



WORKING PAPER SERIES

03-10

Māori values for Māori business: Cultural Capital in Indigenous Organisations

ISSN 1179-3023 (online)

ISBN 978-0-475-12359-6

Philip Best

Lecturer

Te Kawa A Māui

Victoria University, New Zealand

philip.best@vuw.ac.nz

Tel.: + 64 4 463 5466

Matene Love

Senior Lecturer

Victoria Management School

Victoria University, New Zealand

PO Box 600

Wellington 6140

New Zealand

matene.love@vuw.ac.nz

Tel.: + 64 4 463 6020

Fax: + 64 4 463 5084

ABSTRACT

Cultural capital holds much prospect as a theoretical concept for engaging core Indigenous Māori values in capitalistic endeavours, yet it still awaits satisfactory interpretation by Indigenous Māori management theorists researching in Aotearoa New Zealand. Particularly, little is known about how Māori values, beliefs and perspectives impact managerial decision-making to create competitive advantage locally, nationally and internationally. Kaupapa Māori Research has been cited in the research literature as an ideal method for exploring the little known experiences of Māori managers employing the concept of cultural capital. This paper argues that a particular variation of Kaupapa Māori Research be employed to collect and interpret empirical material collected in face-to-face interviews with managers in Māori-centred (tribal and family -based) organisations operating in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Keywords: cultural capital, indigenous, Maori business, Maori values and productivity

“While local companies cannot match a global giant’s economic resources, it can compete by making the most of its cultural capital, and emphasising the prestige of its cultural heritage. By cultural capital... means those aspects of your culture that are valued (Italy’s reputation for designing elegant clothes and accessories for example), which can be commoditised and turned into an economic resource.”

(Kippenberger, 2000, p.21).

INTRODUCTION

Māori organisations are gaining an increasing amount of the New Zealand economy showing growth rates superior to the national average. Whilst Treaty settlements account for some of this growth in Māori assets these account for less than five percent of the total. Some Māori organisations have not done well in the first few years after their formation but then begin to perform well, showing greater growth, though others have performed well from the outset. Māori organisations not only measure their success in a different way to European organisations they also have different methods of leadership and management based on Māori tikanga and kawa that can result in productivity and asset growth that are different to those expected. Cultural capital may be able to explain these differences.

ON CULTURAL CAPITAL

At the risk of oversimplification we might accept, given the international literature (Berkes and Folke, 1992, 1994; Broady, 2001; Clerq and Voronov, 2009; Fujimoto, 2004; Meeteren, Enggbensen, and San, 2009; Robinson, Schmid and Siles, 2002; Schuller, 2000; Silva, Warde and Wright, 2009; Throsby, 1999, 2000, 2003, 2005), that cultural capital is that aspect of a particular culture that is valued, can be commoditised and therefore turned into an economic resource (Kippenberger, 2000) Our reading of the literature suggests the notion of cultural capital is barely apparent in the field of Aotearoa New Zealand business research and further, non-existent in the Māori business field.

For a while now economic theory has explained business as being those activities advancing shareholder wealth. Scholars are well aware of the influence economic theory has had on business. Van Over and Barone (1975) once crafted that “...the ideologies upon which the modern-day corporation is founded are based on principles and philosophies set forth in the protestant ethic and classical economic theory” (p.339), further stating that “...the

corporation has but one role in society: to maximize profits for the shareholder-owner” (p.339). Indeed, the conversationalist with the most to say on economic theory was Milton Friedman (1962, 1970, 1982) whose interest was in the promotion of shareholder wealth.

We might accept that indigenous businesses are different to Western businesses in that their owners, stakeholders and beneficiaries want different things; financial, environmental, social as well as cultural outputs from their business activities. Thus, there is little doubt that cultural elements are at work within Māori businesses. But these cultural elements are complex and diverse. It is our opinion that cultural capital may well hold the clue to researching the successes of Māori businesses. For guidance on how cultural capital may be applied in the research field of Māori business we turn to its use in education, arts and anthropology.

In the Arts, Throsby (2005) has suggested that “an item of cultural capital can be defined as an asset that embodies or gives rise to cultural value in addition to whatever economic value it might possess” (p.3). While he claims that cultural capital can be centred around an intangible item such as ideas and beliefs, he goes on to offer a compelling example of a tangible item so we repeat it in full:

“a heritage building may have some commercial value as a piece of real estate, but its true value to individuals or to the community is likely to have aesthetic, spiritual, symbolic or other elements that may transcend or lie outside of the economic calculus. These values¹ can be called the building’s cultural value.” (Throsby, 2005, p.3).

Clearly there is a value which can be placed on an item which is different to the economic value of the item. This difference, according to Throsby, is the cultural value, or in other words, the cultural capital part of the total capital attached to an item. So to extrapolate, one could postulate that when an item is sold, a portion of the capital realised as financial capital could in fact be cultural capital. In other words the sale has converted cultural capital into financial capital. This can perhaps be explained as follows.

Two artists can paint on the same size canvass with the same amount and colours of paint, taking the same time to complete their work. The Rembrandt is worth many times that produced by the unknown artist. Similarly two people can have the same educational backgrounds, similar experiences, be of the same age and yet one is able to command a higher remuneration than the other. Two organisations producing similar products with similar costs and one can sell its products at a premium over the other. The value of an indigenous tour

may be higher than a non-indigenous tour. These are all examples of a relationship between cultural capital and economic capital.

These examples also show there can be a difference between the economic value of an item and its total value. We suggest that the difference may in fact be the cultural capital of the item. This suggestion is not too different from when Bourdieu (1980) postulated cultural capital may explain the differences in educational attainment. This was because he believed that the then current theory did not completely explain educational success. His use of cultural capital to explain a gap in understanding is a notion we will return to.

In Anthropology cultural capital is seen as an ability within a group which enables survival and

“refers to factors that provide human societies with the means and adaptations to deal with the natural environment and to actively modify it: how people view the world and the universe, or cosmology, environmental philosophy and ethics, including religion, traditional ecological knowledge and social (and) political institutions includes the wide variety of ways in which societies interact with their environment; it includes all cultural diversity.” (Berkes & Faulkes, 1992, p.2).

If it is possible to transfer this notion into the business arena it may suggest that cultural capital is in fact one of the fundamental bases on which a business, as a group of individuals making up a community, operates. If this is so, then an understanding of cultural capital is fundamental to understanding the elements that contribute to the success of a business.

Robinson et al. (2002) suggested cultural capital and organisational capital may provide the experienced kernels of commonality essential to the development of social capital. They appear to be suggesting that cultural capital may give rise, at least partly, to social capital. We think that social capital and cultural capital are the opposite ends of a linear relationship whereby cultural capital pertains to individuals and social capital relates to groups. If this is so, then there should be a relationship between cultural capital, social capital and human capital which would then lead on to the relationship with financial capital, natural capital and the performance of the organisation, Thus our contention which we may further develop as our research progresses, that understanding cultural capital may be pivotal to a greater understanding of productivity in organisations.

There is a relationship between one's culture and cultural capital. Rueylijg Tzeng (2010) points out that Americans working in Taiwanese businesses increase the cultural capital of both themselves and the organisation they are employed with. They do this by absorbing some Taiwanese "ways of doing things" whilst for the Taiwanese employer they increase the opportunities for businesses with American companies. In fact Americans are prepared to take a reduction in salary in order to develop this increased cultural capital thus establishing a further possible link between cultural capital and economic capital. In a similar way, indigenous corporations use indigenous culture in the sense of "ways of doing things" and sometimes as well using their own cultural knowledge to produce products and services which are more valuable in the market-place. Thus establishing a possible further link between cultural capital and economic capital.

In researching the literature on cultural capital a range of capital descriptors emerge. It may be that as our research continues that we are able to identify these as relatives of cultural capital. Examples include; Feminine Capital (Fujimoto, 2004), Intellectual Capital (Schuller, 2000), Racial Capital (Farrer, 2010), Organisational Capital (Schuller, 2000), Religious Capital (Demerath, 1991), Sexual Capital (Farrer, 2010), Spiritual Capital (Demerath, 1991), and maybe Symbolic Capital (Clerq, 2009) as well. All these notions have something in common. They are related to a person's thinking, beliefs and experience. Unlike Human Capital:

"human capital...includes any skills, information, and know-how that contribute to social mobility. Human capital operates in the marketplace and is directly productive. Cultural capital operates through informal social interaction and is only rarely economically productive² (DiMaggio 2004).

We question whether cultural capital is "rarely economically productive" as it may well be that cultural capital is greatly more productive than we realise.

As we have said before, cultural capital may be related to social capital possibly on some sort of continuum that relates groups to individuals. In the indigenous world, Robinson and Williams (2001, p55) offer:

"the Māori concept of family (whānau) moves seamlessly from the immediate family to the wider family network (hāpu) and the tribe (iwi), where the (extended) family becomes the community and the community is made up of the (extended) family. Social capital is created through networks and relationships that are within all of these expressions of "family" (or community). Thus, in the Māori context, the distinction between cultural and social capital disappears. Cultural capital is an important aspect of social capital and social capital is an expression of

cultural capital in practice. Social capital is based on and grows from the norms, values, networks and ways of operating that are the core of social capital.”

This may suggest that the relationship between cultural capital, social capital and therefore human capital may be different when comparing indigenous with non-indigenous organisations.

Cultural capital is a complex and convoluted term that means different things in different contexts. Indeed, it has barely made its way to Aotearoa New Zealand business research and its appearance in Māori business research appears non-existent. Māori organisation’s pursuit of the quadruple bottom line of Cultural, Environmental Financial, and Social, along with Maori values employed in successful Maori organisations may be leading to their success. Maori organisations are becoming increasingly successful in New Zealand. It may be, that their success can be explained by understanding the cultural capital of such organisations where an explanation using more traditional forms of capital may be found wanting. If cultural capital is, first, something other than, or in addition to, economic capital and second, potentially divergent across organisational (say, business) structures, then does an exploration of Māori business cultural capital hold prospect in challenging the prevailing economic conceptions of business that ‘appear’ so authoritative? We think so. In order to advance this, we move to outlining the fundamental presuppositions of our approach to exploring this agenda empirically.

EARLY INDIGENOUS MĀORI TRADE³

Māori organisations prior to European contact were the powerbase in Aotearoa New Zealand. When Māori arrived in Aotearoa New Zealand in the 1300’s, they were greeted with an extensive coastline punctured with harbours and estuaries that seemed to go on forever. It is the largest, southern-most island group in Polynesia and vastly different to any other. It was no doubt alluring and fascinating. Those East Polynesians who were the ancestors of Māori today were soon to discover that the land’s flora (plants and vegetation) was extremely diverse. From desolate tussock-lands to colossal Kauri trees and from mosses to beech forests on mountain sides, from inshore shellfish beds to massive offshore fish resources, it was lush with the natural resources that Māori needed to live and support their people. Various minerals were also available and along with foods introduced from the homeland of Hawaiki⁴,

these goods were to become the heart of gift exchange, commodity trading and Māori enterprise in Aotearoa New Zealand (Petrie, 1996).

As Māori started to occupy various areas of the country, regional products were exchanged over long distances. Coastal Māori offered kaimoana (seafood) and inland Māori provided berries, preserved birds and other products of the forest in return. Petrie (1996, p.25) notes on the transfer of minerals:

“Minerals associated with particular districts were also important trade items. Obsidian from Tūhua (Mayor Island), particularly valuable for knives and cutting tools, found its way to many other areas, as did argillite from Nelson and D’Urville Island and Basalt from Tahanga in the Coromandel. The trade in pounamu (greenstone or jade) was vital to the economy of South Island Māori. It was exchanged for obsidian and argillite as well as flint, chert and other minerals, but the trading of stone for foodstuffs was also significant”.

The social structure of Māori prior to European settlement is difficult to determine. It is, however, safe to assume that society was based on kinship. That is, it was based around the unifying social structures of whanau (extended family), hapu (sub-tribes or a collection of families), iwi (tribe or a collection of hapu), and waka (a collection of iwi tracing their ancestry to migratory canoes). Indeed, Māori were the first small enterprise owners in Aotearoa New Zealand (Cameron & Massey, 1999). Even before the European settlement of Aotearoa New Zealand in the early 1800s, Māori had well-established business systems and regular trading patterns amongst their own whānau, hapū, within their own iwi, and between various iwi, but things were about to change.

MĀORI ENTERPRISE THROUGH SETTLEMENT IN AOTEAROA NEW ZEALAND

The increasing number of settlers arriving in Aotearoa New Zealand, along with the extensive land purchases by Europeans forced the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi on 6 February 1840. The earlier Declaration of Independence on 28 October 1835 had been an attempt to make Aotearoa New Zealand an independent nation for northern Māori under the protection of Britain. These significant events affected the ability of Māori to retain social, cultural and economic resources and control. The signing of the Treaty of Waitangi formed the basis for European settlement, the establishment of a British style of government and business opportunities for both parties in Aotearoa New Zealand. Following the years of settlement,

one of the major changes was that Māori switched their business and trading focus away from trading amongst themselves to forging business associations with the settlers (Love & Love, 2005). This soon extended to developing business relationships internationally, with history recording Māori making regular trips to Australia and the South Pacific to source and secure profitable business opportunities abroad. As Aotearoa New Zealand developed as a country and the economy grew, Māori found their niche in the primary sectors of business, preferring to remain within their own rohe (regions) on their traditional land blocks and collectively deriving an income through farming and agricultural activities (Love & Love, 2005).

Māori, in the first half of the nineteenth century, were the powerhouse of the New Zealand economy. Maori had market gardens, wheat farms, flour mills, shipping operations, timber, flax and food production facilities (Petrie, 2006)

However, with opportunity came certain threats to Māori culture and ways of doing things. The natural resources Māori had relied on to survive and support their people were in many cases taken from them. As Geare, Campbell-Hunt, Ruwhiu and Bull (2005) note, ‘...taking away a people’s resources (social, cultural and economic) also involves taking away their opportunity for development and self-determination’ (p.57). During the early years of colonisation, Māori suffered huge land losses -by legislation, purchase and confiscation. To Māori, land is the essence of all living and spiritual being. It not only provides economic opportunity but is also the source of spiritual, cultural and social identity. The Māori word for "land" is whenua. The Maori word for "placenta" is also whenua. When Māori started to lose their land, they also started to lose their identity and a sense of location. Māori without their land ceased to be Tangata Whenua - *the people of the land*.

MAORI ENTERPRISE IN THE 20TH CENTURY

The mid-1900s saw Aotearoa New Zealand move to become a more industrialised society than it had been in the past. The consequence was a severe labour shortage that soon developed in the main towns and cities. To fill the void in the labour market, government policies were put in place to entice Māori from their rural land blocks and into the cities to take up jobs in the unskilled and semi-skilled work sectors (Love & Love, 2005). Within two decades the world witnessed the largest and fastest case of urbanisation of an indigenous people ever seen from a rural setting to an urban environment. Māori had, in essence, traded

their status of being self-employed on their communally owned agricultural blocks to that of being employees in the fast growing industrial sector in the cities and towns of Aotearoa New Zealand (Love & Love, 2005).

The inevitable restructuring and downsizing of many of Aotearoa New Zealand's large manufacturing and primary sector businesses in the late 1980s/early-1990s, had a devastating effect on Māori, seeing them being laid off in disproportionate numbers to the rest of the workforce in Aotearoa New Zealand (French, 1998). As a consequence, Māori were left both jobless and without a foreseeable future in the modern workforce. In essence, they were faced with two options: either look to the government for support and welfare for the rest of their lives; or rekindle the entrepreneurial spirit their ancestors once possessed and develop their own enterprises in a SME⁵ consumer hungry world (Love & Love, 2005). Many chose to start their own businesses. This Māori desire to start developing their own enterprises reflected that entrepreneurial spirit. The result was the substantial growth of Māori participating in the SME sector. Yet, what confronts us in Aotearoa New Zealand is the inability to identify just what a Māori business is.

ON IDENTIFYING A MĀORI BUSINESS

There are a small, yet invaluable, number of contributions made to the conversation on identifying a Māori business. In *Ngā Kāhui Pou: Launching Māori Futures*, Mason Durie (2003) challenged "Māori business leaders to reconsider how commercial opportunities might contribute to Māori development in a way that accorded with Māori values and aspirations, and promoted synergies between Māori" (p.246). Durie referred to a 'Māori-centred' business as one that "deliberately revolves around Māori people, Māori assets, and Māori priorities" (Durie, 2003, p.246).

McInnes (1993) identified that "ownership in a core Māori business (Te taitaka) exists above the 50% level and there are significant Māori staff and management levels as well as objectives that could easily be defined as being responsive/sensitive to Māori aspirations" (in French, 1998, p.19). Gordon, (1996) stated that by having some characteristics, this leads to fulfilling other characteristics that are essential; "the degree of control is determined by ownership power and management powers because they control the firm's structure, vision, culture, assets, employment, financing and product" (in French, 1998, p.21). In a

questionnaire, with a response from 153 Māori business people, French (1998, p 21) found that:

“a third of the people surveyed thought it would be possible to define a Māori business using only one of the parameters (ownership, culture, management practices, product and numbers of Māori managers and employees) put forward”.

There is a strong case for ownership as the dominant characteristic and it may help to discuss this further. However, contributors do not seem to agree that ownership is the ‘only’ characteristic and there is no sign from scholars that ownership solely defines a Māori business. McInnes (1993) argued that “ownership is paramount but control/management and staffing are also important determinants of business ethnicity” (p.19). But, what is it that is unique about Māori business managers? Durie (2003) noted that “managing diverse goals is a requirement of good management” (p.249) and those managers must adopt Māori values. Love (2004) added that Māori management employs more caution and consultation. Here, a Māori manager’s obligation to Māori well-being is evident. However, do we assume that a Māori manager will hold such values, address diverse goals, employ caution and consultation and therefore practice them?

The numbers of Māori in management positions and as employees in a business is not well known. However, where there are Māori managers/employees, then their actions will reflect the greater needs of Māori society. So, what do Māori managers and employees bring to a business that eventually makes the business, Māori? The concept of whānau is brought up in the literature as it relates to employees; “employees identify themselves as whānau and in so doing they have their part in the mana⁶, and the whanaungatanga⁷, which goes with that” (Knox, 1992, in French, 1998, p.18). The concept of whānau illustrates the personal obligation of the employee to the greater concern for wider Māori prosperity. Individual well-being gives way to the well-being of all Māori. Knox (1992) argues that Māori business is “different because it has a whānau focus. The business serves the needs of the whānau, and authority is by consensus including advice from Kaumātua⁸” (p.18).

Consistently through the literature is this idea of retaining protecting and growing the asset base: “a Māori organisation because of the nature of the land holdings must be seen as having a primary objective of retaining and growing the core asset and being risk adverse in terms of its decision making” (Palmerston North Māori Reserve Trust representatives, in Federation of

Māori Authorities, 2003, p.49). Similarly, “with other businesses there is the opportunity to sell off the business and take a capital gain, but for Māori organisations the fundamental requirement is that the asset is protected and that it grows” (Palmerston North Māori Reserve Trust representatives cited in Federation of Māori Authorities, 2003, p.49). Unlike many non-Māori businesses, French and Walker (1999) identified that profit may not be as important as the survival of and retaining of assets.

Ultimately, there has been the argument for Māori businesses to integrate into the Western or capitalist system that has arisen from colonisation. Gould (1996) argued that though some organisations have held on strongly to traditional values, “others have adjusted their culture more readily to reflect the values of a modern capitalist society” (p.23). French (1998) further explained that Māori business is “a phenomenon of post-colonial era” and refers to Māori business as having to develop infrastructure “whilst enabling their survival and integration into the new systems” (p.17). Similarly, French and Walker (1999) posited that “Māori who work in the Western business entity are working in foreign soil, and they've got to adapt” (p.117). Herein lays a significant issue for Māori as they attempt to retain assets and cultural identity while at the same time strive to be part of the capitalist system, economic leaders and contributors to national prosperity. Traditional Māori businesses were developed using Māori values and perspectives. Twenty First century Māori businesses are based on the same concepts – many of these are deeply embedded in “the ways of doing things”. Cultural capital may be a way of describing these unknown and unresearched elements.

KAUPAPA MĀORI RESEARCH⁹

The purpose of this section is to review Kaupapa Māori Research as a philosophical foundation for our study. It is a concept that has been the subject of much debate, however, there are common understandings and assumptions. At the centre of Kaupapa Māori Research is the resistance to, rejection of, or challenge against the dominant discourse established through; colonialism and Pākehā and Western ways of knowing. As Henry & Pene (2001) argued, “Māori intellectuals, in resistance to colonial heritage and hegemony of New Zealand’s colonial past, are at the forefront of developing the Kaupapa Māori paradigm” (p.234). Similarly, Bishop (1996) added that “Kaupapa Māori research, is challenging the dominance of the Pākehā world-view in research” (p.146) and referred to the opposite of Kaupapa Māori Research as the dominant discourse.

Such statements clearly indicate that Kaupapa Māori Research resists the dominant discourse. Bishop (1996) went on to suggest that an understanding of the Kaupapa Māori position challenged "...the ways of defining, accessing, and constructing knowledge about indigenous peoples and the process of self-critique that is used by Western scholars as a means of attaining what becomes their version of the 'truth'." (p.146) and further indicated, that Kaupapa Māori Research "...challenges the fact that power and control over the research issues is located in another cultural frame of reference" (p.146). Walker (1990) proposed that "over the past two decades, the Māori Renaissance, or cultural revival, has engendered an environment in which Māori intellectuals have begun to challenge Western models of knowing and knowledge-construction" (in Henry & Pene, 2001, p.236). Quite simply, some Māori have begun to reject notions of theory and research (Smith, 1999). However, the arguments move beyond resistance.

They go further and identify that Kaupapa Māori Research not only resists the dominant discourse but also attempts to reclaim tradition and indigeneity. Glover (1997) claimed that Kaupapa Māori Research has arisen from "Māori dissatisfaction with dominant Western forms of, and Pakeha control of, research and...a desire to recover and reinstitute matauranga Māori – the indigenous system that was in place before colonisation" (in Cunningham, 2000, p. 65). Reid (1998) not only argued against colonisation, but went further to suggest that "Kaupapa Māori challenges a universal approach..." and goes on to explain that Kaupapa Māori must be able to "address Māori needs or give full recognition of Māori culture and value systems" (in Henry & Pene, 2001, p.236).

The traditional value of collectivism forms an important assumption that underlies the Kaupapa Māori Research process (Bishop, 1996). He explained further, the interpersonal, interdependent assumptions held by Kaupapa Māori researchers:

"...as we learn our whakapapa [genealogy], we learn of our total integration, connectedness, and commitment to the world and the need to let go of the focus on self. We know that there is a way of knowing, that is different from that which was taught to those colonised into the western way of thought" (p.158).

Bishop (1996) introduced the term 'whanaungatanga' which "...consist literally of kin relationships between ourselves and others, and is constituted in ways determined by the Māori cultural context" (Bishop, 1996, p.147). He goes on to argue that "whakawhanaungatanga is the process of establishing whānau relationships, literally by

means of identifying, through culturally appropriate means, your bodily linkage, your engagement, your connectedness, and therefore unspoken but implicit commitment to other people” (Bishop 1996, p.148). This collective concept is essential and guides the research process. In fact, it may well be this collectivism, so familiar to indigenous people that is one of the contributors to Māori cultural capital.

Identified as a unique epistemological position, the Māori philosophy of whānau is the core social unit, as opposed to the individual, brought from pre-colonial times. It is a way of organising, incorporating ethical procedures, distributing tasks, keeping Māori values central, giving the community a voice and as a way of debating issues that impact on the research project (Smith, 1999). Yet, according to Bishop (1996), individuals have responsibilities to assist others in the research group while adhering to the kaupapa of the group. The role is often that of a Kaumātua:

“A leader in a whānau of interest is not one who makes all the decisions, but rather is a guide to culturally appropriate procedures for decision-making and a listener to the voices of all members of the whānau. The role of Kaumātua is to seek consensus from the collective and be the ‘voice’ of the group” (Bishop, 1996, p.149).

Smith (1995) once argued that Māori involvement in Kaupapa Māori Research should be done by, for and with Māori, commenting that “Kaupapa Māori research has provided a position from which researchers and the researched have been able to set new directions for the priorities, policies and practices of research for, by and with Māori” (Smith, 1999, p.183). She further states that a radical point of view might argue against non-indigenous participation, but also identifies that some may say non-indigenous people may be involved, but not on their own and definitely not if they are anti-Māori. Bishop (1996) made his position clear, “Non-Māori researchers need to seek inclusion on Māori terms, in terms of kin/metaphoric kin relationships and obligations, that is, within Māori constituted practices and understandings in order to establish their identity within research projects” (p.157). Simply, Cunningham (2000) points out; “...Kaupapa-Māori research has a high degree of involvement of Māori at all levels” (p. 65).

Kaupapa Māori Research theorists have been relatively critical with their views. Indeed, we might argue that critical research (particularly feminist research) makes much of the same argument that Kaupapa Māori Research has attempted to impose on Aotearoa New Zealand researchers. When it comes to business, a Kaupapa Māori Research inspired procedure is

found wanting. Māori business research should not only be about uncovering Māori ways of conducting business, it must be also concerned with the impact of all business actions on all things Māori and therefore some understanding of the theoretical base from Kaupapa Māori Research is important. Irwin (1994) sums it up nicely when he states that Kaupapa Māori Research is research which is culturally safe and culturally relevant (in Smith, 1999). Kaupapa Māori Research is a useful tool to use in researching cultural capital in Māori organizations because it uses Māori concepts to understand what might be the Māori cultural capital in Māori organizations. It is our intention to explore further how Kaupapa Māori Research will assist us in our exploration of cultural capital as we attempt to be critical of prevailing modes of knowing and yet loyal to the Māori people.

CONCLUSION

Māori businesses and organisations are, once again, becoming very successful and powerful. Some of the reasons for their success have been their ability to convert traditional principles and philosophies into economic gains; that is, turning cultural capital into economic capital over and above what can be expected. In the same way that cultural capital seems to be able to explain some of the missing links in education and has a place in the arts and anthropology it is posited that a thorough understanding of cultural capital in indigenous organisations may also aid in understanding their success.

The issue is that much of our understanding can be put down to anecdotal evidence. Kaupapa Māori Research techniques may well be the answer to understanding cultural capital in Māori organisations. Kaupapa Māori Research guidelines may offer prospect in informing practice and, in particular, living up to the rigor of international indigenous research scholarship. We, the authors, hope that our research will offer something unique to local and international practice and scholarship. Thus, the questions are; first, what are the fundamental presuppositions present in Māori-managerial interpretations on cultural capital; second, what does this mean for Māori organisations and their pursuit of market share, and third, what are the implications for local and international scholarship.

REFERENCES

- Berkes, F. and Folke, C. (1992). A systems perspective on the interrelations between natural, human-made and Cultural Capital. *Ecological Economics*, 5(1):8.
- Berkes, F. and Folke, C. (1994). Investing in Cultural Capital for sustainable use of natural capital in *Investing in natural capital: the ecological economics approach to sustainability*. (p128 – 149), Washington, Island Press..
- Best, P. (2010). Indigenous business in *Management a VMS Approach*. Milton, John Wiley & Sons.
- Bishop, R. (1996). Addressing Issues of Self-determination and Legitimation in Kaupapa Maori Research. In B. Webber (Ed.), *He paepae korero: Research perspectives in Maori education* (p. 143-160). Wellington: NZCER.
- Bishop, R. (2003). Changing Power Relations in Education: Kaupapa Maori messages for mainstream education in Aotearoa/New Zealand [1]. *Comparative Education*, 39(2): 221-238.
- Bourdieu, P. and Nice, R. (1980). "The aristocracy of culture." *Media Culture & Society* (2): 225 - 254.
- Broady, D. (2001). What is Cultural Capital? Comments on Lennart Rosenlund's social structures and change. *Sociologisk arbok* Issue 2.
- Burrell, G., and Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological Paradigms and organisational analysis*: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.
- Calas, M. B., and Smircich, L. (2002). From 'The Woman's' Point of View: Feminist Approaches to Organization Studies. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of Organization Studies* (p. 218-257). London: Sage.
- Cameron, A. F, and Massey, C., (1999). *Small and medium-sized enterprises: a New Zealand perspective*. Auckland, Longman.
- Clegg, S. R., Hardy, C., and Nord, W.R. (2002). *Handbook of Organization Studies*. London: Sage.
- Clerq, D. and Voronov, M. (2009). The role of cultural and symbolic capital in entrepreneurs' ability to meet expectations about conformity and innovation. *Journal of small business management*, 47(3): 398 - 420.
- Colman, S. (2007). The role of human and financial capital in the profitability and growth of women-owned small firms. *Journal of Small Business Management* , 45(3):303 – 319.
- Cooper, A., Gimeno-Gascon, C, Javier, F., and Woo, C.Y. (1994). Initial human and financial capital as predictors of new venture performance. *Journal of Business Venturing* 9: 371 – 395.
- Cunningham, C. (2000). A framework for addressing Maori knowledge in *Research, science and technology*. *Pacific Health Dialog*, 7 (1):62-69.
- Demerath, N. J. I. (1991). Religious Capital and capital religions: Cross cultural and non-legal factors in the separation of church and state. *Daedalus* , 120 (3): 21 - 40.
- DiMaggio, P. (2004) "Cultural Capital." *Encyclopedia of Social Theory*. 2004. SAGE Publications. (internet)(accessed 10 May 2010) available from <http://www.sage->

reference.com.helicon.vuw.ac.nz/socialtheory/Article_n66.html?searchQuery=y%3D11%26quickSearch%3Dcultural%2Bcapital%26x%3D33

- DiMaggio, P. and Mohr, J., (1985). Cultural Capital, Educational attainment, and Marital selection. *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol 90 No. 6.
- Donaldson, T., and Preston, L. E. (1995). The Stakeholder Theory of the Corporation: Concepts, Evidence, and Implications in *Academy of Management Review*, 20(1), 65 - 91.
- Durie, M. (2003). The Business Ethic and Maori Development (Ch 16). In M. Durie (Ed.), *Nga kahui pou launching Maori futures*. (p. 241-252). Wellington, N.Z: Huia.
- Eames, P. (2006). *Cultural Wellbeing and Cultural Capital*. Waikanae, PSE Consultancy.
- Evan, W. M., & Freeman, R. E. (1995). A Stakeholder Theory of the Modern Corporation: Kantian Capitalism. In W. M. Hoffman & R. E. Frederick (Eds.), *Business Ethics: Readings and Cases in Corporate Morality* (3rd ed., p. 145-154): McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Farrer, J. (2010). A foreign adventure's paradise? Interracial sexuality and alien sexual capital in reform era Shanghai. *Sexualities*. 13(69).
- Foley, D. (2000). Successful Indigenous Australian Entrepreneurs: A case Study Analysis. *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies Unit*, Volume 4. Brisbane, University of Queensland.
- Foley, D. (2003). An examination of indigenous Australian entrepreneurs. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, , 8 (2).
- Foley, D. (2004). *Where do Indigenous Australian entrepreneurs fit into mainstream society?* ANZAM Paper 2004.
- Foley, D. (2005). Do indigenous Australian entrepreneurs fit into mainstream society in *Proceedings of the second annual AGSE International entrepreneurship research and exchange, Regional frontiers of entrepreneurship research*, Swinburne: University of Technology.
- Freeman, R. E. (2001). Stakeholder Theory of the Modern Corporation. In W. M. Hoffman, R. E. Frederick & M. S. Schwartz (Eds.), *Business Ethics: Readings and Cases in Corporate Morality* (4th ed., p. 160-167): McGraw-Hill.
- French, A. J. (1998). What is a Maori business: A survey of Maori business peoples perceptions? A research report presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Business Studies in Management at Massey University.
- French, A., and Walker, R. (1999). Walking in two worlds: fragments from a conversation with Ngatata Love. In N. Monin, J. Monin & R. Walker (Eds.), *Narratives of business and society: differing New Zealand voices* (p. 109 - 120). Auckland, N.Z: Pearson Education New Zealand; Longman.
- Friedman, M. (1962). *Capitalism and freedom. With the assistance of Rose D. Friedman*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Friedman, M. (1970), The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase Profits. *The New York Times Magazine*, September 13.
- Fujimoto, K. (2004). Feminine Capital: The forms of Capital in the Female Labor Market in Japan. *Sociological Quarterly* 45(1): 91-111.

-
- Geare, Campbell-Hunt, Ruwhiu and Bull (2005). The New Zealand management supplement. Auckland: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Harmsworth, G. (2006). *Māori values in the Māori business approach: An interim report investigating the incorporation of tikanga in Māori business & organizations*. Auckland: Mana Taiao.
- Harmsworth, G. (2002a), *Māori sustainable development in the 21st century: The importance of Māori values, strategic planning and information systems*. Palmerston North: Landcare Research.
- Harmsworth, G. (2002b). *Indigenous concepts, values and knowledge for sustainable development: New Zealand case studies*. Palmerston North: Landcare Research.
- Harmsworth, G. (2002c). Indigenous concepts, values and knowledge for sustainable development: New Zealand case studies, Paper given to 7th Joint Conference, "preservation of Ancient Cultures and the globalisation scenario". School of Māori and Pacific development & international centre for cultural studies, India 22 - 24 November 2002. Palmerston North: Landcare Research.
- Harmsworth, G. (2005a). Report on the incorporation of traditional values/tikanga into contemporary Māori business organisation and process Report LC/0405/058. Palmerston North: Landcare Research.
- Harmsworth, G. (2005b). Good practice guidelines for working with tangata whenua and Māori organisations: consolidating our learning, Landcare research report LC0405/091. Palmerston North: Landcare Research.
- Henry, E., and Pene, H. (2001). Kaupapa Maori: Locating Indigenous Ontology, Epistemology and Methodology in the Academy. *Organization*, 8(2): 234-242.
- Irwin, K. (1994). Maori Research methods and Processes: An Exploration. *Sites*, 12(Autumn), 25-43.
- Kang, M. J. and Glassman, M. (2010). Moral action as social capital, moral thought as Cultural Capital. *Journal of Moral Education* 39(1): 21 – 36
- Kim, P., Aldrich, H., Howard, E. and Keister, L.A, (2006). Access (Not) denied: The impact of financial, human and Cultural Capital on entrepreneurial entry in the United States. *Small Business Economics*, 27: 5 – 22.
- Kippenberger, T.(2000). Emerging strategies for local companies. *The Antidote* 5(2): 21 - 24.
- Lindsay, N J, Lindsay, W A, Jordaan, A and Hindle, K, (2006). Opportunity recognition attitudes of Nascent Indigenous Entrepreneurs. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 3(1): 56 – 75.
- Lindsay, N. J, (2005). Towards a cultural model of indigenous entrepreneurial attitude. *Academy of marketing Science review*, no. 05 (Internet)(accessed March 2007).available from <http://www.amsreview.org/artilces/lindsay05-2005.pdf>
- Lindsay, N., Lindsay, W., and Jordaan, A. (2005). Toward an inclusive theory of opportunity recognition: nascent indigenous entrepreneur attitudes toward opportunity recognition. In *Proceedings of the second annual AGSE International entrepreneurship research and exchange, Regional frontiers of entrepreneurship research*. Swinburne University of Technology.

- Love, M., and Love, T. (2005). Māori and Self-employment. In C. Massey, (Ed.), *Managing a Small Enterprise in New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson Education New Zealand Ltd.
- Meeteren, Masja Van, Enggbersen, Godfried, and San, Marion van, (2009). Striving for a better position: Aspiration and the role of cultural, economic and social capital for the irregular migrants in Belgium. *International Migration Review* 43(4).
- Palmer, F. R. (2000). Maori girls, power, physical education, sport and play: "being hungus, hori, and hoha", a thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy of the University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand.
- Petrie, H. (2006). *Chiefs of Industry: Maori tribal Enterprise in Early colonial New Zealand*. Auckland, Auckland University Press.
- Poutama Business Trust. Retrieved: (12 June 2004), Web address: <http://www.poutama.co.nz>
- Robinson, L. Schmid, J, Allan, A and Siles, M.E, (2002). Is social capital really capital. *Review of Social Economy*, 60(1).
- Schuller, T. (2000). The complementary roles of human and social capital. *International Symposium - The Contribution of Human and Social Capital to Sustained Economic Growth and Well-being..*
- Selvarajah, C. and Meyer, D. (2006). Archetypes of the Malaysian manager: Exploring ethnicity dimensions that relate to leadership. *Journal of Management and Organisation* 12 (3).
- Silva, E., Warde, A. and Wright, D. (2009). Using mixed methods for analysing culture: The Cultural Capital and social exclusion project. *Cultural Sociology* 3(299).
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.
- Smith, L. T. (2003). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (Sixth Impression ed.). Dunedin: University of Otago Press.
- Spiller, C. (2003). Investing In Culture – The 4th bottomline. *Ethical Investor* Issue 22.
- Spiller, C., Erakovic, L., Henare, M.and Pio, E. (2010). Relational well-being and wealth: Maori businesses and an ethic of care in *Journal of Business Ethics* .
- Stampnitsky, L. (2006). "How does "culture" become "capital"? Cultural and institutional struggles over "character and personality" at Harvard." *Sociological Perspectives* 49(4): 461 - 481.
- Te Puni Kokiri: The Ministry of Maori Development. Retrieved: (12 May 2004), Web: <http://www.tpk.govt.nz/business/facilitation/who.asp>.
- Throsby, D. (1999). Cultural Capital. *Journal of Cultural Economics* 23(3):12.
- Throsby, D. (2000). *Conceptualising heritage as Cultural Capital. Heritage economics: Challenges for heritage conservation and sustainable development in the 21st Century*, Canberra, Australian Heritage Commission.
- Throsby, D. (2003). Cultural Capital. *A handbook of cultural Economic*. R. Towse. Cheltenham, Edward Edgar: 166 - 169.

-
- Throsby, D. (2005). On sustainability of Cultural Capital. *Macquarie Economics Research Papers*. Sydney, Department of Economics, Macquarie University.
- Tilley, E. and Love, T. (2010). Learning from Kaupapa Māori: Issues and techniques for engagement. In the refereed proceedings of the *Australian & New Zealand Communication Association Conference 2010*, Canberra, 7-9 July.
- Tilley, E., and Love, T. (2005). The Role of Research in Cross-Cultural Communication in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In Sligo, F., & Bathurst, R. (Eds.), *Communication in the New Zealand Workplace: Theory and Practice*. Wellington: Software Technology of New Zealand.
- Tzeng, R. (2010). Cultural Capital and cross-border career ladders: Western professional migrants in Taiwan. *International Sociology* 25(123).
- Waldegrave, C. (1993). The challenges of culture to psychology and post-modern thinking. Paper presented at the Conference of the New Zealand Psychological Society, University of Victoria Wellington , 23-24 August.
- Walters, K. D. (1977). Corporate Social-Responsibility and Political-Ideology. *California Management Review*, 19(3): 40-51.
- Zohar, D. and Marshal, I. (2004). *Spiritual Capital: Wealth we live by*. San Fransisco. Berrett-Koehler.

¹“It is expected that there will be some relationship between cultural and economic value, since individuals will generally be willing to pay more for items they value more highly in cultural terms. But the relationship is unlikely to be perfect, and many examples exist of goods with high cultural value and low economic value, and vice versa.” (Throsby, 2005).

² http://www.sage-reference.com/helicon.vuw.ac.nz/socialtheory/Article_n66.html?searchQuery=y%3D11%26quickSearch%3Dcultural%2Bcapital%26x%3D33

³ Tilley, E., & Love, T. (2005). The Role of Research in Cross-Cultural Communication in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In Sligo, F., & Bathurst, R. (Eds.), *Communication in the New Zealand Workplace: Theory and Practice*. Wellington: Software Technology of New Zealand.

⁴ Kaumata is a male elder of the group – a wise person.

⁵ Small to Medium size Enterprises.

⁶ Mana is difficult to translate into English. It has variously been described as authority, control, influence, prestige, power, respect.

⁷ Whanaungatanga is relationships or kinship.

⁸ Kaumatua is a male elder of the group – a wise person.

⁹ Tilley, E. & Love, T. (2010). Learning from Kaupapa Māori: Issues and techniques for engagement. In the refereed proceedings of the *Australian & New Zealand Communication Association Conference 2010*, Canberra, 7-9 July.