, they are so multitasked and just have so many demands on them that in actual fact they do a lot of little things everywhere, but no one thing somewhere. So they’re spread so thinly and I believe that because they aren’t concentrating on one specific area it just takes a lot longer for us to progress.

In addition, the generations coming through bring with them strength of cultural knowledge. We have the emergence of rangatahi who are educated and comfortable in Māori and non-Māori worldviews. The development and implementation of the kōhanga, a Māori language family programme for young children from birth to six years of age and kura kaupapa, state school level teaching in the Māori language, education initiatives reflect Māori aspirations and produce Māori who are bilingual, bi-cultural and well-educated. Those participants are the evolution of Māori economic development in terms of how their cultural consciousness
and confidence in mainstream practices will shape the field. As Jenny notes “we’ve got the benefit of the generations coming through from kōhanga and kura kaupapa ... the strength is coming through but we’ve got to prepare the ground for our young people so that they can play seamlessly across all these boundaries.” In many ways, Māori and indeed younger generations of Māori are more prepared for and capable of articulating bi-cultural understanding which is a powerful indicator for the future of Māori development. Therefore we argue that research into the area of succession planning is vital for Māori leadership to prepare the ground for future leaders in the field.

In American Indian communities leadership is grounded in different forms of persuasion founded by logics derived from each specific spiritual community, which reflects the level of diversity amongst American Indian nations (Warner & Grint, 2006). It is from a similar position that Māori as an agonistic community can find value in their conception of leadership as contested. Indeed, as Tracey attests “leaders need to ... work different politics of the whole perspective.” Within a collective one or a few people can make a decision for the community because they work on the basis that they have the backing of everybody and they are in touch with their people. Māori leadership in business has to take into account the expectations of the Māori community, which requires a comprehensive awareness of strategic intent beyond individuals and even iwi.

III. Kaupapa Māori Leadership

I argue that kaupapa Māori leadership responds to the challenges of dominant leadership orthodoxies in terms of how leaders lead. Chapter Six emphasised the point that in a highly contextualised and pragmatic field, the logics and cultural values imbued in kaupapa Māori influence the way that agents operate. That is to say, the logic of kaupapa Māori is explicitly involved in how agents in the field make sense of the world, and therefore construct specific strategies that negotiate the social world (Bourdieu, 1977). The purpose of this chapter was not to establish a platform of normative leadership styles that we are trying to replace. Therefore, I conclude this chapter by reiterating that the intention here was not to produce the kaupapa Māori leadership model, rather it was to illustrate an approach to leadership practice that is drawn from the logic of kaupapa Māori. In this Section, I offer some conclusions on
the distinctive nature of kaupapa Māori leadership as identified by the several strands of narrative that comprise this chapter.

The focus here is on kaupapa Māori leadership as a socially and culturally constituted form of practice that specifically arises from a convergence of practice where the Māori habitus is dominant. The narrative highlights the discursive interaction of kaupapa Māori that leads to the contexts and choice of ‘strategies’ from which practice regarding leadership emerges. A key feature is the context specificity of the Māori habitus that provides a culturally contingent frame of reference that is grounded in a different logic to that of Western conceptions of leadership. Rueben’s comment, regarding ‘context and rules’ in the introduction to this chapter, locates the role of cultural identity and telos of practice as two distinctive frameworks with which I can base a discussion on the distinctive nature of kaupapa Māori leadership.

A. Kaiārahitanga

I use the term of kaiārahitanga as Māori leadership (Aotahi Ltd, 2005), highlighting that in practice it is the logic of kaupapa Māori which contributes to our understanding of leadership. In keeping with a practical knowledge approach, the role of human activity is central to understanding kaiārahitanga that is influenced by the socialised experiences reflected by position and embeddedness in the field. At the forefront then is the notion of identity, drawn from kaupapa Māori and how it informs leadership decisions. However, it is not merely a question of discerning what is popularly known as the ‘cognitive maps’ which people are supposed to carry around in their heads. Rather it is about unpicking the underlying reality-constituting logics of individuals (themselves understood as socially constructed and temporarily stabilised configurations of relations) (Chia, 1997).

Kaiārahitanga draws from Māori epistemology and whakawhānaungatanga, social relationality as establishing a culturally constituted logic to their activity. The bricolage offered in Part A of Section II illustrates, in terms of who we (as agents in the field) identify as being in positions of leadership, the position held in the field and therefore power. It is this
that influences the characteristics, behaviours and traits drawn from the logic of kaupapa Māori evident in their leadership practice. As Knights and Morgan (1991: 267) argue, power resides “as a property of person or, at best, specific groups”, therefore managers and staff are not just passive agents or victims of power. Those who are depicted as leaders in the field are transformed into subjects that secure their sense of meaning, identity and reality (Knights & Willmott, 1990) through participation in practices of strategy.

While celebrating Māori identity and individuality we must also embrace the strengths associated with inclusivity and recognise that every person has ownership of the field and a role to play. Context-sensitivity allows for the interdependent construal of the Self described by Markus and Kitayama (1991) associated with other non-westernised cultures (for example, Asian, Latin American and Māori). In a later piece, they argue that a group’s cultural ideal of the relations between self and the collective is rooted in institutions, practices and scripts, not just ideas or practices (Markus & Kitayama, 1994). Kaiārahitanga therefore has to negotiate within and develop relationships with a broader array of business, social and cultural dynamics, which results in different expectations in Māori business.

Research in this area has identified that the way in which different cultural groups understand the notion of leadership may not necessarily be the same as in the West, but at times they may draw from similar views (Alves, Manz, & Butterfield, 2005). For example, Alves et al. (2005) highlight the similarity between the relational way of Chinese thinking and transformational leadership which acknowledges the role of social relations. However, as they argue, the most important distinction is whether the notion of relation carries the same meaning in China as in the West. I would also add ‘how’ that notion of social relations is enacted in the different cultural contexts. That is to say, how practice assists decision-makers to generate meaning from and impose meaning upon their surroundings. Therefore, I argue there is a logic of reciprocal exchange in kaupapa Māori leadership that I refer to as relational accountability.

Kaiārahitanga is an elected involvement by consensus and not just a business transaction with a certain level of remuneration and levels of authority. Therefore, Māori leadership has different expectations placed upon it by its community that brings whakamana, or
empowerment that can be taken away. Thus it can be ascertained that kaiārahitanga incorporates an element of ‘responsibility to’ the staff and broader community, not as a hierarchal structure necessarily. Unlike Western organisations, which have had ‘buy in’ to the hierarchical structure, kaiārahitanga has different expectations placed upon it that can bring whakamana, or empowerment or can take it away. The power of the leader comes from the people they are providing leadership to. In this context leaders are accountable to their collective, as opposed to a board of directors who will have a legal separation and limited liability.

Leaders in the Māori business field need to recognise where strengths and weaknesses derived from Māori culture are situated. The type of leaders needed to develop and nurture Māori business are people who are very good with tikanga Māori, languages and culture but who are also very good with issues of general business management. It is leadership that requires a certain degree of creativity and entrepreneurship, not only in business but in how they manage the interaction between commercial and Māori business values. It brings an inherent understanding of managing systems of exchange that makes sense to both fields. Therefore, we look for a wider range of ‘qualifications’ in Māori leadership, qualifications that include social and cultural notions of good practice, as well as economic.
CHAPTER EIGHT: KAUPAPA MĀORI SYSTEM OF EXCHANGE

The purpose of this chapter is to address the research question - *what strategies do agents in the Māori cultural field enact in business?* Specifically, we engage with what socio-cultural resources distinct to Māori business, because they embody kaupapa Māori, which offer potential avenues of improvement in firm performance. In Chapter Two I introduced Bourdieu’s notion of fields as spaces of competition where agents or institutions work at valorising their own capital by means of strategies of accumulation. Given its pragmatic orientation kaupapa Māori operates as a relational field of power particularly given the interaction between the social, cultural and economic systems of exchange that are deeply embedded in practice. It is here in the narrative that discussion turns to forms of taonga, rendered here as those resources both tangible and intangible, that have attached to them a form of value and which are only understood within the interactive context of kaupapa Māori.

In Chapter Six kaupapa Māori was presented as constituted by the conflict involved around attempts to determine the hierarchy of different species of taonga, or capital. The notion of taonga, or capital, illustrates what is at stake in terms of strategies that affect the distribution of capital within the field. The research whānau acknowledged the historical sense of conflict created between Māori businesses subscribing to the field’s cultural context and values and what is viewed as modern business practice. Delia highlighted the conflict between traditional and contemporary systems of exchange:

> The conflict I see in the tourism sense of Māori business are those who are really strong in tikanga and want to hold that and not compromise it. Especially if they are iwi based. This can lead to a lot of conflict in what we do …. For example, we host visitors. How do we take money in exchange for something that is a natural value for us?

*Delia’s* commentary reflects an issue in terms of a Māori business operator wanting to maintain the integrity of kaupapa Māori, in this instance manakitanga, the principle of the quality of caring, kindness, hospitality and showing respect for others (Henare, 2001). *Delia’s*
story, drawn from her experience in a State Sector agency responsible for tourism development, illustrates a disparity between the social processes surrounding manakitanga and putting a market price on a service being offered. In relation to inter-capital exchange in the context of kaupapa Māori the choice of ‘strategies’ regarding resource decisions are informed by the value and distribution of specific forms of taonga, or capital. In addition, the strategies chosen are in response to Western orthodoxy regarding the dominant systems of organised exchange to counter the disparities alluded to by Delia’s comment.

In Section I, I begin by outlining a conceptual space for reconsidering the nature of capital exchange in order to adopt an understanding that is congruent with alternative paradigms (Biggart & Delbridge, 2004; Biggart & Guillen, 1999; Fiske, 1991), and in particular kaupapa Māori. Section II identifies the conception of culturally constituted system of exchange as a medium for valuing socio-cultural resources in a Māori context. To conclude, Section III locates Māori business practice as a consequence of inter-capital exchange through the empowerment of agents in the field by creating power in terms of allocation and distribution of capital in a way that makes sense to them.

I. Challenging Dominant Systems of Exchange

Regardless of the successes of early Māori entrepreneurial activity as discussed in Chapter Three, Māori cultural values and practices have long been described as being quaint and traditional. As a consequence Māori business practice was often interpreted by non-Indigenous observations as unsophisticated, less practical and lacking in efficiency when compared with the dominant logic guiding organisation and management practice regarding firm performance (Chapter Two). The disparity between the two perspectives is hardly surprising given the Western organisational philosophy that emphasises economic outcomes. This section will challenge the dominant frameworks of inter-capital exchange and outline a conceptual space that provides for a contemporary construction of traditional forms of organised exchange.
Chapter Three illustrated that Māori were no strangers to the art of exchange. However, unlike the European model of exchange imposed upon them, the Māori economy is relational, grounded in social organisation. For example, Mikaere made the observation that “our relationship with land is quite different from the Pākehā perspective,” which indicates different priorities attached to ‘land’ as a capital resource given the relational logic of kaupapa Māori. Land and landscape has specific meanings for Māori as it draws us to a sense of belonging as identified by the comments of Brandi and Jenny:

**Brandi**

I’ve been connected to my people and to my land since I was conceived.

**Jenny**

We are a people operating very much from a collective point of view. So much of our asset wealth is tied up in collective or communal assets. So our identity and our sense of self worth and self belief is tied up in that idea. If we don’t have that, then those collective assets will have little value going forwards. … that’s not going to keep us true to our tangata whenua status.

In the context of kaupapa Māori the different forms of taonga, or capital and their distribution are determined by the social processes and systems of exchange distinctive to Indigenous Māori epistemology. While a number of scholars have advocated for a broader understanding of capital exchange (Granovetter, 1985, 1995; Zukin & DiMaggio, 1990), it has been Bourdieu’s work that is most notable in its expansion of capital beyond its traditional classical economic conception. Bourdieu’s framework (Chapter Two) identified and provided distinctions between economic and non-economic capital providing a platform from which to examine the relationship between the social, cultural and economic elements of society.
A. Systems of Exchange

At an abstract level there has been significant scholarly work that has produced alternative ways of conceptualising the notion of market using both social and cultural constructs. The first is associated with theorists of the social structural approach, in particular Granovetter’s (1973; , 1985) work on embeddedness and social ties that revived Polanyi’s (1957 [1971]) idea of economic action as being embedded in social relations of various types. This school of thought conceptualises markets as structures of social relations and focuses on the organisation of market roles as status hierarchies and networks (Baker & Obstfeld, 1999; Burt, 2000; Gabbay & Leenders, 1999). The other conceptualises markets as cultural arenas, involving the view of markets as socially constructed worlds (DiMaggio, 1992). Here the role of a culturally constituted inter-capital exchange is highlighted in terms of its influence on tangible relationships and decision-making of organisation management and human participants.

I use the term system of exchange to distinguish specific types of organised exchange, either implicitly or explicitly, as opposed to market because I subscribe to Biggart and Delbridge’s (2004) view wherein markets are conceived of as one type of exchange system. The representation of these systems of exchange is typically in versions of either a capitalist or socialist economy. The primary distinction being the extent to which the different domains of social life are viewed as ‘friction’ or means of introducing the plurality of social actors and values into the explanation of behaviour (Tsoukas, 1994). Given our discussion regarding the dominant themes of research and practice in organisational research (Chapter Two), we can see the dominant understanding of market exchange and its associated value and norms prescribe an ‘absolutisation of the market’. That is, practice based on the intellectual and ideological treatment of what constitutes the transactional behaviour of market actors, which are assumed to be rational (Barber, 1995).

In addition, the notion of an economy disembedded from society provides a rational economic control of society (politics, family life, education, the arts, settlement patterns, religion) (Stanfield, 1989). The Western rationalisation process therefore deems those elements that can be quantified, such as economic assets, to be valued more highly and
prioritised. The inclusion of esoteric values, as opposed to quantitative monetary values, creates some challenges because they are difficult to identify, measure and manage. As a consequence, it is more difficult to place value on socio-cultural resources and capabilities of a business, mainly because they tend to be more subtle, therefore they have been discounted or ignored all together.

In the classical capital sense economic resources are those physical assets that are able to be deployed, maintain continued independent existence and meet an economic need. However, some scholars bemoan the use of the term capital as too limiting, in that it ignores other things that sustain human life that make it not only tolerable but also satisfying and rewarding (Bourdieu, 1977; DiMaggio, 1992; Smart, 1993; Zukin & DiMaggio, 1990). Human beings want not only physical goods and services, but also social support, physical and social security, freedom of expression, opportunities to develop ourselves and a host of other outcomes not captured by the narrow idea of goods and services encapsulated by the traditional meaning of capital (Inkeles, 2000). Organisational theorists studying the firm’s performance from a resource-based (RBV) perspective have long advanced this idea (Barney, 1991; Peteraf, 1993). Vital to this approach is the level of control over those resources by a firm enabling the implementation of strategies that improve its efficiency and effectiveness, and its ability to achieve superior economic performance and competitive advantage.

The underlying logic of this perspective is the relative impact of firm-specific resources on sustainable competitive advantage and the implications these have on the strategies firms pursue to obtain a competitive advantage (Amit & Schoemaker, 1993; Barney, 1986, 1991; Mathews, 2002; Peteraf, 1993; Wernerfelt, 1984, 1989). Specifically, Barney (1991) argues that for a firm to have this potential, a firm resource must meet four criteria: it must be valuable in that it can exploit opportunities and/or neutralise threats in a firm’s environment; it must be rare amongst a firm’s current and potential competition; it must be imperfectly imitable and non-substitutable, wherein there must not be strategically equivalent substitutes nor ease of obtaining them; and, it must be appropriable to the organisation, that is, the firm must be able to claim ownership and/or control of the valuable and rare resources, and hence lay claim to the rents created by these resources.
The RBV of the firm offers managers a better understanding of which resources provide for better returns and it then stands to reason they can better determine the firm’s competitive strategy. However, as discussed in Chapter Two the RBV maintains a rational focus and positivistic stance that Rouse and Dallenbach (1999) argue fails to access deep understandings of how firms differ and what a difference that makes. The RBV fails to respond to wider contexts that help make intelligible many of the complex details revealed by intimate investigations of minutiae practices.

Economic exchange is only one type of the general process of social interaction. It is affected in different social systems both by their varying values and norms and by other social and cultural variables such as kinship, organisational, knowledge, religious and governmental institutions. Research in the area of firm performance has a long history of using tangible and intangible, economic and non-economic resources that are required to create advantage. More recently we have seen the introduction of relational resources that extend beyond the physical forms of capital (Araujo & Easton, 1999; Dyer & Hatch, 2006; Zaheer & Bell, 2005). As a consequence it has become evident that there needs to be another mechanism for introducing non-economic resources into the equation.

B. A Contemporary Construction of Traditional Exchange

The notion of systems of exchange recognises that there are different types of economic exchange that occur not only in different historical times and in different societies but also very much within the same society (Biggart & Delbridge, 2004). Biggart and Delbridge (2004) developed a classification scheme that distinguished between four different types of exchange systems (Table 4), which they argue reflect the existence of different competing and comparative logics of exchange. A key point, and one I highlight here, is their argument that there exists a “qualitatively distinct type of socially organised exchange that support substantively different orientations to economic action and, hence, culturally different trading areas” (Biggart & Delbridge, 2004: 29).
What this highlights is that there are various exchange arenas, with their own defining logics, that exist in global and domestic economies and which dominate at different periods and locales. Each arena of exchange subscribes to its own logic of operation, its own corpus of etiquette and form of social relations. Additionally, each produces its own system of valuation and rates of exchange, representing a unique style of the tactics and strategies of domination (Yang, 1989).

Table 4 - Systems of Exchange: Actors and Actions (Biggart & Delbridge, 2004:37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Elements</th>
<th>Price System</th>
<th>Associative System</th>
<th>Moral System</th>
<th>Communal System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation of the Exchange</td>
<td>Auction market</td>
<td>Horizontal &amp; vertical networks</td>
<td>Morally regulated exchange</td>
<td>Collegial association; kin or ethnic group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of Social Relations</td>
<td>Universalistic</td>
<td>Particularistic</td>
<td>Universalistic</td>
<td>Particularistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to Action</td>
<td>Individual gain</td>
<td>Mutual gain</td>
<td>Principled</td>
<td>Relational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Actor</td>
<td>Autonomous individualism</td>
<td>Individual or corporate actor in network</td>
<td>Ethically committed individual/firm</td>
<td>Group member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual expectation</td>
<td>Self interest</td>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
<td>Subordination to ethical standard</td>
<td>Subordination to group norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breach of system norms</td>
<td>Social relations</td>
<td>Autonomous self-interest</td>
<td>Disregard of ethical principle</td>
<td>Disloyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System regulation</td>
<td>Self-regulation</td>
<td>Social ties</td>
<td>Organisation of committed actors; third party certifiers</td>
<td>Community; collegial order</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The notion of qualitatively distinct types of socially organised exchange resonates with Fiskes (1991) concept of four elementary structures used to describe the spectrum of human social relations and activity (Table 5). Fiske’s thesis is that people use four elementary relational structures to describe the spectrum of forms of human social relations. Primarily he views all human action as relational (as a counter to the Western misrecognition of this fact) and therefore requires that different relationships are necessarily differently understood and located in the context of the social action.
### Table 5 - Systems of Exchange: Four Relational Models of Human Action (Fiske, 1991:42-49)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Elements</th>
<th>Market Pricing</th>
<th>Equality Matching</th>
<th>Authority Ranking</th>
<th>Communal sharing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal exchange</td>
<td>Pay (or exchange) for commodities</td>
<td>Balanced reciprocity.</td>
<td>Superiors have pastoral responsibility to the community</td>
<td>Collegial association; kin or ethnic group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>Market decides, supply and demand</td>
<td>One person, One vote, equality</td>
<td>By authoritative decree, chain of command</td>
<td>Group seeks consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Influence</td>
<td>Cost/benefit incentives and penalties</td>
<td>Compliance to return a favour</td>
<td>Obedience to authority</td>
<td>Conformity, mutual modelling and imitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Orientation</td>
<td>Corporate, bureaucracy, rational, legal organisation</td>
<td>Equal status peer groups</td>
<td>Hierarchical organisation</td>
<td>Unity, solidarity, kinship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Actor</td>
<td>Autonomous individualism</td>
<td>Individual or corporate actor in network</td>
<td>Ethically committed individual/firm</td>
<td>Group member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral ideology</td>
<td>Abstract, universal, rational</td>
<td>Strict equality and balanced reciprocity</td>
<td>Heteronomy, legitimation</td>
<td>Caring, altruism, protection of relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breach of system norms</td>
<td>Reasonable expectation of risk</td>
<td>Misfortune equally distributed</td>
<td>Have I angered God? Did I disobey the ancestors</td>
<td>Stigmatisation, isolation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fundamental characteristics of culturally constituted system of exchange resonate with features from the other systems of exchange. Each system of exchange represents distinct logics, they are not mutually exclusive rather they traverse institutions (political, economic, religious, etc.) and are intertwined within them (Yang, 1989). The exercise of relations that surround the notion of economy have been scrutinised in understanding the modes of exchange for traditional or archaic societies for many years (Bourdieu, 1977; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Dalton, 1961; Mauss, 1970; Smart, 1993).

In addition, Chinese society uses the notion of guanxi to take on the sense of social connections. Guanxi means relationships built on pre-existing relationships of classmates, people from the same native-place, relatives, superior and subordinate in the same workplace, and so forth (Yang, 1989) and thus is a key dynamic involved in the cultivation of symbolic and social capital to extend social networks to increase trust to facilitate exchange (Bourdieu, 1977). The relationship must be presented as primary and the exchanges, useful though they
may be, treated only as secondary. Indeed it is the strengthening of trustworthy social relationships that is the main objective of guanxi.

Biggart and Delbridge’s (2004) communal system of exchange is also an example, whereby economic exchange is affected in different social systems both by their varying values and norms but also, for example, by such other social and cultural variables such as kinship, organisational, knowledge, religious and governmental institutions. While their view is significant in that it provides for an understanding of exchange systems dependent on developed patterns of social organisation it does not, like potlatch and quanxi, allow for relationality between different systems of exchange.

I suggest that the frameworks offered by Biggart and Delbridge (2004), and Fiske (1991) offer a scheme of differentiation between systems of exchange based upon the actors logic of action and the structure of social relations between them. I argue they provide a contemporary understanding of traditional exchange, providing a counter to the tensions involved between traditional and contemporary systems of exchange. In the following narrative Karla provides examples of kaupapa Māori logic that embodies Fiske’s notion of communal sharing. Karla had been discussing tension in relation to placing value on to practices and resources that are considered ‘traditional’ or ‘cultural knowledge’:

One of our regional operators had an experience where some whānau had contacted them. They said “look we’ve had a call from a fishing lodge who has a client staying with them and they want someone to take them out hunting. They’ve asked us because we’re local hunters and we know the area. We’re also Māori, so we can give them the cultural perspective. They offered us $20 each for a half day trip.” However, the market rates for a half day guide with culture adding value to a tourism experience, would be $400-$600 for a half day.

This story highlights that in many instances there is potential for exploitation of Māori, exploitation which is not necessarily intentional, but is due to the cultural exchange being
under-valued or taken for granted. **Karla** expressed this point when she continued to discuss the notion of whakama, noted here as shy or feelings of lost mana, in business:

> Many Māori will end up being doormats because they don’t get that bit where they can stand up and say ‘excuse me but, no’. You will see that through tour groups or young businesses who bend over backwards, let guests stay, eat, let them learn and participate in cultural activities, but then charge them a small amount or not charge anything because they feel whakama. Now that they have broken bread and welcomed them into the whānau they say we can’t ask family for money.

These stories reflect tension arising over a mis-match of interpretation of cultural practices. In these types of situations, the research whānau identified that non-Māori possibly wouldn’t understand the cultural misunderstanding that occurred. They would participate in the exchange and think that was the end of the relationship, whereas as **Karla** suggests “the Māori operator has agreed to do something and they would expect koha in return, without having to ask for money upfront.” This management of meaning may lead to an uneven distribution of capital in a field because certain forms of capital may be devalued (Everett & Jamal, 2004). In this case symbolic violence is said to have occurred simply due to the meaning of cultural capital from a non-Māori worldview taking precedence.

In addition, decisions around firm resources will also respond differently depending on the logic of the system of exchange. I argue that while there are many attributes of resources that make them likely sources of competitive advantage, which are not amenable to managerial manipulation, it does not necessarily preclude resource-based logic having important practitioner implications. Through the resource-based logic, managers can create a focused list of resources deemed relevant, and value can be determined from the market context within which the resource is to be applied. Therefore, rather than limiting its prescriptive qualities, using a resource-based logic encourages innovative thinking (Barney, 2001).
In using Biggart and Delbridge’s (2004) conception of qualitatively distinct types of socially organised exchange and Fiskes (1991) four elementary relational structures we can locate kaupapa Māori as being guided by its own logic, its own corpus of etiquette and form of social relations. That being so, it therefore produces its own system of valuation and rates of exchange, grounded in the highly contextualised orientation requisite for engagement with Māori business. In the following section we discuss culturally constituted systems of exchange as a medium for valuing socio-cultural resources in a Māori context.

II. Discussion: Culturally Constituted Systems of Exchange

Russell argues that “while there are inanimate objects - everything has a life or a mauri and that’s significant because everything has the potential for life or potential for power.” The constructs ‘social’ and ‘culture’ are rich with complexity and diversity, therefore their connection to organisation is inherently difficult. The research whānau expressed a strong view about the importance of economic viability in business practice. However, when it comes to engagement in economic areas, the argument that economic activity should be absolutely separate from social activity and cultural knowledge was discounted.

A significant characteristic of a Māori system of exchange is the connection to how Māori distinguish and prioritise between the forms of taonga, or capital. Chapter Three outlines key features of kaupapa Māori and Māori social organisation which, in Bourdieuian terms, are constitutive of ‘the way the game is played’. Two key features of that ‘game’ are derived from deeply embedded practices of engaging with social, cultural and economic systems of exchange, and the agonistic construction of social relations.

A. Characteristics of Māori Systems of Exchange

The following narrative reiterates that a business philosophy engaging social and cultural values does not necessarily mean poor commercial performance, therefore we argue that Māori cultural values in business are not necessarily antithetical to good business. They are
central to the construction of the Māori habitus and therefore the field and, distribution of capital. As Jenny comments:

Profitability matters, but the thing when we think about a Māori business is the inter-relationships between economic, social and environmental. A Māori business has an absolute core, the focus in those inter-relationships for the greater good, for future generations and for the rohe. If you’re someone not motivated to that end, you’re just a person in business.

Māori business practice is informed by the logic of kaupapa Māori, which has different modes of value attached to taonga, or capital and therefore different priorities in business. We do not assume that Māori are not motivated financially. Indeed, the research whānau found that Māori business was no different to other businesses in wanting to be successful economically, as discussed in Chapters Three and Four. As Jenny suggests “businesses are fundamentally the same whether they’re run by Māori or not because the fundamentals of business are the same.” A comment by Brandi also reflects how kaupapa Māori offers a different perspective on the relationship between wealth creation and kaupapa Māori business practice:

It definitely appeals to me to have a high standard of living, to have everything that I need and want. But, if I didn’t know my whakapapa, if I didn’t have a connection to my whānau, to my marae, I believe that I would be missing something great from my life. But I’ve been lucky because I’ve been connected to my people and to my land since I was conceived, so I don’t have any of those issues. I know where I’m from, I have all that stability.

However, success for Māori business is about finding that right balance. The research whānau discussed the interconnectedness of economic, social and cultural capital as being clearly evident in traditional Māori society. Every action, whether it be socially or economically motivated is guided by the established frameworks of socio-cultural relations that exist (Chapter Three). As Tracey comments, “the focus has been on independence from
one another. We’ll look at social, or cultural or economic ... However, they are so much embedded in one another that to take them independently it’s not giving the full synergy of all three together to Māori business.” In Bourdeiuian terms this reflects how the different species of capital, the way it is distributed and the power with which it imbues its holders, varies across the different fields. Kaupapa Māori embraces the collective and relational perspective of the cultural, social and economic and therefore Māori economic development is not just about individual monetary improvement, it includes the esteem of the individual and their whānau.

A Māori perspective of business practice engages with the connectivity and relationship between these forms of capital, but there does need to be clear distinction of functionality around commercial and social activity. As Peter argues “we’re here to make money but there is this issue of balance.” When discussing the value attached to and management of capital, we are not suggesting that Māori business prioritise social and cultural capital more or less than other businesses. When it comes to decision making regarding resource usage, certainly profitability of the decision is important. However, other considerations and influences (distinctly Māori) are given equal value, which resonates strongly with current trends in business practice to engage with the notion of sustainable business practice.

The concept of sustainability, in business terms, provides a global platform for economic, social and ecological balance in organisational decision-making (Gladwin, Kennelly, & Krause, 1995). Sustainability represents’ an agenda of organisational change towards shaping practices that consider and mitigate the negative effects of organisational activities on society and the natural world. Importantly, the scope of this concept embodies a pledge to the maintenance of economic, social, institutional, and environmental pillars of human society and advocates a means to configure human activity so that society’s members and economies are able to meet their needs and express their greatest potential in the present, while preserving biodiversity and natural ecosystems indefinitely (Shrivastava, 1995).

The research whānau certainly identified economic, social and cultural capital as being key species of capital in the field that informed Māori business practice. However, for many of our whānau this could not be done in isolation from natural or environmental capital. From a
Māori perspective the protection of our natural environment is an important aspect of achieving balance, as opposed to maximizing utilisation of resources. Peter’s statement locates the idea of looking after assets for future generations as central to the knowledge systems that drive practice in kaupapa Māori:

That’s probably the difference between us and all other New Zealanders. The one true share holder you’ve got is tangata whenua. We are not a sell up and abandon operation. Whereas all other individuals, all other groups can set up, exit and just disappear. That gives you a different perspective.

Peter’s comment reflects the cultural value of kaitiakitanga, understood here as a term that encompasses ethics of conservation and stewardship of our natural resources. It also encompasses the notion of intergenerational wealth through the relationship between these forms of taonga, or capital for the purposes of the ongoing well being and creation of a better world for our children and their grandchildren. This is a point supported by Emma when she says that “for Māori that commitment to that community is longer than they happen to be in business.” It represents a core philosophy in terms of how to manage assets is embedded in oral traditions and practice, conserving and protecting assets for future generations which requires a long term view about returning capital investments (Loomis, 2000).

Māori systems of exchange incorporates investment in and gains from good asset management with a primary purpose supporting social and cultural capital building for the community. An example by Karla also illustrates different priorities in terms of the difference between values-based and commercial based business:

I was talking a few weeks ago with a business operator. They recently had the opportunity to process three lots of about eighty people through their very small FIT (Free Independent Traveller) focused business over the space of a week. Their business is very whānau oriented. The tourists go out with the father, tour around the region and they get the history of the land, the sea, and the links to iwi. They get a very historical view and then they go back to the house and talk
to the whānau or whoever is there at the time. They get taken through the marae and shown how the marae is the cornerstone of the community and that all the houses that sit around the marae are owned by family. So they get this sense of community.

The business operator turned that down even though it would be of commercial value. It would have been a lot of money for them to turn around. However, they felt it would dilute the experience of having eighty people wander through a marae at one time. They made a values-based decision to turn that down because they didn’t think the consumer would get the experience.

**Karla** continued the story to describe how this had allowed them to achieve a quality experience and therefore maintain a sustainable advantage. Therefore, in this example, the Māori operator felt that the potential of diluting the experience was counter to the importance of social and cultural elements of practice, particularly key concepts such as manaakitanga, or hosting and kaitiakitanga, or guardianship.

In Chapter Five I discussed the utility of whakawhanaungatanga as a metaphor for culturally constituted research. As a reminder I described it as the process of establishing relationships, literally by means of identifying, through culturally appropriate means, your engagement, your connectedness and therefore (unspoken) commitment to other people (Bishop, 1996, 2008). I return to it again as an appropriate symbol of social capital in the context of kaupapa Māori, as illustrated by the following comments:

**Peter**

We’re looking at strategic positioning. Building a relationship on the basis that you know we’re the tangata whenua, we’re long term committed to our region.
Jacob

Your credibility and approach is understood by other Māori businesses and I guess they trust you and your involvement with them. So relationships become a very important part to develop my business.

Each of these comments reflects the significance of those series of relationships intrinsic to kaupapa Māori. Both Peter and Jacob’s statements allude to the ability to ‘strategically position’ an operation and establish trust and credibility based on who you are, your identity. As Julie argues our “relationships develop quicker because of our whakapapa links.” Araujo and Easton (1999) identify that “resources cannot be allocated in an economic system without the intervention of human agency” (: 71), therefore social capital as a relational resource resides in the interpersonal relationship between two or more sets of agents.

The notion of knowledge includes the role of general business knowledge combined with the utility of Māori cultural knowledge as cultural capital. That is as a resource or capital asset that contributes to business performance and capability. Karla offers an example from a tourism perspective where a Māori business has to involve telling their story through the experience:

What they are sharing is their lived experience. It is their land. They are talking about my grandfather who stood on this hill. That was his pa site. He protected it from whomever and these are his stories. As opposed to a Māori man stood on that hill and he protected it from some people.

Karla’s commentary illustrates it’s not just a case of showing interesting landscapes, but ensuring that their guests learn about and engage with wairua Māori, which only a Māori business could do. The experience that is being offered is so much entwined with their identity and the sharing of hau that the connection between social, cultural and economic capital is taken for granted. It has always been so. Given its basis in kaupapa Māori, Māori business practice therefore relies on the simultaneous construction of knowledge frameworks from both an individual and collective perspective.
B. Practice: Economy of Affection

For Māori, the exchange of taonga, such as greenstone, carved weapons, preserved 'luxury' goods which were imbued with the mana, or prestige and hau, a vitality of their makers, were treated in a very different in light from that of commodities of very little value (Petrie, 2006). As discussed in Chapter Three, Māori adopted and adapted commercial activities early on to provide a high degree of wealth accumulation and success. In addition, for the most part, those activities were operated based on traditional systems of exchange and communal ownership. That being so, it is not counter to kaupapa Māori to derive economic advantage from social relations or cultural experience and the potential it could have to attract the market. However, traditional systems of exchange can often be deemed as being hostile to capital accumulation, which does not accurately reflect the interconnectedness of social, cultural and economic systems constitutive of a pragmatic worldview, such as kaupapa Māori. As an example I outline a story shared by Jacob that reflects the difficulty of operating Māori business grounded in traditional practices such as utu, or business based on reciprocity:

During the early stages of their business they were finding that the business was not achieving much support. We talked about it and he said to me “There’s something wrong, we don’t seem to be able to get people coming for our business. Yet when we’re doing our tours we find there’s a whole bunch of people who want to join in but they won’t buy things.”

The suggestion was made to resort back to the concept of utu so that there is no charge for the tour. We said, “Tell your customers that they are most welcome to come on the tour and if at the end of the tour if you feel that you’ve enjoyed yourself then you might like to make a koha.” This approach made sense to and fitted the kaupapa of the Māori business in question. It captured how they wanted to provide their service and share their experiences with customers. The sharing of something Māori is action dependent and so rather than someone paying in advance for something, they acknowledge the exchange by way of
koha as utu. This approach made an incredible difference and operated very well.

However, the land this operation worked on was government controlled. As administrators of the land they [the state] would not allow the business to take place on that basis. They could not use traditional approaches to monitor how much income there was and so couldn’t get their concession fees.

In this instance, difficulty arose because koha as a mechanism of exchange does not conform to the parameters of what constitutes commerce as determined by the dominant field. This reflects the problems associated with ‘relating to kaupapa Māori’ in terms of practice, particularly with regards to identifying capital exchange and its distribution within a contested field of power. What is required is a culturally constituted system of exchange embedded within a relational context, as a medium for valuing socio-cultural resources in a Māori context. In situating the field of practice in kaupapa Māori I draw on the notion of economy of affection, and the gift economy in reference to their use as a system of exchange (Bourdieu, 1977; Mauss, 1970; Smart, 1993; Yang, 1988, 1989). I argue that these modes of exchange provide a different conceptualisation of the power relationships and their social and symbolic expressions which have crystallised around production and distribution in the Māori economy.

Fiske (1991) argues that all human action, including systems of exchange are relational. He emphasises the relationality between the systems, where he posits that most societies use all modes of exchange, although they differ markedly in the relative prevalence of the models and in evaluative preferences among them. In the context of kaupapa Māori, communal sharing as a form of exchange is encapsulated in the notion of whānau, which is contingent on inclusion to the collectivity. Equality matching is keeping track of relativity in exchange values, such as the reciprocal balance of utu. Authority ranking is about respect for legitimately achieved social position, such as kaumātua, or respected elder.
The fourth system of exchange in Fiske’s (1991) view is market pricing, where exchange contracts are negotiated in a non-relational way and where the trouble of implementation occurs. Chapter Three identified a philosophy based on balanced exchange was a potential source of vulnerability for post-contact Maori, when faced with a different form of psychological contract grounded in individuality results in one-way relationships and constant failures of reciprocity. Typically, the prevailing conceptualisation of exchange is as an economic market, which Polanyi (1957 [1971])(1957) portrays as an unregulated capitalist market system disengaged society. However, when understood in relation to each other, these four systems offer complementary actions that mesh with each other as a whole and makes sense as an integrated social relationship.

Returning to Mikaere’s statement that “our relationship with land is quite different from the Pākehā perspective,” illustrates how the orientation to land differs between the elementary model of communal sharing which views it as defining ethnic identity, and as land received in trust from ancestors and held for future generations (Fiske, 1991). Mikaere’s comment certainly resonates with communal sharing, compared to market pricing where land is viewed as a capital investment, purchased for expected appreciation, lease or rent, or as a means of production. However, that is not to suggest that Māori would ignore the economic value of land, as the recent Tiriti o Waitangi settlements would attest to.

Henare (1995) describes how traditional Māori society was underpinned by an ‘economy of affection.’ He located this in direct contrast to the capitalist ‘economy of exploitation’ introduced as a result of colonisation (Henry & Pene, 2001). Henare’s conception of the economy of affection was guided by Karl Polanyi’s substantive view of the economic process which saw the economy as an instituted process or cultural pattern of arrangements by which a given human group provisions itself as a going concern. Henare (1997) defines an economy of affection as an invisible economy in which the affective ties based on common descent and common residence prevail, which resonates with Fiske’s (1991) notion of communal sharing that exhibits reciprocal exchange. Fundamentally an economy of affection operates as an informal economy, based on reciprocity and aroha, or love, encourages collective endeavour, communication and redistribution of a range of goods and services (Loomis, 2000).
I make use of the terminology of an economy of affection to reinforce cultural meanings and invigorate the kinship system. From a kaupapa Māori perspective the wairua, or spiritual essence of people and where they come from is a key element of what constitutes business. It is the spiritual values creating awareness that all life, including what is less than human, is sacred (Marsden, 2003), which are intrinsic to exchange. As Carly’s comment suggests “there’s also what is intangible and it comes from the heart and not the head. What is the wairua, or the mana of the project that may not actually be measured, but needs sustaining.” In other words, there must be commitment to the true spirit of practical intention. Incorporating this perspective means business questions are not merely how much profit or turnover is achieved? Instead we include the question of what is the wairua of the decisions or profits generated from the enterprise? That is, it is not solely about the transfer of ownership or control over capital, but rather the sets of relationships based on implicit psychological foundation (Fiske, 1991) that guide the exchange and bind the parties to it. Thus, for Māori business and their decision making it is the existence of wairua as a spirit of intent that captures the moral ideology of communal sharing as a system of exchange.

III. Kaupapa Māori System of Exchange

A key argument in this thesis is that the assumptions of universal applicability fall short of representing the systems of exchange that exist within Indigenous economies (Dalton, 1961). In organisational analysis, we are still plagued by the practices and discourse that underpin the dominant assumptions regarding market exchange discounting social and cultural variables that constitute modern social systems (Biggart & Delbridge, 2004). Recently, there have been increased attempts at understanding the mutual influences between economic exchange and those social-cultural structures in which an economy is embedded (Araujo & Easton, 1999; Biggart & Delbridge, 2004; Granovetter, 1985). Indeed, in relation to organisation studies, we are seeing more organisations attempting to connect to those things that are spiritual or more natural (Ashar & Lane-Maher, 2004).

Practice in the context of kaupapa Māori is constituted by the conflict involved around attempts to determine what the hierarchy of different species of taonga, or capital are. In accordance with the logic of practical knowledge, the notion of taonga, or capital, illustrates
what is at stake in terms of strategies that affect the distribution of capital within the field. While Māori businesses have access to distinct combinations of social and cultural resources and capabilities that can be used to drive and complement firm performance, the operationalisation of them requires a specific type of organised exchange (Biggart & Delbridge, 2004; Bourdieu, 1977, 1986; Mauss, 1970). That is to say, a system of exchange that can take into account the interdependent nature of social, cultural and economic considerations and the synthesis of traditional and contemporary modes of exchange in all effects of practice.

In this chapter, the focus has been on culturally constituted systems of exchange that draws from the logic of kaupapa Māori. In drawing from a pragmatic epistemology to understand the dynamics of capital exchange, we necessarily engage the whole set of power/knowledge relations which are written, spoken, communicated and embedded in social practices (Knights & Morgan, 1991; Powell, 2002). In the following discussion I offer some conclusions, derived from the narrative threads of this chapter, regarding the behaviour shaping implications of a culturally constituted system of exchange, given its distinctive characteristics and relational substance.

A. Whakawhiti

Whakawhiti translates to mean exchange (Aotahi Ltd, 2005) and I use it to represent how the different forms of taonga, or capital are embodied by social practice and systems of exchange distinctive to kaupapa Māori. In considering the way in which Māori place value on different forms of taonga, or capital we can see that each form of taonga, or capital is manifest in different currency. Fields are networks of social relations, structured systems of social positions which are guided by the logics imposed by the different forms of capital (Bourdieu, 1977), therefore, the relationality between the different forms of capital is evident. I argue that whakawhiti embodies the highly contextualised nature of exchange required for a culturally constituted system of exchange, and resonates with the pragmatist epistemology of kaupapa Māori.
This perspective supports the kinship system and allows redistribution of a limited range of goods, services and cash to maintain cultural integrity and the worldview. Such a society, embodied by an agonistic pluralism (Mouffe, 2000) is held together by the principle of reciprocity and a sense of interdependence (Owen, 1995). In this context exchange is relational creating obligation and reciprocity. A key feature of which is that it allows Māori business practice to engage with the connectivity and relationship between forms of taonga, or capital.

Māori business practice is about achieving balance between economic, social and cultural taonga, an approach founded on a participatory framework and cycles of reciprocity, which have been the engines of Māori field development pre- and post-colonisation. However, there does need to be clear distinction of functionality around commercial and social activity. Karla’s comment in Section II, Part A of this chapter is illustrative of the different ‘currency’ associated with social and cultural elements of practice, particularly key concepts such as manaakitanga, or hosting and kaitiakitanga, or guardianship.

Whakawhiti is compatible with the current trend in practice towards more sustainable and ethical practices, going beyond practices such as rationalisation and division of labour, recognising cultural diversity and heterogeneity in exchange environments. Within the context of kaupapa Māori the expectation is that capital maintains whanaungatanga, which goes beyond the economic aspect of wealth creation and includes the logic of reciprocity. Reciprocity occurs when the relevant values and norms, either of the whole society or some part of it, prescribe that individuals who have reciprocal obligations to one another by virtue of their status in any one of a variety of particularistic collectivities (family, clan, tribe, friendships or communities) give to and receive from one another material and immaterial goods in traditionally patterned ways, just by virtue of these relationships (Polanyi, 1945).

Reciprocity in exchange has significance for role systems in that it tends to structure each role so as to include both rights and duties. Gouldner’s (1960) analysis of reciprocity as a pattern of exchanging goods and services, of benefits or gratification, also incorporates generalised social, cultural and moral norms which define certain actions and obligations as repayment for benefits received. Failure to respond appropriately, as per the norms of cultural
convention, places the recipient into a subordinate position. I return to Karla’s point made in Section I, Part B of this chapter regarding Māori operators expecting koha as a mechanism of exchange. Koha, as a donation, gift or contribution of sorts is a mechanism of traditional Māori systems of exchange in that it works in conjunction with the principles of manaakitanga to regulate reciprocal relations. I argue that by using the language and meanings associated with kaupapa Māori, we illustrate how this interaction does not have to be viewed as a tension, but rather as an opportunity to create synergy between traditional and contemporary systems of exchange.
CHAPTER NINE: KAUPAPA MĀORI COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

The purpose of this chapter is to address the research question - what strategies do agents in the Māori cultural field enact in business? Specifically, this chapter discusses those strategies Māori use to manage the network of relations in the field that influence practice and improve performance. An important element within the field of Māori business and one which is central to the way they operate is related to who you are in relation to everyone and everything; past, present and future (captured by the notion of habitus and discussed in Chapter Seven). The importance of this is supported by the comment by Brandi:

Most non-Māori business people are more reserved with what they tell you. Whereas, Māori people will tell you the whole lot, their whakapapa, who they don’t like, who they do like and you have this great laugh with them. And they really appreciate that personal touch and they really appreciate acknowledgment of who they are and where they are from. You end up talking about their whānau half the time. It’s a point of commonality and makes them feel they are not being talked down to or catered for. It’s not necessarily in a Māori way but recognising that commonalities are addressed. You’ve got common ground.

The research whānau determined that Māori are good relationship builders because ‘who you are’ and ‘where you come from’ are important facets of building a trusting relationship. Humans are always trying to find commonality with others and for Māori there’s more of a connection and understanding the means by which we acknowledge that relationships are never just about individuals. Māori build relationships in the field on the basis that they are tangata whenua with a long term and committed attachment to specific rohe, defined here as region.

In addition, Chapter Six locates kaupapa Māori as a field that is hierarchically positioned with other fields, in which the State is dominant. Delia recognised this as an issue that contributed to misunderstanding and conflict as what she “saw were two worlds that worked in different ways and didn’t necessarily understand each other.” Delia’s comment reflects the
symbolic violence perpetuated on Māori businesses through the way in which the demarcation of power is controlled between Māori and the State, forming the basis for symbolic struggles over the power to produce the legitimate vision of the world (Bourdieu, 1989, 1991b). This has significant implications for Māori businesses operating in a field dominated by the practices associated with the doxa of mainstream or Western political ideology.

This chapter presents the field of relations that exist in the inter-firm configuration of relationships and networks, formal and informal, public and private that influence Māori business practice. In Section I, I begin by outlining a conceptual space for reconsidering the nature of the field of organisation and management as an inter-dependent construction of connections between agents in the field. In section II we engage with the notion that Māori business practice takes place in a contextualised field of struggle. The discussion highlights the discursive interaction of kaupapa Māori that leads to the contexts and choice of ‘strategies’ from which practice regarding business relations emerges. Finally, Section III presents collaborative forms of relations as culturally constituted forms of practice, in the context of kaupapa Māori.

I. Challenging the Disembedded Construction of the Field

Bob argues that in business “it would be politically correct to say that by Māori, for Māori, but I find that overly simplistic.” Often the adage ‘By Māori, For Māori’ is mistakenly viewed as a response to the imposition of a specific cultural hegemony, oriented towards mainstream logics. However, the true intent of tino rangatiratanga, is described as the right of self-determination for Māori peoples in relation to others (Bishop, 2008). This draws us to an important narrative thread, which is the notion of interconnectedness and those broad sets of relationships in which Māori agents and hence businesses are embedded. Networks, and in particular the networks of relations within which Māori businesses operate, can only truly be understood by examining the perceptions of the human actors that exist within the field (Gulati, Nohira, & Zaheer, 2000; Wasserman & Faust, 1994).
A constant theme in research whānau discussion was regarding Māori taking responsibility for their own development. Peter argued that we can fall into the notion that modern business practice and Māori businesses “are two totally separate things and they can’t be. What it is about really is the cultural context and values we have.” Peter’s comment highlights an important narrative theme of this chapter. The synthesis between mainstream and kaupapa Māori, which raises the challenge of creating processes and systems grounded in different socio-cultural frames of reference.

Until recently, using culturally constituted relationships to leverage tangible and intangible resources was a largely under-explored opportunity in Māori business. While many Māori businesses would quickly identify connections to other Māori actors, they oftentimes do not see informal networks as being valuable to their business performance. Māori businesses operating today must explore the potential of networking. This section continues on to challenge the doxa of the field in relation to collaborative efforts between Māori and mainstream. I do so to develop an understanding of business practice in the context of kaupapa Māori in a way that offers insight to our approach regarding the phenomenon of business relationships.

A. The Independent Nature of the Field

Peter

Recognise strategically that for us to achieve … [culturally, socially and economically] … we need to find alliances that give us that skill, that capital or markets to round out the picture we are trying to achieve.

Peter’s statement is referring to the notion that businesses do not operate within a vacuum. The organisation can be viewed as an entity that does not exist independently from its surroundings, including both tangible (market, organisational and industry factors) and intangible (social, cultural, ecological, etc.) contexts and relations (Granovetter, 1985, 1995). Māori businesses need to be able to develop relationships that “round out that picture,” which requires attention to cultural, social and economic networks of relations. This
perspective provides the basis for recognising relationships between individuals as opposed to merely focusing on purely economic motivations to describe their activity and highlights the engagement or embeddedness between society and economy (Granovetter, 1985; Polanyi, 1945).

Interestingly, recent research and practice in the academic tradition of network theory has illustrated a shift that has resonance with the Māori view. Networks are the most commonly known entities associated with interconnected relationships that provide opportunities for and constraints on behaviour by focusing attention onto relations and patterns of interaction, and not isolated individual actors (Brass, Galaskiwicz, Greve, & Tsai, 2004). The most dominant conception of strategic networks is the collection of organisations “linked together through chains of ownership relations arranged in a pyramidal or hierarchical fashion” (Smangs, 2006: 891). Research in this field has focused on a variety of theoretical perspectives, levels of analysis and outcomes (Borgatti & Foster, 2003), including learning in alliances (Gulati, 1998, 1999), network ties (Burt, 2001), network resources (Dyer & Singh, 1998; Gulati, 1999). In organisational literature, the concept of strategic networks has grown considerably given the associated economic consequences of firms participating in inter-firm relationships (Borgatti & Foster, 2003; Dyer & Singh, 1998; Jarillo, 1988).

The strategic network perspective reveals that the embeddedness of firms in networks of external relationships with other organisations can provide significant implications for firm performance (Dyer & Hatch, 2006; Gulati, Nohira, & Zaheer, 2000; Zaheer & Bell, 2005). Indeed as Gulati et al. (2000) argue, the image of autonomous organisations striving for competitive advantage is increasingly inadequate in a world in which firms are embedded in networks of social, professional, and exchange relationships. Gulati (1998) identified three related research themes that are illustrative of networks and associated alliance structures: first, the unit of analysis that is usually adopted is the firm or the alliance, most often depicted as a dyadic relation; second, examining the formation and performance of alliances in an asocial context; and third, focusing primarily on firm- and industry-level factors that compel firms to enter alliances. However, the prevailing emphasis of these approaches is grounded in a functionalist and mechanistic view, stemming from a focus to quantify network structures. A resulting of which is a sterile and asocial understanding of networks that tends towards
descriptive patterns of relationships in terms of density, clusters and nodes (Borgatti & Foster, 2003; Smangs, 2006).

More recently there has been an ever-increasing focus on networks and organisations that moves away from individualist, essentialist and atomistic explanations towards more relational, contextual and systemic understandings (Borgatti & Foster, 2003). Current approaches to network research and practice indicate a movement towards the inclusion of more socio-cultural contexts in understanding networks and relationships (Granovetter, 1995; Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998; Smangs, 2006). The contextualised approach to understanding networks is grounded in the strand of research in economic sociology that explains how economic actions influence the social structure of ties within which they are embedded (Granovetter, 1985). Therefore, realising that economic actions are influenced by the social context in which they are embedded and that actions can be influenced by the position of actors in social networks (Gulati, 1998).

In the following discussion I turn to the role of relationships and networks in the field and management of Māori businesses. Managing the people and operational processes within the organisation requires recognising that management and organisations are dependent on the contextual environment. Therefore we need appropriate mechanisms to facilitate engagement between and within fields. The objective here then is to develop a conceptualisation of networks that more accurately portrays our understanding of Māori business practice.

B. An Interdependent Approach

A key thread of the narrative was that Māori make connections between people very quickly because it comes naturally through the orientation of the Māori worldview that everything is connected. For example, there is a reciprocal rather than commodified perspective on relationships, although as success in Māori business performance demonstrates, the former does not preclude the latter. As Russell comments “a key aspect of building relationships in a Māori context is that it is about exchanging and accepting stories, knowledge and experiences.” A significant element of this approach is kanohi ki te kanohi or face-to-face,
which refers to putting a face and a history to the people and organisations they are dealing
with and is absolutely integral to building relationships with Māori.

**Julie** also suggests we are “very protective of the relationships. The trust is between
individuals not organisations.” These narrative comments focus on the particular relations
people have, such as respect and friendship, that influence their behaviour (Nahapiet, Gratton,
& Rocha, 2005) and highlights internal social structures as linkages among individuals or
groups, specifically in those features that give the collectivity cohesiveness to facilitate the
pursuit of collective goals (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). Examples include firm structures
based around the flexible network and less concentrated industries located in countries such
as Taiwan, which is considered a familistic society with an ethic driven by Confucianism and
the elevation of family bonds above all other social loyalties (Biggart & Guillen, 1999;
Fukuyama, 1995).

In relation to Māori business, **Emma’s** point that “kaupapa Māori is so much bigger than a
business for yourself” reflects the Māori principles of whānau, the embodiment of
relationships and connectivity within and between communities, and whakawhanaugatanga
which is noted by Bishop (1996) as the process of establishing relationships and
connectedness to other people. The concept of relational embeddedness describes the kind of
personal relationships people have developed with each other through their history of
interactions (Wasserman & Faust, 1994), which highlights the consideration of context.

This brings us to the notion of business groups, entities described as a loose constellation of
firms spanning a wide variety of industries and held together by common ownership of
informal control ties (Kock & Guillen, 2001), the constitution of which brings to mind the
chaebol of Korea or the keiretsu in Japan (Fukuyama, 1995; Granovetter, 1995; Guillen,
2000). In his desire to develop a more sociologically inspired approach to understanding
business groups, Granovetter presented a working definition:

One can consider as business groups those collections of firms bound together in some formal and/or
informal ways, characterised by an 'intermediate' level of binding. This means that we exclude, on the
one hand, a set of firms bound merely by short-term strategic alliances, and on the other, a set of firms
legally consolidated into a single entity (Granovetter, 1995: 95).
I find the features of business groups, as described by Granovetter, useful in terms of understanding the role and series of relationships of networks in the context of kaupapa Māori. It provides for the conceptualisation of business groups as predominantly coordinated by means of social relation, providing for a more sociologically inspired representation of how firms interact (Smangs, 2006).

An important feature of a social network perspective, and one that resonates with the pragmatic orientation of kaupapa Māori, is the ontological assumption that the concepts inherent within organisational literature dealing with network relationships can be socially and historically constructed (Granovetter, 1985; Halinen & Tornroos, 1998). In addition, businesses that emphasise interdependence rather than independence may emerge as a distinguishing characteristic of emerging organisational paradigms (Daft & Lewin, 1993; Dyer & Hatch, 2006). In the following section we discuss culturally constituted collaboration in order to develop new insight to a kaupapa Māori approach regarding the phenomenon of business relationship.

II. Discussion: Culturally Constituted Collaboration

The spirit of Māori society lies not in its organisational structures, but in the ongoing, dynamic relationships between its members. If this realisation is not made soon, then the institutional structures and practices which were constructed to empower Indigenous peoples such as Māori may end up ultimately destroying the very cultures they were meant to protect (Barcham, 2000: 151).

Practice, as argued by Brown and Duguid (2001), reflects epistemic differences amongst communities within organisations, which I argue also extend to the networks of relations that exist within and between fields. Developing connections with mainstream agents through networking as Jenny suggests, “doesn’t mean that you lose your Māoriness,” rather that we are embracing the diversity and uniqueness of our own context. Barcham’s (2000) quote draws us to two important threads of narrative. In the first instance, he is engaging with the ideas of misrecognition, complicity and of symbolic violence, which are at the centre of Bourdieu’s conception of power (Bourdieu, 1977, 1984; Bourdieu, 1999; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Secondly, he reminds us that kaupapa Māori is pragmatic and this
pragmatism is expressed most clearly in seeing everything as relational and highly contextualised in its processes, which has been a constant theme throughout this thesis.

Symbolic violence is a manifestation of deep structural power exerted through the doxa and tacit modes of socio-cultural domination that structure action and impose legitimacy of the status quo (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Everett & Jamal, 2004), and includes actions that have discriminatory or injurious meaning. I mention it again to remind us that it is important because in Bourdieuan terms, the State with its own driving logics and norms of behaviour sets ‘the rules of the game in which we are participants.’ In this instance Barcham refers to institutional structures that are on the surface said to be there to protect, conserve and empower a people, when in reality the mono-cultural logic guiding their practices can be effectively destructive. In the following section a key thread identified by the narrative is explored, which is the need for a reconstitution of the institutional framework to ensure that the rules of game make sense to all of the agents within the field.

In addition, another important narrative thread identified by the research whānau is collaborative engagement with other fields that will in the long term strengthen and protect Māori culture. The notion of collaboration and power, of stakeholders engaging in an interactive processes that informs their practice, is an important and emergent theme in the organisational literature (Brown & Duguid, 1991; Everett & Jamal, 2004). We argue that in order to mobilise resources as efficiently and effectively as possible Māori business practice is a collaborative enterprise. In part B of this section, we discuss the distinctive character of relationships and networks understood from within the cultural context of kaupapa Māori.

A. Reconstituting the Institutional Arrangements

In Chapter Eight I described the story shared by Jacob that reflected the difficulty of operating Māori business guided by the logic of traditional practices because they do not conform to the parameters of what constitutes commerce as determined by the dominant field. Jacob concluded his story by stating that “this type of tension can only be resolved through some level of structural change.” As discussed (Chapters Three and Six) a misrecognition of power relations is embedded in the institutional arrangements of New
Zealand, which are restrictive to Māori forms of organisation and practice. For Bourdieu, misrecognition occurs in concealing how the game reproduces social inequality through the reproduction of the hierarchy of positions and capitals. Therein, lies the “true foundation of a realistic theory of domination and politics” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

**Brandi**

Even though government agencies thought they were helping Māori with capacity building, with extending their skill level - and there has been a lot of good as far as the capacity building element has gone. It’s exposed a lot of Māori people to opportunities they never would have had if there hadn’t have been that funding - I still felt they were agency controlled … stuck between a rock and a hard place, because here we were these public servants, trying to empower our people but with the restriction of a charitable trust, incorporated society, whānau trust entity, and then also the criteria that the government insisted on.

**Brandi’s** comment expresses the concern regarding the constraints of imposing strict government criteria and policy onto Māori business practice. The issue therefore is that State policy has legitimated its own power and authority to establish the structure and role of the economy, which predetermines the behaviour of the agencies and agents that operate in that economy. For example, a story offered by **Karla** illustrates the interactions and inherent tension between fields and what role it plays in practice:

From a Māori operator’s perspective the Regional Operator are the people who are offshore marketing them, talking to the wholesalers and selling the destination. They don’t have a Māori mandate.

But when you get a regional operator, in terms of Māori tourism product, saying I have done the product, I can answer all questions they ask about it. There is no way you could even hope to answer questions that wholesalers would have about a product when you’ve only had a walk through and assume that they are going to do a better job than the Māori Regional Operator.
Just because she’s seen the product and “I have an affinity with Māori.” But you’re not Māori and that’s the problem.

In this example, State policy has established the structure and role of a particular industry, which predetermines the behaviour of the agencies and agents that operate in that industry. In this instance it has led to conflict between non-Māori definitions of Māori phenomena being given precedence over kaupapa Māori. The research whānau identified that an important thread of narrative surrounds the structural change of New Zealand’s framework of institutional arrangements.

Without doubt, government agencies offer services that add value to Māori business practice. However, in the past Māori businesses have failed to engage with these agencies in a collaborative and enduring way. Partially as a result of the symbolic violence perpetuated upon their practices, however symbolic violence at its most effective requires an element of complicitness of the subordinated party (Everett & Jamal, 2004). This occurs when the dominated become so entrenched in the mechanism of their domination that they begin to undertake discourse and practices that reproduce it. For example:

*Jenny*

A Māori business owner requiring significant funds to commercialise her product was very emotional regarding the lack of support from Māori led agencies. The question put to her was, “why did she see it as being the responsibility of Māori agencies and lending organisations to be available to her to take it to the next step? Why was that such a critical issue for her?”

*Jenny’s* Māori business operator may have been exhibiting a sense of frustrated obligation. However, in *Jenny’s* words “*she had gotten so entrenched in this idea that only Māori agencies could help her that she couldn’t see what she was doing, which was limiting her choices of investors or contributors.*” A narrow mind-set can exist within the Māori cultural field that creates limitations and barriers. However, we must recognise that those ‘mind-sets’
or ‘worldviews’ are often those which we have bought into, which are intricately bound up with technologies of power which reproduce particular discursive practices (Knights & Morgan, 1991). Those mechanisms and systems of organisation through which the State is positioned as the legitimate authority, confirmed in authoritative publications, practices and policy making (Bourdieu, 1991b).

The State will always have a role in the field of Māori businesses given that there is specific policy and agencies mandated to provide service to Māori business. However, a more coherent and strategic approach throughout the public sector is required to facilitate effective engagement. Key findings from the Hui Taumatā Project (2006) regarding the role of the State and its framework of institutional arrangements were that those agencies that specifically provide services to Māori businesses need: to become more proactive and flexible in the sense of who they target and how they reach their communities of interest; to include models that reflect how social, cultural and economic capital interact and contribute to one another; to develop closer engagement within the public sector to generate a more cohesive network of agencies that work together to meet the needs of the Māori business community; and to identify those agencies that adequately represent and contribute to network relations with the private sector.

This leads us to strategic partnerships between Māori and non-Māori commercial operations. The significance of relationships and networks between Māori and mainstream, and even within Māori communities, was highlighted in the briefing report provided to the Hui Taumata Taskforce and Business New Zealand. The report, ‘Building Business Partnerships: Closer Collaboration between Māori and General Business Communities’ profiled the status of engagement between the Māori business community and private and public sector business organisations (Hui Taumata Project, 2006).

The report’s primary focus was on finding ways for these two communities to work collaboratively for the benefit of each other and the New Zealand economy. In relation to the discussions of the research whānau the report highlights three significant premises required for successful Māori business practice. These are that the Māori and general business communities perceive and understand the world from different but equally valid perspectives
that influence their business practice; that these different perspectives must be recognised and acknowledged if strategic engagement between the two communities is to be developed; and that effective engagement requires mutual commitment, partnership and enduring relationships (Hui Taumata Project, 2006).

“Many Māori participants had some association with their local whānau and Māori community. The participants from Otago, Wellington and Nelson identified respective Māori business networks as communities where they could connect with other Māori businesses and garner knowledge and support when they needed to access other business services.

These networks were viewed as being pivotal to the growth of confidence and networking for Māori business operators …

“For many starting up they don’t have the confidence and they prefer to deal with Māori people. …we’ve found they definitely won’t go to the likes of Chamber of Commerce in the first instance. They may end up there eventually, but often it is through us [Māori business network] or through the Māori business facilitation service. Once they have their business plan in place and feel more confident then they may engage more.

Māori participant” (Hui Taumata Project, 2006: 29-30)

The development of Māori business involves the facilitation of engagement with other mainstream business networks, but importantly creating and nurturing robust Māori business connections with other Māori networks. Typically, Māori do find it somewhat difficult to understand and negotiate within the government institutional framework, which is why networks such as the Māori business networks are important structures within the field. These networks provide a good connection to mainstream agencies such as Chamber of Commerce and Biz mentor programmes, and we argued that the Māori business network structure provides a safer environment for Māori to operate in by encouraging mentoring and peer support.

For many Māori, seeking out other Māori in similar fields to network with is a valuable counter to feelings of isolation, but to share knowledge, ideas and create a sense of community in business practice is also important. As a Māori business participant noted in the Hui Taumata Project:
Māori business networks provide a great source of information, advice and peer support. We have developed a strong sense of community and trust. Sometimes it’s just about belonging to a group that understands me and my wanting to learn more about my Māoriness (Hui Taumata Project, 2006: 43).

The Hui Taumata project (2006) identified that Māori business networks that were operating during the undertaking of the research were developed around business orientation or specific issues and values. Significantly these networks were not constituted by a single network, but by several, and so we include the ‘clustering together’ of Māori businesses from across a variety of industries and sectors. We argue that these Māori business networks represent a form of collaborative systematic exchange, offering transfer of different kinds of favours and obligations between actors, including resource transfers and information transmissions (Smangs, 2006). The research whānau identified the term ‘business whānau’ to represent the notion of culturally constituted forms of collaboration, which reflect the context and power relations of kaupapa Māori.

**B. Practice: The Business Whānau**

*Rueben*

My relationship with the business is not as a single entity. There is no business entity. It is that entity and everything that sits around me … the whānau. So the whānau’s as much of the business as anything else.

*Rueben’s* comment illustrates how the logic of kaupapa Māori provides the foundation of the business whānau. I use the three analytically separable elements offered by Smangs (2006) for the conceptualisation of the business whānau: network(s) of interrelated firms, the institutionalised logic of reciprocity, and the intersubjective interpretation of actors inside as well as outside the group. First, we engage with the notion of business groups as a network of firms in terms of the whole group entity representing more than the sum of individual firms; while firms and individuals may come and go the group remains (Borgatti & Foster, 2003; Granovetter, 1995; Smangs, 2006). As *Jacob* states “Māori concepts, for example whanaungatanga is actually about relationships, that’s a basis for doing business. Relationships as a basis for doing business.” Therefore, we argue that Māori businesses
operate in networks which most often reflect a whānau or collaborative perspective. The notion of whakawhanaungatanga with an emphasis on social relationality beyond genealogy that captures the sense of community emerged as a significant cultural value driving Māori business relations.

From a kaupapa Māori perspective the idea of creating a business partnership is not simply a matter of forming a relationship. As Russell suggests kaupapa Māori has a reciprocal energy in “the synergy that is created through Māori coming together for any businesses ... There is no competition. The synergy is ‘how can we help each other do well at this.’ Rather than I’m not going to share much because we are in competition.” This leads us to the second element useful in our description of the business whānau, and one which is aligned with Fiske’s (1991) notion of a communal sharing as a system of exchange, the logic or norm of reciprocity (as identified in Chapter Eight). The logic of reciprocity inherent in the nature of business relationships is important, particularly in the context offered by kaupapa Māori. Business relations can be more formal or alternatively based on values such as trust and reciprocity.

**Karla**

For example, in the case of a Māori horticultural business that entered into arrangements, but not formal contracts, with other Māori landowners for the use of their land. This presents a high risk if they’re investing in equipment and resources to develop that land and to produce from it. The whānau could turn around and say “thank you but we don’t want to carry on with this now.” However the relationship has endured primarily because the arrangements are founded on personal relationships and a reasonable sharing of the benefits.

*Karla’s* commentary reflects that there is a different logic guiding Māori businesses in terms of their relationship building and networking. Therefore, establishing rigid contractual relationships as the sole basis for the business relationship is not the best way to engage with Māori businesses. This does raise the question of when in the relationship the arrangements should be more formalised, particularly important to avoid the tension that can arise as the business becomes larger or more successful. I suggest that an answer to that question would
not necessarily be found in the Western centric network literature, but more likely in study of the organisation of East Asian capitalism (Guillen, 2000).

As an example, I draw attention to Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars (1997) concept of cooperative competing derived from East Asian values and their influence on business practices that facilitates closer and more enduring relationships. Coopetition is the simultaneous competition and cooperation between two or more rivals competing in global markets (Luo, 2007). As an example, Tata Motors, a multi national corporation headquartered in Mumbai, India both cooperates (in joint marketing, research consortia, supply sharing) and competes (in production, sales and marketing) with many rivals, including Ford, Kia, Mitsubishi, and Hyundai, in a few concentrated markets such as India and South East Asia (Luo, 2007). I suggest this business model has placed emphasis on a less adversarial perspective of networks and relationships.

Importantly, there is recognition that there are two levels, the individual but also the community. Smangs (2006) identified this as the subjective sense of belonging together that prevails in a communal system of exchange (Chapter Eight), which locates human action in a relational context. In the context of kaupapa Māori, the notion of whānau draws us to communal sharing as a form of exchange encapsulated by its collectivity. Therefore, consideration must be paid to the ways in which business groups are perceived inter-subjectively and constructed by individuals in the process of recurring social interaction. Indeed, the value and contribution of the existing Māori business networks was a prominent disclosure from the Hui Taumata research project. As one participant of the research responded:

Māori business networks provide a great source of information, advice and peer support. We have developed a strong sense of community and trust. Sometimes it’s just about belonging to a group that understands me (Hui Taumata Project, 2006: 47).

For Māori, the conception of a business network, or business whānau, relies not only on the practical business networking and building Māori business capability, but to do so in a way
that makes sense to Māori. Thus, that sense of belonging and development of a community are important catalysts for effective relationship building. This is representative of the Māori community and the sense of belonging, where people are connected by family or wider whānau relations where we include the intersubjective interpretation of actors inside as well as outside the group (Smangs, 2006). Indeed, the project commented further that many participants noted that they felt more comfortable and safe when asking questions and even sharing their opinions because the respective network hui were designed to meet the needs of its members. A point reiterated by Nancy, “my Māori networks are not like my Chamber of Commerce networks, because that has got totally different ways of approach to business.”

Herein lies the third element of practice that constitutes the business whānau, which recognises that the development of relationships does not require individual businesses to abandon identity, rather they pose an opportunity to develop niche markets and a degree of specialisation that will in the end provide Māori with a wider range of options and a value-added product (Durie, 2003). That being so, Māori businesses operate in a dynamic and culturally-specific network of relationships, where meaning is derived from a common discourse among people within it that enables them to recognise and state the terms of their interdependence (Smangs, 2006). Therefore when looking for potential business partners, regardless of the nature of the relationship, more often than not Māori will look for non-Māori organisations that have the same or similar values, as a comment by Tracey illustrates:

I think it’s something to do with that wairua that helps us to meet the right people at the right time to do the same things together. Whenever I go out there to develop relationships with organisations, I ensure I do whakawhanaungatanga with them first. Before even getting down to the nuts and bolts, just to be able to see where the values are. Because if I dare to bring them in front of my people they’ll get eaten alive. So why would you ever want to do that to them, let alone yourself.

Māori look for practice that sits comfortably within kaupapa Māori. Tracey’s comment draws attention to ensuring a complementarity exists between organisational cultures when determining the nature of an appropriate business relationship. The relational structures
surrounding iwi and whānau are also significant, particularly when based on Māori resources (land, knowledge) and it is important to get buy-in from the whānau. As Karla discussed “in the Kaikoura example, before they started that business that had a hui at the marae and they asked all of their aunties and uncles for permission to tell the stories.” It would be the community that provide Māori businesses the licence to operate, particularly those oriented towards a Māori centred approach or based on local Māori knowledges.

Kaupapa Māori has specific logics that guide behavioural norms for Māori society and this also applies to networks of relations, which is supported by Granovetter’s (2005) argument that social structure has an impact on economic outcomes. Thus, in terms of governance the business whānau can thus analytically be conceived of as predominantly coordinated by means of social control mechanisms (Smangs, 2006). For example, as Julie identified “it would be really easy to exploit people ... but it would only happen once because trust, utu and goodwill holds the relationships together.” A statement that reflects the control mechanism relative to a system of exchange embodied by communal sharing (Chapter Eight) and that is a form of socio-cultural exclusion.

III. Kaupapa Māori Collaborative Relationships

This chapter presents narrative construction of the inter-firm configuration of relationships and networks, formal and informal, public and private that influence business practice. Māori businesses operate in a field that is hierarchically positioned with other fields, in which the State is dominant (Bourdieu, 2001; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992), raising the challenge of creating processes and systems grounded in different cultural frames of reference. Peter’s comment in the introduction to this chapter regards the presumed tension between Western and Māori business practice as being different, is wrong. His statement highlights that it is in fact about ‘context and values’ expressed through practice which is important. In this Section, I offer some conclusions on the distinctive nature of collaborative networks in the context of kaupapa Māori as identified by the several strands of narrative that comprise this chapter.
I argue that there are distinctive opportunities to be gained from the ‘harmony’ between the two worldviews in business, in fact this duality of capability can be viewed as a form of advantage. The challenge is how to bring those worlds together so Māori business can mobilise resources to benefit the whole community as well as protecting those values that are unique to kaupapa Māori. The objective then is to develop a conceptualisation of networks that more accurately portrays our understanding of Māori business practice. This requires that we draw on the logic of kaupapa Māori to encourage work within collaborative networks that engage with the Māori community and with non-Māori entities at both a strategic and tactical level.

A. Kōtuitui

I argue that in order to understand Māori business practice grounded in a different cultural frame of reference, we need to look to the logic of pragmatism and context of relations. I use the term kōtuitui as network (Aotahi Ltd, 2005) to highlight that in practice it is the logic of kaupapa Māori which contributes to our understanding fields as networks of collaborative relations. The concept of collaborative approaches in Māoridom is not new. It has been a part of Māori practice historically, derived from the way our Tūpuna operated and managed resources. Elements of relationship are founded on Māori values and strategic partnerships that were flexible and adaptable to specific situations. One of the oldest forms of Māori organisation, the marae, is an expression of belonging and connection to a community but that expression comes in many forms and we could argue that a marae is essentially a network. It has all the characteristics of a very socially cohesive network, but ultimately there are a set of rules, derived from kaupapa Māori that keep it together.

The research whānau’s experience is that the development of trusting and lasting personal relationships is central to the field of Māori business. However, good networks and contacts are not about exploiting contacts but about reciprocity, where the emphasis is on what can be done to support and provide for each other. In keeping with the cultural value of hau, that assistance or encouragement may not be returned directly, but rather can be passed along to help others. The trust is between individuals not organisations and relationships can be
developed quicker because of whakapapa links, highlighting the interdependent nature of kaupapa Māori.

I have described kaupapa Māori as a field that is a simultaneous space of conflict and competition, illustrating the relations between the positions of power occupied by the agents or institutions who compete for the legitimate form of specific authority. Our analysis of the field allowed us to incorporate the categorical differences in historically or culturally distinct instances, which reflected a great deal of dissonance between Māori and the systems of organisation (authoritative publications, practices and policy making) through which the State locates themselves as legitimate authorities (Bourdieu, 1991b). A consequence appears to be fragmentation and miscommunication, particularly in the way control and authority is distributed within the Māori field, which predetermines the behaviour of the agencies and agents that operate.

Reliance on a ‘by Maori, for Maori’ perspective creates artificial boundaries around what constitutes Māori business and its activities, which marginalises the cultural field and leads to a meta-narrative that constrains activity. This undoubtedly raises a number of issues concerning the associated privileging of ‘dominant interests’ over and above issues such as self-determination and social justice for Indigenous peoples. Therefore, I suggest that change is required to develop the sophisticated business capabilities and value added in Māori business, however bringing together the ‘two worlds’ requires structural change, recognition and celebration of uniqueness and diversity of identity.

I argue that initiatives which continually separate and marginalise kaupapa Māori from other fields is not practical. However, there are indications of much more robust engagement occurring (for example see Hui Taumata Project, 2006), highlighting the synthesis between mainstream and Māori values, raising the challenge of creating processes and systems to operationalise in practice the synergies between the two worldviews. I suggest the framework of the business whānau, not as a model that replaces a universal Westernised model of business, but rather as a framework to illustrate how business relationships can be managed successfully and sustainably in the context and power relations offered by kaupapa Māori.
Part Three – Weaving the Kete

On most occasions the conclusion serves to render the ultimate word on matters under consideration. Here, however I offer the last part of this thesis as something akin to a pause for reflection. Part Three, Weaving the Kete, represents this thesis’ contribution to the ‘Three Baskets of Knowledge’ that captures the sense of unity between the physical, spiritual and philosophical as represented metaphorically. I introduced the Māori legend of the ‘Three Baskets of Knowledge’ in Chapter Three as the way in which Māori have created a system of ideas about humankind and the world in order to regulate life. The baskets reflect the centre of one’s being that is constitutive of our most basic convictions and provides for the connection between knowledge and wisdom (Marsden, 2003). To end, I return to the metaphor of the ‘Baskets of Knowledge’ for two reasons.

First, the narrative intention of this thesis is the weaving together of many threads of the kete as represented in the previous chapters. Therefore, Chapter Ten is not intended as a conclusion to the narrative. Rather I view it as a space where I can draw the together the threads, or weave, of the narrative to highlight the various points of relevance in the preceding chapters and address the research agenda of this thesis. Second, my aim in Marsden’s words is to “feed you with the food contained within the baskets” (2003: 77), where food is a metaphor for knowledge.

Finally, but not lastly, nor indeed less importantly, Chapter Ten fulfils a dual function representing the closure of this thesis, as well as being the conduit for the further collaboration in terms of the contribution it offers to the academy, practitioners and the Māori community. I’m not making claims in a normative sense as to what is; rather I have focused on people’s discussion of various aspects of practice. I’m not making claims that this is the best or only way to understand Māori business practice. However, I do locate this thesis as one thread in a rich tapestry of narrative encompassing the field of Māori business and an indication of the potential regarding the future mobilisation of Māori economic development.
CHAPTER TEN: THE RISING TANIWHA

The research agenda which has guided this thesis is that:

- Firm performance is not merely an outcome of economic activity, but is also a corollary of the value derived from combinations of distinct socio-cultural resources and capabilities.

A key argument of this thesis has been that to comprehensively engage with this proposition we must develop an understanding of firm performance with an emphasis on the contextual development and relations of power connecting the concepts of society, culture and organisation. However, this is an approach which sits uncomfortably with the traditional research approaches in the field of organisation studies (Chapter Two). A major contribution of this thesis is the theorisation of an Indigenous paradigm, which draws from the pragmatic orientation and philosophical cohabitation of both kaupapa Māori and practical knowledge. This is an approach to research which I argue provides a culturally attuned response to organisational research that necessarily engages with a deeply contextual and pragmatic worldview.

In addition, as Emma argues, “kaupapa Māori businesses have to reinforce those tikanga that will make them sustainable ... and a lot of those tikanga are universal principles of effective business.” A major dynamic of this thesis is that ‘business practice is business practice’, regardless of cultural distinctiveness. Wherein, I posit that different cultures bring specific nuances in practice, derived from the dynamic interaction that informs their cultural field. In addition, my intention throughout this thesis has been to gain greater insight into how a Māori cultural context informs business practice. A sentiment captured by Jacob that illustrates through difference a culturally specific approach to understanding firm performance:

> If you look at the way Western business operates. They’ll come together, they’ll do business together and getting the business done is the first thing. Developing
the relationship comes after. In my view Māori is the opposite. You do business because you’ve got a relationship. The relationship leads to business.

At this point it is important to reiterate that I do not offer this chapter merely in a summative sense. In narrative inquiry, there is relevance in the detail offered throughout the thesis and not only in this closing commentary. This chapter begins with a discussion positioning the narrative landscape in Section I. It is here where I again highlight the epistemic reflexivity that was so central to this research. Therefore, the activities, understandings and self-interpretations of the researcher are taken as being a constituent part of the research context. Section I then is where I provide an overview of the research approach embodied in kaupapa Māori research as an Indigenous paradigm. I then highlight the contribution to research of firm performance in terms of the distinctions and delimitations of the narrative position adopted.

A primary objective of any piece of research must be its contribution to the appropriate field, empirically and practically. Therefore, in Section II, I reiterate the contribution of this research by reflecting on the research questions and insights that emerged through the narrative of Part Two. Next, in Section III, I outline the important methodological contribution of the research approach and I pull together insights on the topics generated through an Indigenous paradigm to illustrate its utility in organisational research. Finally, in Section IV, is where I present the end, which is not the end. I offer poroporoakī, rendered here as a farewell ceremony (Barlow, 1994). I choose this terminology because it reflects the circularity of narrative and the continuation of life.

I. Positioning the Narrative Landscape

I acknowledge that the primary audience for this thesis is academic. It is they whom I have been addressing in this work. However, the fundamental driver and inspiration of this research has been those players of the game, the agents in the field, the Māori practitioners that operationalise kaupapa Māori in their everyday activity. Chapter One identified the importance of Bourdieu’s ‘rules of the game’ which set the direction and parameters of the
research. In my articulation of the research landscape my primary focus has been on the creation and meaning of social experience within the Indigenous Māori context, drawing from an epistemology which is relational and experiential. However, it has been the sharing of their stories and lived experiences that capture the reflexive stance of this research. It is here, at this final juncture that I return to reflect on my opening statement in Chapter One -

_This thesis is the product of both my personal and academic experiences. At the forefront I position myself as an Indigenous Māori woman and researcher claiming genealogical, cultural, political and social sets of experiences._

It has been my involvement that has mediated my location in the field, reflecting my personal and scholarly negotiation of the two worldviews. This understanding was foundational in my utilisation of an Indigenous paradigm guided by pragmatic orientation of kaupapa Māori. It has led me to explicitly delimit this study in time and place allowing for the specific argument of this thesis, the purpose of which is to develop a different understanding of organisational practice and firm performance and not to produce generalisable statements. Therefore, I have written this account through my involvement rather than via a detached position. This responds to a practical knowledge approach which casts aside realist claims of objectivity, as I have explicitly brought my own whakapapa and experiences into the processes and writing of this thesis. Neither do I make relative claims of subjectivity, as my aim has been to acknowledge the close connection between objective structures of a culture and the dispositions of individuals in order to produce knowledge of the social world that is not reducible to the practical knowledge possessed by lay actors.

Two agendas regarding the position of the narrative landscape for this thesis have emerged. First, the epistemological and ontological assumptions central to the sense-making and knowledge creation cycle in Indigenous contexts. I argue it is an approach that counters the problematic legacies of Orientalism and the tendency for the dilution and commodification of Indigenous knowledge. Secondly, through the use of narrative as an expository technique I see this work as a dialogical representation, allowing voices other than mine, both in relation to the research whānau and in relation to society at large, and providing for the centrality of experience, from an individualised and communal sense, within which an expression of Māori business practice is captured.
A. Kaupapa Māori Research

In this thesis, I argue that kaupapa Māori is the prevailing worldview or paradigm that drives expectations and practice in the field of Māori business. Therefore, from the outset I have argued for the utility of an Indigenous paradigm. In this thesis, I argue that an Indigenous paradigm offers a contextualisation of kaupapa Māori as the epistemological base of productive inquiry. In the first instance I position it as an ideological response to calls of integrity and authenticity in conceptualisation and empirical analysis of Indigenous contexts (Denzin, Lincoln, & Smith, 2008; Kovach, 2005; Prasad, 2005). I argue that to undertake organisational research in an Indigenous context it is necessary to do so from an alternate philosophic orientation to that which is currently endorsed by mainstream organisational theory and practice. I do so to counter the imposition of Western knowledge, in the nature of academic work and in the production of theories which marginalise Māori knowledge, language and culture (Smith, 1999a). A sentiment shared by Julie when she stated, “not research for research sake. Māori are sick to death of being researched, by well meaning, well intentioned, non-Māori organisations with no obvious benefit.”

The utility of my alternate approach resides in the capacity to respond to the research questions that arise in the context of Indigenous organisations and to reflect Indigenous worldviews as opposed to viewing practice and knowledge through a Western lens. Importantly, and as has been reiterated throughout this thesis, I view an Indigenous paradigm as an alternate philosophic framework dependent on a complex opposition to and emergence from dominant Western paradigms. I also suggest that the philosophical assumptions offered by an Indigenous paradigm are discursive effects based on the logic of practice. This is as opposed to the universal rationalism which embodies traditional Western perspective of organisation research and practice.

A key ‘difference that makes a difference’ in my conceptualisation of an Indigenous paradigm is practical knowledge embodied by a pragmatic epistemology. The focus of an Indigenous paradigm is on the pragmatic process of social interaction, drawing from an epistemology that offers a comprehensive framework of engagement with the reflexive, relational and experiential dimensions. It enables a deeper and more contextualised
understanding of organisational forms and management practice (discussed further in Section III of this chapter) and, more specifically, a viable epistemological avenue for a powerful and productive conceptualisation and empirical analysis of Māori business practice.

The utility of an Indigenous paradigm, imbued as it is in practical knowledge, is that it draws attention to the way agents interact with the social and physical characteristics of context and relations of power in the everyday activities that constitute practice. A key feature of this approach embeds the contextual and power considerations within the logic of their specific epistemic communities of knowledge (Brown & Duguid, 2001; Deetz, 2000; Dei, 2000). Therefore, it has been the specific logic of kaupapa Māori, embodied in mātauranga Māori, or Māori epistemology that has acted as the orienting contextualisation for this research.

The understanding that kaupapa Māori is a distinct worldview leads us to appreciate its own structuring assumptions, values, concepts, orientations and priorities grounded in Indigenous Māori knowledge. The contemporary use of kaupapa Māori is imbued in traditional Māori values and beliefs. Henare (1998) offers an analytical framework founded on the koru, the spiral fern shape that symbolises new life, or in Bishops (1996) view the continual cycle of knowledge. The framework, entitled the koru of Māori ethics, represents the relationship between core beliefs, the spiritual realm and the physical dimensions. As Henare describes “…like the koru on the fern, each ethic reveals an inner core as it unfurls, and they are the foundations of Māori epistemology and hermeneutics - knowledge and interpretation of oral traditions, events and history …” (1998: 7).

The work of both Marsden (2003) and Henare (2003) provide insight into a pragmatic Māori worldview that represents the sacredness of all things and the significance of continuity of practice. I argue that it is this perspective that is critical in understanding the inherent adaptability of Māori as they weave their cultural being within their business activities. However, I note that my connection to the cultural framework of kaupapa Māori does not imply that the only way forward for Māori business practice is a return to the traditional as discussed in Chapter Six. I refer back to a statement made by Bob regarding the need for Māori to acknowledge the past, but also maintain a focus on the future in business, where he doesn’t assume that practice today should be grounded in strategies employed in the past.
Māori practice is a process of continual transition driven by cultural values, which is a core tenet of pragmatism. Our approach to past doctrines is to always require reconstruction in order to remain useful for the present time (Dewey, 1998).

Kaupapa Māori research draws from traditional beliefs and ethics, while responding to the quest for tino rangatiratanga, meaning self-determination and empowerment for Māori people (Bishop, 2008; Smith, 1999a; Walker, Eketone, & Gibb, 2006). It is a perspective that offers a broader intellectual and political context that emphasises interdependence and spirituality as fundamental to the process of knowledge production and dissemination. It is implicitly founded on collective consciousness, and historical and cultural concepts that are not necessarily reflected in positivist or anti-positivist categorisations. This does not negate the applicability of the methods associated with these paradigms, but rather speaks to the underlying assumptions, processes and application of research for both the researcher and the researched (Henry & Pene, 2001). A practical knowledge approach provides a comprehensive framework with which to examine Māori business practice because it can take into account the relations of power and interweaving of social, economic, cultural and temporal constructs that operate in a pragmatic Māori society.

B. A Delimited Narrative Account

In embracing a narrative approach as research strategy, I have argued that it is suited to research in Indigenous contexts because it enables me, the researcher, to portray the diversity of kaupapa Māori. Kaupapa Māori research aims to develop a wider framework for establishing meaning and social significance, such as contributing to notions of self-determination, decolonisation, emancipation and social justice. This position is not usually captured in organisational research based on Western-centric paradigms (Bishop, 2008; Kovach, 2005; Prasad, 2005; Smith, 1999a), given its asocial focus. However in Clandinin and Connelly’s (2000) view, narrative as an approach to research necessarily embeds these notions within the connection of my own, individual sense of justification and a more public or communal social sense of significance.
In addition, kaupapa Māori research opens up possibilities in the theorisation of context and power through experience, reflexivity and relationality, which can be difficult to translate into analytical practice. I argue it is the discursive interaction of narrative in the construction of this thesis that has provided for the taken-for-granted experiences of ‘being’ Māori, a location which influences the embedded structures, collective and individual dispositions, and systems of exchange which play a significant role in influencing practice, often in subtle or tacit ways.

Key arguments and the process of research emerged during and after I engaged with the field and were refined and finalised quite some time after those initial years of fieldwork. In this sense, I have violated the linear model of formal research process, a point Boon (2003) raised in writing ‘something’ with regards to a defendable doctoral argument was to immediately programmatise “that which should be kept ‘fluid’ (: 248). In relation to narrative this tension is indeed one with which I have grappled throughout the process of transcribing, writing and creating ‘moments’ of stories that are interpreted, captured and seemingly closed down. I have written these narratives with the intention that they are understood as accounts of symbolic actions embedded in words and incorporating a temporal quality to the text regarding sequence, time and place (Bryant & Lasky, 2007). They are a discursive practice by which fields, in this instance kaupapa Māori, and organisations are continuously constituted.

The difficulty arises in finishing a living narrative, a story that can be retold with different twists and turns, resulting in different findings. This tension is one in which I found many conflicts. However, it is one in which I argue an Indigenous logic, specifically its approach to knowledge, provides an appropriate response. The circularity and continuity of narrative allows us to weave together the different strands of thought and experience, writing and reading text that is in place, in relation of person and place, in context, in the past, in the present and in the future (Marsden, 2003). Over the course of the fieldwork I experienced various shifts in interpretation, opinion and understanding of the Māori worldview and practice. I am also conscious of the fact that an awareness of change was not exclusive to academics such as myself. Comments by two members of the research whānau offered their thoughts about how interpretations and awareness can change over time:
Emma

Those rangatahi who are educated, comfortable in Māori and non-Māori worldviews, they are the next level of the evolution of Māori economic development. We are evolving. I don’t think that the moment I am describing is going to be what economic tiro rangatiratanga is going to be in 20 years time when those people are grandparents. It will have metamorphosed into something else.

Sarah

I think it is a really good time to think about what does the new world look like. Maybe it looks a little different from 1850 and it’s not about our land. It’s actually about investing and diversifying in the new world - in the global economy.

What these statements draw attention to is how interpretation presents patterns of events over time influenced by the social, cultural, historical, economic, political elements of the time. What constitutes reality is in constant resistance and change depending on people’s interpretations and dynamics in the field. Narratives are laced with social discourses and power relations, which do not remain constant over time. This has specific implications for the role of the readers in terms of their active reconstruction of the narrative. Just as narrative embraces the existence of multiple realities, it also makes provision for the diverse nature of audience characteristics and expectations.

Flexing my Reflexivity

One of the most challenging struggles in the pragmatics of academic writing “has been in the omissions – the incidents, stories and topics I could not include” (Riad, 2004: 382). Riad’s concerns resonated with my own sense of responsibility regarding the maintenance of a Māori worldview. The thesis writing process requires the omission of the experiences, volumes of data, information, episodes, meetings, metaphors and stories shared by the research whānau. In the process of interpretation and representation I have had to struggle
with my own feelings of fear and inadequacy. Let me in a typically Māori way provide a personal narrative by way of illustration:

During my school age years I was indoctrinated into the pedagogical framework of the New Zealand education system.\(^\text{19}\) In the earlier years I learnt about ‘the Māori’ as some mystical creature in New Zealand’s past that had long since disappeared from our shores. I learnt that since there were no more full-blooded Māori left in New Zealand, we are all one people and to succeed in the world I had to forgo my Māori-ness and conform to this ideological vision of ‘one-people’ in New Zealand. Unfortunately, the representation of ‘one-ness’ was distinctly different to my own identity.

My narrative identifies the complex inter-relationship between the habitus and the cultural field. Needless to say, I am a product of the colonial State policy of assimilation and I never had the opportunity to learn the historical reality of my own cultural heritage and as a consequence my fear is derived from my own sense of ‘not belonging’ leading to my vulnerability in engaging with kaupapa Māori. Combined with an additional layer of complexity, the subtle, or sometimes not so subtle, pressure to legitimise my research process within mainstream organisational research, I felt like I was in an academic no-mans-land.

Addressing the academic requirements for research was overcome through my conceptualisation and application of an Indigenous paradigm in my research. My (self-created) tension with regards kaupapa Māori has been somewhat more difficult to rise above and honest reflection might argue will always be present. However, I locate my own personal journey as an important thread of this narrative. My engagement with the research whānau embodies the social embeddedness of agents encountered in a practical knowledge perspective recognising the Māori habitus as involving the individual and the social collective. The choices of Indigenous methodology and narrative inquiry as method are

---

\(^{19}\) My school age years were between 1975-1988. A notable point here being that I attended primary, intermediate and secondary schools in the South Island and so was often only one of a handful of Māori students.
bound to me, my constructed (and reconstructed) self-identity and my personal journey of cultural rediscovery.

A large part of my [re]emerging Māori self was the responsibility of sharing the wairua, or spirit of the research whānau and providing for the integrity of reciprocity. In Chapter Three and again in Chapter Five I described hau and utu as significant cultural concepts in terms of their power of sense-making in the context of kaupapa Māori. I depicted an exchange captured by Marcel Mauss (1970) regarding the practice of utu, or balanced exchange, and the idea of the hau as offering us culturally situated insight into the role of narrative inquiry as a research method. Unlike a market oriented exchange, where my part of the exchange might be solely financial remuneration, the practice of utu allows for the hau of this research to be shared more widely to academic and practitioner fields, engaging broader social, cultural and economic concerns.

II. Business Practice as Narrative

The narrative surrounding Māori business offers a distinctive form of socio-economic rationality that provides a broader utility in explaining and understanding firm performance. In terms of Māori business practice Jacob states that the “economy of New Zealand as a whole suffers by not having Māori business or Māori business being seen in the proper context. There’s this perception that Māori does not equal good business”. Jacob’s statement reflects the sentiment that ‘if anything is Māori then it can’t be good business’, which has consequences for the construction of Māori identity, tensions between Māori and Pakeha cultural fields, and valuation and distribution of the different forms of taonga, or capital. However, as Bob argues, “not withstanding serious physical oppression, there is nothing preventing Māori from engaging in the world in the way that makes sense to Māori.” It was not the intention of the research whānau to ‘expose’ or identify specific values as ‘best practice’; and it certainly wasn’t the intention to create one dimensional definitions of the meanings attached to Māori values in a business context. The following discussion draws from the narrative exposition as shared by the research whānau, particularly in Chapters Six through Nine that captures the embeddedness of kaupapa Māori in practice.
This section highlights the insights that have emerged through Part Two in relation to the two field questions that are addressed by this thesis. The three questions posed by Tsoukas and Cummings (1997) in Chapter One are a useful platform from which I explore the notion of how knowledge informs practice in an organisation context:

First, what are organisations? Second, what sort of knowledge do practitioners need to possess in order to manage organisations? Third, what mode of action should practitioners adopt towards organisational events and processes?” (Tsoukas & Cummings, 1997: 655)

As an entree to my research agenda, these questions connect to the field of practice in the business arena. I consider them to be an important approach to addressing the research questions offered in the exploration of the link between knowledge (both individual and collective) and human action in the context of kaupapa Māori.

A. An Indigenous [kaupapa Māori] perspective of organisational practice

Chapter Six addresses the research question ‘What does an Indigenous [kaupapa Māori] perspective of practice offer our understanding of organisational practice’? An important attribute of this chapter is that it identifies cultural antecedents and contemporary manifestations of Māori business practice as exposed by the research whānau, particularly in relation to understanding the kaupapa of Māori business. This inevitably led us to ask ‘what is Māori business?’ I argue that Māori business practice is oriented towards experiential activity and relational accountability, reflecting a distinctive feature of kaupapa Māori as a culturally oriented philosophical framework. As a consequence I argue that Māori businesses necessarily engage with a more culturally differentiated view of the field as a network of objective relations between positions than do their mainstream counterparts (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

The inclusion of a logic grounded in kaupapa Māori to examine business practice requires a framework of analysis capable of reflecting how Māori social processes and cultural values, their meaning and expression are operationalised in practice. Bourdieu’s analytic apparatus of field, habitus and forms of capital, as a refined three-tiered relational notion of social structure, provides access to the distinctiveness of fields, each with its own history, logic and
agents. This provides insight as to what it means to be Māori in terms of developing an interdependent construal of Self (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). The Māori habitus is depicted as inclusive of the individual, and the subjective as a simultaneously social collective, imbued in surrounding contextual factors and implicit normative tasks that are held as social norms in kaupapa Māori. Brandi’s comment “if I didn’t know my whakapapa, if I didn’t have a connection to my whānau, to my marae, I believe that I would be missing something great from my life” reflects how central being Māori and belonging to a community gave her a sense of purpose that influenced her business practice, more particularly her motivations in business. Importantly, this refers to a belonging and connection to kaupapa Māori, or in a teleological frame the notion of Self realised in community (MacIntyre, 1981).

In addition, Māori business practice involves achieving a balance between economic, social and cultural capital. In this context the research whānau determined that in terms of capital Māori refer to those forms of taonga—those resources both tangible and intangible—that have attached to them a form of value. These can include fairly altruistic forms of value, such as te reo or Māori language which is regarded as a taonga of significant cultural value in kaupapa Māori. Another example in 2002 saw road works on a 100m section of an expressway halted by Transit New Zealand until a meeting could be held with Ngāti Naho, a north Waikato hapū of the Tainui iwi, who raised concerns about the presence of the taniwha Karu Tahi regarded as one of the guardians of the Waikato River.

While these are legitimate forms of taonga, we can also take note of the more tangible manifestations of taonga, such as those land and capital assets owned and more importantly controlled by very successful Māori Trusts, such as Tuarapaki Trust (Chapter Four). However, it is in their approach to managing these assets that we see a distinction. Witikanga argues that “we make an assumption that business is all about profit maximisation but is it?” When discussing the value attached to and management of taonga, we are not suggesting that Māori business prioritise social and cultural capital more or less than other businesses. Wakatu Inc. is an example of gaining control and governance over Māori assets, achieving economic superiority but weaving social and cultural features back into the strategy and decision-making of the organisation.
To depict the notion of cultural field as a field of struggles or competition, the terminology of mana motuhake, which is closely associated with tino rangatiratanga, is useful in terms of capturing the sense of Māori self-determination and autonomy (Durie, 2001). The utility of mana motuhake is embodied in its conceptualisation of power and control. In this sense I use it as a dimension that captures the way in which control and authority are distributed within the Māori field and the demarcation of power between Māori and the State.

The question of ‘what sort of knowledge do Māori practitioners need?’ emerges through the metaphysical juxtaposition of the physical and the philosophical sense of Māori business and practice. There is a strong undercurrent of pragmatism operating in kaupapa Māori, which grants a central role to the relational and pluralistic characteristics of knowledge. The contemporary use of kaupapa Māori embodies a culturally specific value orientation of practice, which centrally locates traditional cultural norms and beliefs guided by mātauranga Māori, or Māori epistemology. That includes the knowledge based on the cognitive understandings and interpretations of the social, physical and spiritual worlds as reflected in the karakia ‘The Three Baskets of Knowledge’.

Of particular note was how Māori cultural values play an important role in the dynamic interaction between those forms of knowledge in terms of meaning and therefore practice. Kaupapa Māori operates through the continual transformation of social activity, where individuals are both individually and collectively oriented, grounding the notion of habitus and practice. It takes into account both the collective and the particular, and pays attention to unity, as opposed to the atomisation of individuals and society. I refer back to a conversation between Rueben and myself in Chapter Six which captured the sense of simultaneous construction of Māori knowledge frameworks from both an individual and collective perspective. Ruebens’s explanation of how he operationalises kaupapa Māori in his business activities becomes a salient factor in terms of business practice, particularly the utility of tacit and explicit knowledge management.

Chapter Six provided an objective analysis or ‘map’ of the Māori business cultural field and identified the specific properties and characteristics of culturally constituted practice. Māori business operates within a distinctive form of socio-economic rationality that provides a
wider utility, leading to the provision of contextually rich information in decision-making and therefore improved firm performance. I argue this logic to be the cornerstone of how Māori business can make the most of opportunities and address business challenges.

B. Strategies Enacted by Māori Agents in the Business Field

Drawing from the logic of practical knowledge as a framework of analysis in the context of kaupapa Māori, Chapters Seven through Nine addresses the research question “What strategies do agents in the Māori cultural field enact in business?” Having objectively mapped the cultural field and considered the ‘state of play’ we have encountered the simultaneous expression of dynamic interaction between those socio-cultural values, behaviours and structural arrangements that inform Māori business practice. It set the scene, or in Bourdieuan terms established the ‘rules of the game’ and strategic orientation which influence the ‘mode of action’ Māori practitioners adopt in terms of business practice.

In developing an understanding of the strategies enacted by Māori in an organisational context, a primary concern for this thesis has been to counter the binary construction of a ‘them’ and ‘us’ perspective that is conceived around alternate models of business practice. I argued that we need a research approach that provides for closer connections and a deeper appreciation of activities occurring deep inside organisations and broader phenomena outside. In this instance, using the inter-related notions of habitus, forms of capital and field, the key levels of analysis are industry structure, firm specific effects and more recently the role of the individual actor. I discuss the implications of this approach in relation to further understanding organisational forms and management practices in Section III of this chapter. The following three threads of analysis outline the insights gathered as demonstrated in the respective narrative chapters in relation to the influence of the contextual dynamics of kaupapa Māori on firm performance.
Kaupapa Māori Leadership

Chapter Seven evolved on the basis that the notion of good leadership is somewhat universal. However, a key point was that kaupapa Māori leadership draws from a culturally constituted form of practice heavily influenced by the convergence of practice, in this instance where the Māori habitus is dominant. In the context of kaupapa Māori, the construction of Self takes into account identity as individual and simultaneously as a social collective. Therefore, locating oneself culturally and socially within kaupapa Māori inevitably allows us to transcend the limitations foretold by the individual versus collective debates in the leadership literature.

In the context of kaupapa Māori, the construction of Self takes into account both the individual and collective habitus transcending the limitations foretold by the individual versus collective debates in the literature. I have argued that Māori identity is a consequence of the contextualised construction of the individual and simultaneously a social collective. That is not to ignore the communal sense of leadership which resonates with the way an agonistic community identifies leaders and leadership decisions. Rather it is recognising that it is the mana, or power and authority vested in a leader that is contested. It is that which gives it a communal aspect, however the process of decision making is not necessarily collective.

I argue that kaiārahitanga provides the basis for recognising relationships between individuals and provides insight into a Māori worldview that represents the sacredness of all things and the significance of reciprocity in human relations (Henare, 2001). In our examination of leadership through the lens of Kaupapa Māori we are automatically drawn to a space that opposes focusing on purely economic motivations to describe their activity (Granovetter, 1985; Polanyi, 1945). Thus, subscribing to the interdependent construction of the Self construed in relation to surrounding contextual factors discussed in Chapter Three and Six. Kaiārahitanga operates in the highly contextualised and pragmatic orientation of kaupapa Maori, drawing us to the notion of contested leadership and therefore culturally oriented positions of power and authority.
In terms of Māori business practice, Chapter Eight highlights the socially oriented processes of capital exchange, particularly in the way it is distributed and the power, with which it imbues its holders, varies across the different fields. This chapter provides a platform on which to include and examine the characteristics of an Indigenous economy. An important thread of narrative therefore is the way in which Māori agents in the field placed value on those different forms of taonga, or capital to counter the tension arising over a mis-match of interpretation of cultural practices. Typically it is more difficult to place value on socio-cultural resources and capabilities of a business, mainly because they tend to be more subtle. However, for Māori businesses including the cultural framework of kaupapa Māori adds another level of complexity into the equation.

I argue that an Indigenous paradigm, grounded by kaupapa Māori provides an alternative mechanism for introducing non-economic resources into the equation. It is evident that a resource-based logic has important Māori practitioner implications given that kaupapa Māori operates as a relational field of power, particularly given the interaction between the social, cultural and economic systems of exchange are deeply embedded in practice. It is a system of exchange embedded within kaupapa Māori with its own logic of operation, its own corpus of etiquette and form of social relations as well as producing its own system of valuation and rates of exchange, representing a unique style of the tactics and strategies of domination (Biggart & Delbridge, 2004).

Māori organisation and knowledge is tied to different systems of exchange culturally, socially and economically, therefore it is the behaviour shaping implications of whakawhaiti as a culturally constituted system of exchange that is of interest. This gives rise to the questions of how firms seek advantages that may arise from socially complex assets, such as culture, knowledge, and capabilities embodied in specific actors and learning routines of organisations. In the context of kaupapa Māori these questions inevitably forces attention on how the logic of cultural practices such as koha (gift-giving or the passing along of energy), and utu (reciprocity) are embodied in Māori business practice. In addition, we are also drawn to values, such as mana (status, prestige, and authority), mauri (instills life, energy and power
to all objects is significant because all activities, projects, ideas and relationships are viewed as having the potential for life and power), mātauranga and mōhio (knowledge and knowing) and taonga (property and treasures, including intangible forces, such as the cultural significance of a landscape) and how they influence the inter-capital exchange in Māori businesses.

*Kaupapa Māori Collaborative Networks*

The notion of collaborative relations is not new to Māori social organisation, whether in engagement with the State as the dominant player in the field, or other private sector organisations. In the field of organisation and management, the rapid proliferation of alliances and other forms of interfirm relationships that provide for the socio-relational context of networks in which firms are embedded has led to a more complete understanding of firm behaviour and performance (Dyer & Singh, 1998; Gulati, Nohira, & Zaheer, 2000). In Chapter Nine, I argue that Māori businesses are naturally embedded in networks of formal and informal relations. Whakawhanaungatanga, or social relationality is a central feature guiding practice in the context of kaupapa Māori, and it is where individual and collective groups come together to share knowledge and experience, which has implications for firm performance.

Kaupapa Māori practice retains the same understanding of social and cultural constructs as offered by Polyani (1945) who argued that substantive economic systems that refer to the study of how human activity is shaped by relations of social, cultural and political processes. I argue that in relation to Māori practice, influenced by its agonistic roots that the business whānau operates as a socially cohesive network that reflects a form of culturally constituted collaboration, which embody the context and power relations of kaupapa Māori. I suggest that kōtuitui, or a kaupapa Māori collaborative network of relations is illustrative of organisations moving beyond the premise of being a single entity and towards an arrangement of interdependence around core competencies, which is slightly different to the highly concentrated structures of the past (Dyer & Singh, 1998; Nahapiet, Gratton, & Rocha, 2005; Smangs, 2006).
The business whānau, locates kōtuitui practice within the multiple modes of inter-firm relations, but primarily the most significant feature is the shared kaupapa, or ground rules governing the business whānau. I argue that the concept of business whānau encompasses the simplest level of kōtuitui in terms of relationship guided by business contracts and alliances, to a more complicated level where whakapapa, noted here as linkages and connections between social identities, is expected and accepted to establish common ground for the parties. Hence, I argue that business whānau is constitutive of communal sharing as exchange that is the form of organisational networks congealed and maintained over time by the social mechanism of reciprocity.

C. Future Research

*Emma*

When we all decide to hop in the same canoe and make a strategic decision to paddle in the same direction, when that canoe moves it will achieve extraordinary objectives.

The focus of this thesis is on the practical utility of kaupapa Māori in firm performance, specifically as grounded in the New Zealand business environment. This draws on the notions of practical knowledge and Indigenous paradigm, which offers many avenues of potential research. First, as discussed in Section III, is the approach that conceives of the utility of an Indigenous paradigm in organisation and management research, which includes the capacity to incorporate comparative analysis involving other cultural contexts, for example American Indian, Canadian Indian, and Aborigine. Here I introduce some possible directions for future research involving Māori communities in the business context, as identified by the research whānau.

Entrepreneurship, specifically Indigenous entrepreneurship, is an area of investigation currently experiencing a revival of cultural awareness and opportunities for Indigenous peoples (Dana & Anderson, 2007). How does kaupapa Māori inform what constitutes entrepreneurship? Additionally, given the increasing number of Māori women entering the
business arena, gender would be an interesting dynamic to investigate further in relation to entrepreneurial activity in the context of kaupapa Māori.

The sustainability of Māori business relies on a strategic investment of resources, including human resources. There are two potential avenues for future research in entrepreneurship and leadership - succession planning and managing burn-out for Māori leaders. Also, managers and leaders in kaupapa Māori business will need to facilitate the changing face of the public and private sector, particularly as more qualified Māori emerge into managerial positions, bringing with them confidence and experience in Māori culture and expertise in te reo Māori. What will that look like? How can those public and private sector institutions ensure a smooth transition?

The cultural value system of kaupapa Māori is a consequence of the interaction between tacit and explicit knowledge. An important question asked by members of the research whānau is how can we operationalise the true meanings of concepts such as manakitanga, in practice? If Māori cultural values are being used in tacit forms in business operations, how can we ensure appropriate management of and investment in cultural values as an important firm resource? Consequently, knowledge management in the context of kaupapa Māori is another significant area for future research.

The development of networks, both formal and informal, in the Māori business field is a vital component for the creation of a critical mass of positive energy that will drive Māori economic development. The field maintains Māori business networks as communities of Māori business people with a common interest in terms of being Māori but also being part of the larger mainstream networks. These are a part of formal local and national Māori business networks based around personal contacts, hui, marae and whānau. These networks are significant as a source of motivation and information for Māori business operators. Identity is also an important element in Māori networks that are engaged for support and development of Māori business practitioners. The networks operate to fulfil business opportunities, but also provide support for and celebrate the ‘Māoriness’ of the practitioners in a way that enhances the experience for the business, its stakeholders and customers.
As Sarah comments, “New Zealand is so small and it is made even smaller by keeping Māori business in a purely local context.” Her statement refers to the potential levels of collaborative engagement at an international level. The Māori business cultural field does not operate in isolation, indeed it needs to operate from the perspective of the global economic market of today. One area for potential development is international business, specifically in the management of relationships. I refer to the distinctiveness of the way Māori utilise relationships in business. At present this is a valuable, but under recognised resource for Māori business primarily because New Zealand’s national involvement is so entrenched in the Western approach to business relationships. The potential is for Māori socio-cultural values and practices that resonate with other cultures globally to be recognised. In that relationship with people from other countries, it is not just individual being presented but the collective view behind the idea, product or service that is being offered.

III. Kaupapa nohoia kaupapa – Martin

Martin stated “kaupapa nohoia te kaupapa”, which he refers to as the building of kaupapa, or guiding principles and foundations, together. When we bring two different perspectives together, the energy they create together relationally and in response to contradictions inherent within them emerges with a kaupapa of its own. I feel Martin’s comment captures the overall sense of bringing two worlds together in both research and practice. That is to say, there are unique characteristics of Māori business practice, which are grounded in the epistemological stance of kaupapa Māori in combination with Western philosophies and techniques of organisation that contribute to the performance of Māori businesses. In addition, I argue that the perspective offered by an Indigenous paradigm has much to contribute to our understanding of organisational research and practice.

The underlying premise of this thesis has been that as society becomes more complex and economies more inter-dependent, firms are finding it increasingly difficult to identify sources of competitive advantage. In this section, my aim is to pull together insights generated through an Indigenous approach to illustrate its utility and methodological contribution in organisational research. Therefore, we are drawn back ‘full circle’ to the underlying premise that has guided this thesis from Chapter One:
• Firm performance is not merely an outcome of economic activity, but is also a corollary of the value derived from combinations of distinct socio-cultural resources and capabilities.

This narrative, as expressed by the research whānau, is that Māori business practice is not only a factor of economic action, but is also the product of historical development, deeply rooted in the collective understandings of social organisation and cultural practices as embodied by kaupapa Māori. However, for the most part, the literature on firm performance has maintained the positivistic traditions of research that fail to provide access to deep understandings of how firms differ and what a difference that makes. In terms of understanding organisational practice, those dominant traditions do little to provide a coherent account of decision making or decision makers, that is to say how capabilities are developed and modified over time and what difference that makes to the performance of the firm. In this thesis, I offer an Indigenous paradigm and its pragmatist orientation as a viable epistemological avenue for addressing the problems associated with normative models of science that dominate organisational management.

A. The utility of an Indigenous Paradigm in Organisational Research

In this thesis I have argued for the utility of an Indigenous paradigm as an alternate philosophic framework, dependent on a complex opposition to and emergence from dominant Western paradigms. In this Section I aim to outline the points of difference and specific contribution an Indigenous paradigm offers to organisational research. In doing so, I am reiterating the role of an Indigenous paradigm, grounded by the pragmatic orientation of practical knowledge and kaupapa Māori, as the orienting mechanism for this research. In addition, I argue it is the most appropriate approach to research in Indigenous contexts, such as in this case where it provides a powerful and productive conceptualisation and empirical analysis of Māori business practice.
Chapter Two identified the dualist discourse of the Western worldview as the dominant logic in organisation practice and outlined the challenges of applying these frameworks to Indigenous contexts. The binary construction of reality in terms of dichotomies and oppositions is a characterising feature of the way human activity has been understood in Western thought. It is a binary positioning that is also evident in the way the academy locates organisation and management thought. A consequence has been that the modes of knowledge that are grounded in the Western cultural framework are regarded as having a preordained superiority. Those that sit outside the square of the practices advocated by the dominate logic of firm performance are deemed inferior, unsophisticated and therefore less practical and efficient.

The explanatory realm of organisational analysis has changed dramatically from an ontological, epistemological and methodological point of view (Deetz, 1996, 2000; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Hassard & Keleman, 2002), where new forms of organisation and management thought and practice have come into being. The conceptualisation of an Indigenous paradigm that I make use of in this research is one such example of the many different frameworks that are more inclusive and organic models that have emerged as a counter to the dominant approaches to organisational research. To that end, this work has selected threads of interpretive and critical theory, in particular those associated with the relations of power embodied by the Indigenous and post-colonial fields.

Increasingly attention is being drawn to the shifts over time in how people think about organisations. For example, Tsoukas and Cummings (1997: 655) discuss how the “recovery, of certain strands of Aristotelian philosophy, strands that were marginalised with the rise of scientific rationalism in the 17th century” opens up research and practice in organisational contexts to a richer depth of theory and analysis. This approach represents the philosophical cohabitation between practical knowledge and highly contextualised fields, favoured by Indigenous communities such as Māori, as a description of how things actually work in organisation and management.

In many ways we could argue that mainstream business development is only just starting to catch up with Indigenous worldviews that create and understand forms of social organisation
that are relevant to people, not to objects. I view an Indigenous paradigm as responding as a counter to the ‘them’ and ‘us’ routines of the way we traditionally have conceived of in alternate models of business practice, providing for closer connections and a deeper appreciation of the activities occurring deep inside organisations and broader phenomena outside.

Taking a kaupapa Māori research approach to this research has involved Bourdieu’s social scientific method and pays particular attention to overcoming tensions created by dualist frameworks and advocating for sociological reflexivity in organisational research. Additionally, I based the approach to research in practical knowledge, which reflects the nexus between modern scientific knowledge, craft knowledge and wisdom. I argue that a practical knowledge perspective provides a culturally attuned response to organisational research. As an example, this thesis automatically directs attention to different sets of ideas and issues framed as assumptions, practices and methods that locate kaupapa Māori philosophy, values (ethics) and knowledge squarely in a central position.

Furthermore, the associated method of this approach, narrative inquiry, has provided a medium for research into the tacit and symbolic practices, such as rhetoric, narrative and discourse through which strategy is constructed (Barry & Elmes, 1997; Knights & Morgan, 1991). This approach has signalled this thesis’ departure from the context-independent, power-neutral and theory-practice dualism in research, which I have argued has little to offer reflexive analysis of values and interests that is a precondition for the enlightened development of any society (Bourdieu, 2001; Flyvbjerg, 2001). Kaupapa Māori research, in drawing from the highly contextualised pragmatic epistemology, necessarily engages a whole set of power/knowledge relations that provide a valuable framework to understand organisational forms and management practice (in their historical, social, cultural and economical contexts).

An Indigenous paradigm, grounded in the pragmatic epistemology of practical knowledge provides a medium for a multi-level approach that takes into account both structure and action (Biggart & Delbridge, 2004; Hough, 2006; Jarzabkowski, 2004; Smangs, 2006). In terms of levels of analysis using the inter-related notions of habitus, forms of capital and
field, (or industry structure, firm specific effects and the role of the individual actor respectively) sit comfortably within a practical knowledge approach (Johnson, Langley, Melin, & Whittington, 2007). Pivotal to this approach is the acceptance of the variety of ideas on how social reality is constructed (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000; Bourdieu, 1999; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) and the inclusion of a capacity to understand and interpret social commentary and action (Flyvbjerg, 2001).

The positioning of and distinction between worldviews is an important facet of this thesis. In Chapter One I located the existence of multiple fields in society, embedded within and interacting with each other. An Indigenous paradigm is grounded in the emerging conversation that captures the effects of multiple definitions reflecting different theoretical bases for understanding and criteria for evaluating human activity, each characterised by particular assumptions.

Attention is also drawn to human agency and an emphasis on moving away from the binary perspectives that characterise organisational research. More recently Stacey (2007) suggests that the notions of the individual self as agent—the organisation and the relationship between them—has changed over time, particularly in discourse on the practices of day to day management in organisations. In terms of organisational research this analytical approach allows us to move away from an agentless view (Chapter Two), responding to the understanding of practice and practical knowledge available to individuals and collectives (Bourdieu, 1977; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Brubaker, 1985; Illouz & John, 2003).

Finally, the framework of practical knowledge provides for a meaningful relationship between theory and practice better assisted by dynamic, locally-contextualised theories that can reflect the complexities of practice (Pettigrew, 2001). This represents the dynamic interplay between theory and practice (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Spender, 1998; Van Maanen, Sorensen, & Mitchell, 2007). Indeed a practical knowledge perspective recovers the practical side of theory as a knowledge producing activity (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Kaupapa Māori highlights the reciprocal interplay between knowledge and knowing; they are mutually enabling in that knowledge is a tool of knowing and knowing is an aspect of our interaction with the social and physical world (Cook & Brown, 1999). It is the taken for
granted experiences of ‘being’ Māori which influence the embedded structures, collective and individual dispositions, and systems of exchange which play a significant role in influencing practice.

In relation to organisation studies in general, privileging the dominant perspectives in the process and analysis of practice has resulted in a strong but divisive understanding. An Indigenous paradigm, drawing from the pragmatist epistemology embodied by practical knowledge allows us to engage with the notion of organisational practice in a more comprehensive way through the socialised processes of experience and relationality. By shifting our mode of thinking from within the dominant orthodoxy in organisational literature, we are prompted to ask more diverse and meaningful questions about firm performance.

B. Firm Performance

When I began this research process I was interested in the questions that surround the notion of firm performance. While firm performance has remained the guiding proposition of this thesis, what has changed, has been me. As I engaged in this research I encountered the tensions and development of my own cultural identity and as I progressed it was the way kaupapa Māori engages with those questions surrounding firm performance that took precedence. It was through this lens that I engaged with the proposition regarding firm performance prompting us to look at the field of leadership (habitus), exchange (inter-capital exchange) and relationships (field) in particular.

During the course of this creative endeavour and associated fieldwork I have encountered many avenues for future research using an Indigenous paradigm. I believe that it offers a perspective useful to the wide array of topics located within the field of organisation and management thought. This thesis provides a foundation for more detailed study of firm performance to be undertaken using an Indigenous perspective. I argue that it offers a view of the organisation as something beyond a disembodied system of market exchange and
recognises the embeddedness of social processes in each culture will bring specific cultural nuances to the formulation of what constitutes organisational success.

In particular, this thesis has argued for alternative ways of thinking about firm performance that may provide interesting avenues for further study. For example, a pragmatist epistemology raises questions around the notion of a knowledge-based theory of the firm. In taking the position that knowledge is abstracted from practice the firm can be viewed as a system of knowledge where explicit knowledge is continuously mediated by the practical skills and implicit judgements of those who are the agents of active elements of specific socio-economic systems (Spender, 1998; Tsoukas, 1996). Therefore, by viewing the firm as a knowledge system we can draw on the pragmatic epistemology and logics of practical knowledge to make sense of strategic choices in the firm. In Tsoukas’s (1996) view it is not the resources a firm uses or discovers that are important but the services rendered by them, which is a function of the knowledge applied to them. In addition, as Spender (1998) argues it is not about using the term knowledge to refocus only from the firm’s financial and tangible assets onto its intangible assets, but also onto the organisational routines and core competencies.

This pragmatic reorientation provides an epistemological mooring for theories possessing of firm performance. Business success relies on trust, reciprocity and respect and not on contracts and individual competition (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 1997). It is people, their strength of identity and commitment to others which are central facets of Māori economic development and mobilisation. Māori business practices can be/are successful because they have the capacity to take on board the good business practices that are systematic and theory-based, but they are also more fluid, contextual and innovative in their approach to finding that right balance. For example, Māori business is necessarily drawn into the relational dynamics between the two worldviews, a consequence being the production and authorisation of certain discourses and practices derived from both kaupapa Māori and mainstream views. A key aspect of this perspective is that it is not about exclusivity, but rather bringing together worldviews for understanding and collaboration between Māori and mainstream, in both the public and private sectors. This approach paves the way for research into how firms seek advantages that may arise from socially complex assets, such as culture,
knowledge, and capabilities embodied in specific actors and learning routines of organisations that may be unique to kaupapa Māori.

Drawing from the pragmatic orientation of kaupapa Māori to reflect the relational characteristics important to Māori allows us to take a new perspective of organisational structure. Where Māori are particularly strong in the new world is at the juncture where they naturally adhere to a quadruple bottom line, which is the social, cultural and ecological as well as the economic. A Māori-centred approach may exhibit Māori values in business structure, such as inclusion of kaumātua; more flexible and circular representation of the organisational chart that reflects the wairua and tino rangatiratanga of all staff and other stakeholders; and practice (hold hui as opposed to meetings, include karakia, process how decisions are made, how conflict is resolved) and vision (incorporating tangata and hauora). This point is summed up by Carly:

Organisational structure - flexible moveable situation, so they don’t have a top down structure, because it can’t be that way. The organisation chart doesn’t have the boss and then the staff under the boss, and then people under those people ... it’s circular and holistic because each of those people has their own to have some input. So I think that’s very interesting to look at an organization structure that way, as a circular web of relations. And those relations include respecting the knowledge that each of those people bring into their world, that’s been passed down through their respective whakapapa.

This context highlights using appropriate practice, in this thesis as derived from both kaupapa Māori and mainstream, for improved firm performance. It does not necessarily have to be an insurmountable challenge; rather it requires innovative approaches to engagement along similar lines as the success of kinship supply chains like those used in Taiwan (Biggart & Guillen, 1999). There is ample evidence of successful Māori business practice pre- and post-colonisation, which was discussed in Chapter Three. An important dimension of there practice was that they were successful on a Western economic basis, whilst maintaining traditional systems of exchange.
This is still very much evident today. Iwi corporations, such as Wakatu Incorporated offers us insight into contemporary organisation and management of a large multinational Māori organisation. Wakatu is a multi-million corporation involved in the tourism, property, wine and seafood sectors (Wakatu Incorporated, 2009). Wakatu’s mission statement reflects that attention to balance that reflects a synergistic relationship between economic, social and cultural imperatives:

A business of the land and sea, he taonga tuku iho … for profit, social and cultural growth through professionalism, honesty, diligence and embracing our tikanga (Wakatu Incorporated, 2009).

Wakatu’s business activities are the embodiment of Martin’s earlier statement ‘kaupapa nohoia te kaupapa’, which is the building of kaupapa, or guiding principles and foundations, together. Wakatu’s corporate strategies reflect both Western and kaupapa Māori and it is the energy they create together which are critical to its success.

IV. Poroporoakī

The poroporoakī is where we situate our farewell to the narrative strands that make up this thesis. Poroporakī, or ceremony of closure, is the final part of this thesis, but it is by no means the least important part or even signifying the ‘end’ of the process. Throughout this thesis, I have portrayed the fluidity and circularity captured by the narrative rationality of practical knowledge. As MacIntyre (1981) argues, human activity is life as constituted inside a story of which the individual subject interacts with a series of multiple interlocking narratives. That is to say, this thesis is a part of a continuous narrative wherein we have from an individualised and communal sense captured an expression of Māori business practice.

A key finding of this thesis is that kaupapa Māori as expressed through business practice offers a practical utility in relation to the capability of and potential outcomes for improved firm performance. Therefore, as stated in Chapter One, my thesis is that Māori business operates within a field of simultaneous expression and dynamic interaction between those distinctly Māori socio-cultural values, behaviours and structural arrangements that inform practice. This thesis has engaged with the field of Māori business coming to terms with what
resources and capabilities they have available to them and trying to achieve some sort of advantage in terms of improved performance.

The effectiveness of a practical knowledge perspective by means of its pragmatic epistemology allows us to understand Māori businesses operating within a distinctive frame of socio-economic rationality providing a broader utility leading to culturally constituted forms of practice. A central part of that is how business advantages can be achieved from shared experience and relational accountability, which are fundamental to any ritual or tikanga that Māori have. I have argued that this paves the way for innovative organisation and management practices grounded on giving weight to more deeply contextualised processes and relations through cultural exchange.

**Haere rā, farewell**
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Appendix B – The Foundations of Mātauranga Māori (Royal, 1998)

Io (root cause)

Te Kore (the void)

Te Kowhao (the abyss)

Te Anu (the cold)

Te Pō (the night)

Te Maui (life principle)

Te Pu → Te Rea (stages in the life of the cosmic tree)

Te Rapunga → Te Hihiri (stages of cosmic energy)

Te Mahara → Te Wananga (states of consciousness)

Te Hauora → Atea (the rise of form, space and time)

Ranginui/Papatuanuku (earth/sky)
Appendix C – Discussion Framework

Māori Business Development: examining the role of social, cultural and economic capital

Focus is on understanding the important characteristics and attributes of the Māori cultural field in relation to Māori business. The Māori cultural field embodies the structures and values important to those that occupy the field which are central to social practice and systems of exchange.

What is narrative inquiry?

A narrative approach allows for the research participants to be heard within their own frame of reference, logics and language, rather than that of the researcher, embracing a closer participant-researcher relationship. The process of narrative inquiry encourages participants to engage in sharing experiences and knowledge, going beyond a linear question and answer approach.

- Unstructured interview process - where the discussion has a broad agenda but specific direction is shaped by what the participant tells the researcher.
- Open-ended style of questioning – allowing participants to interpret and answer or discuss topics as they see fit.

The following are general points for discussion.

General Demographic Information

The purpose of these questions is to identify the nature of the business experience.

- Personal details
- Business/Industry experience
- Education & other qualifications
- Position held now (Manager/Owner)
- Te Reo (proficiency)

The Field of Māori Business

The purpose of these discussion points is to identify characteristics of contemporary Māori business.

- How would you define a Māori business?
- What characteristics would you think define the field of Māori business?
- How do you define development in the context of the field of Māori business?
o Describe the structures (institutions, rules, categories, designations, appointments and titles) that are significant to the field of Māori business?

o How do you describe the creation of wealth, superior firm performance and advantage in the context of the field of Māori business?

o Describe the important networks that exist in the field of Māori business?

o How important is experience and knowledge of the Māori World View to Māori business decisions?

o How important are relationships and family?

o How important is leadership?

o What is good leadership?

o How would you define self identity?

o How do you think Māori values can be adopted in governance and management?

o How can Māori values and commercial values be harmonised?

o How would you describe (if any) tensions between Māori and Pākehā business values?
Appendix D – Research Agreement

MĀORI BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT: EXAMINING THE ROLE OF SOCIAL, CULTURAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

RESEARCH AGREEMENT

I have been given and understood an explanation of this research from the researcher and I have a copy of the information sheet concerning this project. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction, but I understand that I am free to request further information at any stage.

I know that:-
1. My participation in the project is entirely voluntary and I understand that I may withdraw from the project at any time without disadvantage to myself;

2. the data [audio-tapes] will be destroyed at the conclusion of the project but any raw data [transcripts and formatted narratives] on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which it will be destroyed;

3. this project involves an open-questioning technique where the precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the discussion develops and that in the event that the line of discussion develops in such a way that I feel hesitant or uncomfortable I may decline to answer any particular question(s) and/or may withdraw from the project without any disadvantage of any kind; and

4. the results of the project may be published and will be available in the library but every attempt will be made to preserve my anonymity. I understand that I and my organisation will be assigned a pseudonym for use in published work, unless I give specific written permission.

Any other conditions for agreement:

I agree to take part in this project.

Participant        Researcher

(Signature of participant)       (Signature of researcher)

(Date)                         (Date)

This project has been reviewed and approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee
Appendix E – Description of Individual Participants

Brandi

Positive Māori development that incorporates economic stability and pride of Māori culture is a passion for Brandi. Brandi has a professional background in education; however she has been exposed to Māori business practice throughout her childhood and adult life through whānau business interests, involving management of Māori land and a small business venture. Brandi has had experience working with Māori charitable trusts and government agencies to support Māori economic development. Currently, she is involved in the Māori Business Facilitation Service offered by Te Puni Kōkiri providing information, mentoring and business advice to Māori business owners. Strong role models and mentorship with a focus on empowering whānau to enable them to navigate mainstream business concerns and embrace Māori values are central to Brandi’s vision for positive Māori development.

Bob

Bob has an extensive background working in the public sector and more recently in the education, development and organisation role for a large iwi corporation. However, Bob makes a strong connection to the knowledge and learning passed along by his whānau, in particular his Mother and Aunties. In his previous work incarnations, Bob worked closely with whānau development, as well as a role in the restructuring and performance management of the State Services Commission. During this time, he also completed a Doctorate focusing on Indigenous forms of organisation. In addition to his current position, Bob maintains close ties to his rohe and is involved with hapū and iwi strategy and capability development, as well as being a deputy chair for the River trust board and a sitting member of the New Zealand Council of Education Research.

Carly

Carly has over 18 years of experience in the tourism industry first within a large corporate airline and secondly at the helm of her own business, both here in New Zealand and overseas in Asia. It was during her overseas tenure that Carly gained invaluable insight into aspects of cultural tourism, when working with different cultural groups from South Korea, China, India and Cambodia. With these experiences and coming back to New Zealand to re-engage with her own Māori roots, Carly completed a Masters in International Relations at Victoria University and became involved in the field of ethical investment, business ethics and sustainability issues in corporate New Zealand. Carly views the field of Māori business as being on the threshold of larger scale development and positive outcomes for Māori business and the wider community. She is particularly passionate about how the concepts of sustainable practice are embedded within a Māori worldview and would like to see Māori understanding going forward in creating enterprises that enable Māori people to participate in their economy.

Delia

Delia is a 5th generation Pākehā New Zealander who has worked in education and tourism, both in New Zealand and overseas. The past several years, has seen Delia in a role that has
focused on improving the understanding, knowledge and collaboration between Māori and non-Māori in the New Zealand tourism sector. This role has prompted Delia’s own journey of learning about New Zealand and Te Ao Māori, something in which Delia is proud of undertaking and passionate about. In tourism, Delia believes that Māori offer a rich, diverse and unique field of culture and practice that must be protected, preserved and promoted in ways that are sensitive to Te Ao Māori. Delia believes that the major area of opportunity and challenge in the field is the willingness of people, both Māori and non-Māori to engage with each other with good intentions, learn from one another, acknowledge differences and be honest in communications.

**Emma**

Emma has had over thirty year’s experience as an academic, working in the public and private sectors in New Zealand and overseas and from life. Her interests centred originally on Māori history and society, then increasingly began to focus on Māori views and practices around business management and development. This has provided Emma with vast insight into the continual evolution that encompasses Māori culture, economy, politics and society.

**George**

Looking back over the past ten years, George has worked in a variety of business contexts, both Māori and non-Māori, public and private. After receiving a Commerce degree, George worked in a small distribution company as the finance manager. After learning all he could there, George moved into the government agency policy environment focusing on Māori development issues, a role which he has found rewarding and challenging. Additionally, George has his own property company, acts as a part-time consultant for a mortgage organisation and maintains his connection to his rohe by working with whānau on small land holdings. George sees tremendous opportunities for Māori development, particularly with the increasing numbers of young, qualified and culturally attuned Māori emerging on the scene.

**Julie**

For Julie her business experiences have been firmly developed around the life she wanted to lead and more importantly the life she wanted for her family. Thus, being a part of the Māori community is a central facet of Julie’s business and it has been the balance of Māori and non-Māori values which has proven to be a significant part of the businesses success. Julie feels very fortunate to have had the opportunity and experience of engaging with many important Māori and non-Māori communities during her personal and business development. For Julie being confident in our own understanding or sense of being Māori is at the core of the continual success and increasing strength of the Māori economy.

**Janice**

Janice has an extensive experience in the world of science and therefore comes from a very technical and strong research background. After a return to university to complete an MBA, Janice ended up in the public sector working with a large City Council developing new products and services for business, such as new processes for recycling. This experience developed Janice’s strong sense of a social and economic focus, which at the time was quite a unique way of engaging with business relationships. More recently Janice has been working
in the field of Māori business as part of the commercial development unit of an Iwi corporation. Janice sees the synergy that can be created between Pākehā and Māori worlds as central to moving forward for both the Māori and New Zealand economy. This means reflecting on and understanding the inherent strengths and weaknesses of both to harness the huge scope of value that Māori business brings to New Zealand.

Jacob

Jacob has a great deal of experience in working with Māori businesses, having built his own consultancy services, offering advice and mentoring to Māori businesses. For Jacob this combines his experience in operating his own businesses, engagement with Māori communities and his role in managing government agencies. A key incentive for Jacob is the desire to support Māori initiatives in business because they are an important foundation for social and cultural development in Māori communities. Jacob views the contemporary field of Māori business as a dynamic and a balanced range of experiences and practices that reflect both Māori and mainstream perspectives.

Jenny

Jenny has had an exciting and varied career working in both the public and private sectors. Her sense of identity as a Māori woman has played a central role in her keen sense of business practice and guided her towards business initiatives in capital investment, technology and community endeavours. Jenny’s personal vision is to be able to make a difference for Māori, for women and in understanding the multiplicitous concept of leadership for Māori people. Central to this is the simple philosophy about making decisions to create choices as individuals and as a community.

Karla

Karla has worked extensively with Māori businesses in the tourism industry. It is her belief that Māori culture must be presented as authentically and respectfully as possible. Her perspective is that Māori is New Zealand’s point of interest as tourists can go anywhere in the world to see mountains, landscape, beaches, geothermal activity, and glaciers, however only New Zealand has Māori culture. Karla’s vision of Māori culture was developed through post-graduate studies and several years working in Japan where she gained a deeper appreciation of distinct cultural nuances. In Karla’s mind, regardless of whatever pathway Māori take towards development, their cultural identity and practice has to take a central role.

Mikaere

Mikaere has a dynamic and varied range of business experience over a period of approximately 20 years; from public service, work in and consultancy for the aviation industry, small business interests, including meat and leather works and general business consultancy. He now offers a range of consultancy services to New Zealand government agencies. Mikaere believes that central to Māori business development are the people and what they can bring to the field. To that end he is a strong advocate for development of networks, particularly a Māori business network, where Māori business community members can come together to share experiences, learn and celebrate together, which he sees as being a crucial aspect of Māori business development that emulates the close relationship based way of practice for Māori.
**Martin**

Martin has worked in a variety of jobs and travelled extensively around the world. This particular background has afforded him significant insight into the distinctive attributes of people and business. His experience has played an important role in his position with Te Puni Kōkiri business facilitation service. Providing support to Māori business is a central concern for Martin and he places strong emphasis on working with people to help make their ideas work. Māori business enterprises need good practices, good information networks and appropriate linkages to cultural values that support their business acumen. Martin strongly believes that Māori business has a lot to offer Māoridom, and to both the New Zealand and global marketplace.

**Nancy**

Nancy has had a great deal of experience in the New Zealand creative industry, particularly in events management, administration and business planning. In keeping with her passion for Māori culture and wealth of experience Nancy designs and manages packages that include taking Māori operators to other countries where they can expose their products and services to international markets. It is a smaller and more personalised approach than some of the larger scale trade expos. A crucial element of the experience is the telling of the story behind the product or service, ensuring the markets gain a real sense of who Māori are. Nancy's experiences in the field of Māori business are grounded in her innate sense of values that are derived from being Māori and a sense of belonging to a collective identity. The future for the field is full of opportunities that need to the impetus of both individuals and communal groups to interact and participate in the growing Māori economy.

**Peter**

Peter has an extensive background in business administration and a great deal of experience in working within the government legislative processes and the Māori Land Court. His passion for business is a consequence of a sound ethic of working hard, good education and the importance of whānau passed onto him from his parents. Travel and exposure too many cultures around the world also supports Peter in his approach to and success in business. Peter currently holds a number of Directorships in Crown agencies and is Chairperson of a successful Māori owned enterprise, which manages a large land estate and other business ventures in New Zealand. This enterprise is something Peter is extremely proud of as its governance is still very much controlled by the hapū and whānau, which set the original objective of consolidating and protecting tribal assets in order to be able to utilise and invest in them wisely. Whilst this venture is something attributable to a distinctive tribal area, Peter views it in a bigger picture of how Māori can take opportunity’s and come together to rebuild communities and build successful businesses that embrace our values.

**Patrick**

Patrick is a partner in an accounting firm with an extensive role in mentoring and business consultation to Māori businesses, either as part of the accounting practice or through the Māori Business Facilitation Service sponsored by Te Puni Kōkiri. Patrick has been involved in the field of Māori business for about 20 years and views his role as being as a facilitator for both Māori and non-Māori business networks in particular the relationship with the
people in various agencies that deal with Māori issues. Patrick has seen a lot of positive change in Māori economic development in the past decade.

**Robert**

After completing a University degree in Management Studies Robert has been involved in numerous small business enterprises in tourism, consultancy and retail. At present Robert is the Chief Executive of a Māori Trust that provides an investment service to assist consolidation and growth of the micro-small Māori business sector. Typically the Trust facilitates access and engagement with other agencies that provide mentoring and other services to assist in the development of a supportive network for Māori business, Robert feels that Māori economic development is good, but can be better. Even though there is a great deal of positive attention on development and Māori are getting better at what they are doing the field of Māori business needs emphasis on upgrading capability and innovative practice.

**Russell**

Russell took a serious interest in Māori culture and practice in his early twenties after speaking on behalf of his whānau at his Grandmothers tangi. That experience inspired Russell to make the most of any opportunity to speak and engage with the Māori community, which he reinforced by taking Māori language papers as part of his under- and post-graduate degrees at University. He strongly believes that Māori businesses can excel when they achieve balance between a Māori and commercial worldview.

**Rueben**

Rueben has had extensive experience in running his own small businesses in the hospitality, catering and educational contract industries. In these business contexts, Rueben has had experience engaging with primarily Māori oriented organisations and also operated one of his businesses with a non-Māori business partner. This provided a unique perspective of the field of Māori business as one that interacts constantly with non-Māori elements. Rueben firmly believes that it is each individual’s experiences in engaging with the Māori community and construction of self-identity, which form the basis for the development and mobilisation of Māori business resources and capabilities.

**Sarah**

Sarah is a Chartered Management Accountant with significant business experience with large and small business operations in both New Zealand and internationally. She currently runs her own business, but also works closely with a network of Māori businesses contributing mentoring, peer support and business advising to Māori business operators in her region. Sarah sees a lot of passion in the Māori business community but also a real need for the up-skilling of Māori business people to develop their businesses capabilities.

**Tracey**

Tracey has had exposure to the operations of whānau business from an early age. Growing up, her father included the whānau in his business activities, from administration to hands-on work experience. This exposure to business activities and strong whānau work ethic provided Tracey with insight into the complementarity between the business world and Māori values.
These skills and values became second nature to Tracey, which saw her in good stead as she entered the workforce. Tracey has worked in a variety of industries from engineering and corporate banking, in Australasia and Europe. After a period of semi-retirement Tracey, became involved in issues facing Māori development, which has seen her become the CEO of an iwi corporation. Tracey sees a more proactive and strategic role for Māori business to ensure that every opportunity available is identified, researched and put into practice. Underlying all of this is the empowerment of Māori, using Māori values to drive business and entrepreneurship.

**Witikanga**

Witikanga has had quite an eclectic background in working with both mainstream and Māori organisations. Most notably Witikanga worked in the fishing industry in both public and private sectors including a role as Fisheries Convenor with the National Māori Congress. This experience has provided Witikanga with the knowledge and skill to create a situation in tourism where both Māori and non-Māori could engage in a meaningful ways. This involved working across all organisational activities and implementing a strategic plan for the agency she worked for aimed at improving its understanding, relationship building and promotion of its Māori client base. The result was a more meaningful engagement with Māori in terms of delivering product and service. For Witikanga, progress in the contemporary field of Māori business is about achieving balance between mainstream and Māori business practices.
## Appendix F – Description of Māori Economic Development Hui

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Māori Economic Development Hui</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Kaupapa of Hui</th>
<th>Number of Delegates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hui Taumata 2005</td>
<td>01-03 March</td>
<td>Intensive discussion, workshops and debate on ways to accelerate Māori economic development and create economic pathways for the generations ahead</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Papa Tongarewa, Wellington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Papa Tongarewa, Wellington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Te Ara Matariki: Pathway to New Beginnings 2005</td>
<td>20-21 June</td>
<td>Te Ara Matariki is based on the philosophy that economies are embedded in society and that economic development can only be successful when it is compatible with the social and cultural values of the societies involved. It asks the question: How do we harness the strengths of indigenous knowledge for economic benefit? Presented paper - Breaking the Mould: Moving beyond traditional conceptions of competitiveness</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennium Hotel Rotorua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate Lodge Cromwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


