

Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga

Te Pae Tawhiti
Māori Economic
Development Programme

Literature Review and Programme Report

November 2011



TE RŪNANGA O NGĀTI AWA



NGĀ PAE O TE
MĀRAMATANGA



TE WHARE WĀNANGA O
AWANUIĀRANGI
indigenous-university

ISBN 978-0-9864622-2-1

Published by Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga,
New Zealand's Indigenous Centre of Research Excellence,
The University of Auckland, New Zealand.

www.maramatanga.ac.nz

Designed and typeset by Kate Broome for undercover

Printed by Norcross.

November 2011

Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga, New Zealand's Indigenous Centre of Research Excellence, holds copyright for this report. This publication cannot be reproduced and sold at profit by others.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND PROGRAMME REPORT

Te Pae Tawhiti Māori Economic Development Programme

Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga

Lynette Carter*
and Rawinia Kamau†
with Mereana Barrett‡

* Kai Tahu, Kati Mamoe, Waitaha, Te Rapuwai; Senior Academic Writer, Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi

† Ngāti Kahungunu, Rongomaiwahine; Project Manager, Te Pae Tawhiti, Maori Economic Development Project, Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi

‡ Ngāti Maniapoto, Ngāi Tūhoe; Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	5
BACKGROUND	6
DEVELOPMENT AND INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE: ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL	8
HISTORIC MĀORI DEVELOPMENT: ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL	11
Historical challenges to Māori asset holdings	12
Developing Post Treaty Settlement Models	17
Iwi Strategic Plans and Social Capital	18
MEASURES OF THE ECONOMY	25
International Measures of the Economy	25
Human Development Index (HDI)	26
Measures of the New Zealand Economy	26
HDI and New Zealand Economic Indicators	27
Measures of the Māori Economy	27
Measures for Māori Economic Development	28
So What Does This Mean for Māori?	29
Human Development and Economic Growth	30
CONCLUSION	32
REFERENCES	34

INTRODUCTION

This document is a preliminary literature review for a three-year research programme that will investigate “What is Māori Economic Development”.¹ This is a Pae Tawhiti Research Initiative supported by Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga, New Zealand’s Indigenous Centre of Research Excellence. The research programme consists of three interlocking projects that will develop various scenarios and frameworks for developing models for future Māori economic development. The purpose of this literature review is to open discussion around Māori economic development with the research programme’s six participating iwi, and will attempt to highlight some silences in the literature that will be addressed at future iwi wānanga. Therefore it is by no means comprehensive, but

instead has been designed to answer a number of questions that are deemed by the research team to be key to addressing the first of three programme objectives: establishing an aspirational framework for Māori economic development. As such, primary and secondary sources were reviewed to establish what has already been said about economic development and Māori economic development in both historic and contemporary contexts. A number of international indigenous references are included to provide the six participating iwi with information on established models for indigenous development. Before we commence with the literature review *per se*, we will provide a background to the research programme that outlines the programme’s three interlocking projects.

1 The project team includes Distinguished Professor Graham Smith, CEO, Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi; Richard Jefferies, Provost, Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi; Jeremy Gardiner, CEO, Te Runanga o Ngāti Awa; Rawinia Kamau, Project Manager, Te Pae Tawhiti, Maori Economic Development Project, Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi; Professor Lyn Carter, Senior Academic Writer, Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi; Dr Mereana Barrett, Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi; Leonie Simpson, Te Runanga o Ngāti Awa; and Esther Cowley Malcolm, Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi.

BACKGROUND

The research programme will identify the critical success factors for Māori economic development. The research assumes Māori principles, values and practices and includes knowledge frameworks from iwi, Māori and non-Māori. The methodology will be eclectic, drawing from a range of Māori and non-Māori research tools from within qualitative and quantitative traditions. We intend to analyse the evidence for what works best for Māori aspirations. We examine two general sets of evidence: quantitative data, which will be sourced from regional and national government agencies to critically assess the indicative trends for regional and national economic (non)growth and/or (under) development; and qualitative evidence of how Māori-centred entities select and incorporate responses and strategies to realise their economic development aspirations. In order to reveal the overt and submerged influences that positively transform Māori economic development, we will engage in three specific projects:

1. The establishment of an aspirational framework for Māori economic development.
2. The design of innovative models and scenarios for Māori economic development.
3. The creation of a futures framework to transform Māori economic development.

The overarching research question is, *what are the critical success factors for Māori economic development?* Underpinning all three

project themes is the overall assumption that the programme aims to achieve frameworks and research methodologies steeped in the Māori way—of seeing, of doing, of being Māori.

The overall research aim is to harness the energy of the emerging Māori economy to the full benefit of iwi and Māori through analysing and assessing practices and strategies that will enable Māori economic self-development located in their own aspirations. The participants for the project will be limited to six iwi rohe as a sample of the Māori population. The six iwi are Ngāti Awa, Ngāi Te Rangī, Ngāpuhi, Ngāti Tahu–Ngāti Whaoa, Ngāti Kahungunu and Te Whānau ā Apanui.

A number of research questions will drive the projects and the overall research programme. The first considers the vision for the project and determines what is meant by Māori economic development. Before we can decide on what Māori economic development is, we need to be clear on how we define ‘development’ and ‘economic development’. Then project team will be able to identify the characteristics of development strategies that make them Māori or iwi centred. Answering this question will pose further challenges in determining how to accelerate and unleash creative potential and innovation within a Māori economic context. It will be necessary to draw on past and current case studies and experiences to capture the variables, values and knowledge that enable the case study models to be couched in an iwi-specific development

framework. We will investigate how many of these models and/or strategic plans drew on the distinct indigenous knowledge from specific iwi. To facilitate this, it is important that we investigate exactly what indigenous knowledge is and how can it drive development strategies and processes. This then leads into the last question—what does an indigenous or Māori model look like and what are the mechanisms for measuring and monitoring progress. These have been suggested as a number of principles of whakapapa: tikanga, mana, whanaungatanga, aroha, rangatiratanga and so on. Each of these variables and others that may be identified through further research will be defined in the context of this research programme. Of interest to the project team is the concept of mātauranga Māori, or Māori knowledge. Just as we will identify what indigenous knowledge is in terms of economic development, so we will define and contextualise mātauranga Māori. We will consider how it can be measured and how it determines progress for economic strategies and initiatives. It will also be necessary to define the concept of mātauranga-a-iwi to capture iwi-specific factors to success.

There will be five main themes running through the research programme that will enable us to investigate the questions posed above and to meet the project and overall programme objectives. The first theme is an investigation into the historical background of Māori economic development. The purpose of an historical study is to determine which, if any, development models could be transferable

to a contemporary context. This leads to the second theme, current economic models and how they meet the criteria for a Māori way of doing, seeing and being. Māori are not alone in the challenges for economic independence and growth so a number of international indigenous case studies will be reviewed. Māori and iwi society is community based. This has historically been the case in economic development and a number of commentators can attest to this (Colman, Dixon & Mare, 2008; Durie, 1999; Monin, 1995; Petrie, 2006). Therefore, third, this research programme will examine the role of communities, both historic and contemporary, in developing sustainable economic growth and development. Fourth, research around building social capital, and in particular Māori social capital, will allow the project team to define parameters for social engagement that take account of national and international collaborative initiatives as well as local development potential. The fifth and final theme looks at past and present research frameworks that are considered 'Māori' in focus, design and implementation.

This literature review will refer to the first three of these themes in the review of historical and current literature. The fourth and fifth themes will be addressed following planned wānanga with the six participating iwi, and analysis will be included in subsequent programme reports. First and foremost is a discussion around what exactly 'development' is and how it relates to indigenous peoples and indigenous development.

DEVELOPMENT AND INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE

Economic and Social

Development is often described as a process towards economic, social and political well-being. Key to understanding how development occurs are the underlying objectives behind each development group or entity that determine the process. This includes the underlying principles and values that form part of the governance process and direct the development strategy. However, often the idea of development is by nature polemic, in that “while some believe that economic growth is complementary with social, cultural and ecological objectives, others see numerous tradeoffs” (NZEIR, 2003, p. 35).

There is argument about the role of culture and cultural variables in influencing the structure, strategies and outcomes of development, particularly the cultural influences on economic development processes (Edlin, 2005, p. 1; NZEIR, 2003, p. 35). Edlin suggests in his paper on nepotism that there is still a long way to go to understand the cultural influences in Māori businesses and that it is a moot point if there is full understanding of how Māori values influence iwi economic considerations (Edlin, 2005, p. 2). Ryan and Te Puni Kōkiri, on the other hand, insist that there is strong evidence that Māori businesses are underpinned by a set of values and processes that are entrenched in iwi tikanga and knowledge frameworks (Ryan, 2011; Te Puni Kōkiri, 2010).

There is a growing move among anthropologists to link development processes in a way that legitimates indigenous knowledge

and allows for the inclusion of indigenous management systems in development strategies. This in turn relates to identity issues and the “fight against cultural imperialism as they [indigenous peoples] take the opportunity to assert a place for their knowledge” (Sillitoe, et al., 2002, p. 2). Sillitoe and colleagues have listed a number of ways that development has been defined in the past and the current “third way”. In the past as part of a “modernisation approach”, the development paradigm “not only dismisses local knowledge, but views it as part of the problem, being non-scientific, traditional and risk-averse, even irrational and primitive” (2002, p. 3). Development was also part of a “dependency approach”, which “portrays poor farmers as helpless victims; local knowledge is again sidelined, this time as the view of the powerless” (2002, p. 3). With the growing interest in promoting indigenous knowledge as a legitimate thought and action, there was a change to a “market-liberal approach”, which is still largely dependent on market forces dictating the group’s choice and appropriateness of the options for development. The next approach, entitled neo-populist, gave “potential prominence to local knowledge, which is taken seriously and granted a role in problem identification, research and so on” (Sillitoe, et al., 2002, p. 3). Here in New Zealand, and in other parts of the Western world, these approaches are not mutually exclusive and have all been experienced at some stage

in Māori development since World War II. All are “mixed up with” policies (Sillitoe, et al., 2002, p. 4); empowerment and development programmes that are usually contrived by the dominant culture—in New Zealand’s case, the standing government. As such, there is the three-year programme timeframe that could be altered or halted with a change in government or government policy direction. Sillitoe and colleagues have identified a rising emphasis on what they term ‘the third way’ as we move into and through the 21st century (2002, p. 5). In this development approach, indigenous knowledge and management processes and systems are given full credence and are these approaches are “trying to advance mutual comprehension and allowing them [indigenous peoples] to speak effectively for themselves... by evolving mutual collaborative research arrangements” that lead to indigenous-driven development strategies (Sillitoe, et al., 2002, p. 5). It is this development paradigm that is being considered in this research programme. Māori, and in particular iwi, are in a position to dictate and speak effectively for themselves in both research and development. As discussed by a number of indigenous scholars, indigenous development places emphasis on the holistic nature of indigenous social organisation and practices. This leads to a bricolage approach (multi-contextual) to determining what indigenous development is.

Development is defined by Amartya Sen as “a process for expanding the real freedoms that people enjoy” (Sen, 1999, p. 3). This expands on the narrower idea of development being linked solely to economic² considerations and

is a useful definition for understanding the holistic nature of indigenous development. Sen also considers that barriers to freedom are variables such as poverty, lack of education and political disempowerment, and overcoming these is paramount to progressing development and, in particular, economic development (1999, p. 3). The Mondragón Corporation in the Basque region of Spain is an example of what Sen describes.

The Mondragón Corporation was born out of the poverty and hunger of Basque peoples following the Spanish civil war. In 1941 Jose Maria Arizmendarrieta developed a doctrine of solidarity for the communities in Mondragón. He established a Professional College in 1943, which was the training establishment for a skilled workforce that was to become the basis for the Corporation labour force. In 1953 the first Corporation was established by five graduates from the College. Thus, a Corporation was founded based on the doctrine of solidarity and underpinned by the values and principles of co-operative community. One of these concerned how education can advance social transformation within communities (Mondragón, 2011). In 2011 the Mondragón Corporation’s structure and businesses continue to be underpinned by its founding values—co-operation, participation, social responsibility and innovation. Social responsibility is key to ensuring that job creation and sustained investment in the Basque peoples is the preferential outcome from the corporate affairs. Building social capital in this way has enabled the Corporation to maintain its own unique Basque identity and philosophies and embed these within the organisational structure and practices (Mondragón, 2011, promotional video ‘Values’). The solidarity doctrine is based around ideas of village co-operatives, which varies from the kinship-based social structures of Māori and other indigenous peoples but provides a valuable case study of the impact of social transformation through education and investment in people. A future initiative for iwi may be to consider taking a

2 Development theory and practice has moved beyond strict economic models, and the theory and practice of development is more discursive and representative of various disciplines. What is meant by development has come to mean different things to different people grounded in interpretations of different contexts and circumstances. For Māori, the debate exposes a dedication to cultural affirmation, a political quest for self-determination and a dissatisfaction with the disparities between Māori and non-Māori (Puketapu, 2000).

controlling interest in the education institutes within their takiwa, thus having positive input into the education pathways offered. The Ngāi Tahu collaborative education structure, Te Tapuae o Rehua, is a step towards ensuring that Ngāi Tahu values, needs and aspirations are taken account of in strategic planning and governance of the various partner institutes. Nevertheless, this falls short of the Mondragón example of establishing its own university and controlling education pathways to ensure that there is a genuine vocationally aligned education system.

Iwi have often looked to near neighbours within the Pacific rim, including Native American tribal nations, for examples of self-determination. One such example is that of Canada's Osoyoos Indian Band led by Chief Clarence Louie. The Osoyoos Band number 450 and most are based at the Osoyoos Indian Reservation in Okanagan, Canada. They have a number of companies ranging from viticulture to construction that realise the Band US\$17 million p.a., which is used to build social and cultural capability and capacity among the Band membership (OIB Development corporation website, 2011). The economic performance is seen very much as one means to the overall 'ends': social and cultural sustainability and growth. The Osoyoos Band has a vision of "pride and profit from the land", with Chief Louie's constant message being that socio-economic development is the foundation for First Nation self-reliance and that "our communities need to become business minded and begin to create their own jobs and revenue sources not just administer government programmes that are often underfunded" (OIB Development Corporation website, 2011). Chief Louie believes that "money is not the most important thing—what you do with it is the important thing" and reiterates that economic performance will lead to economic and social development (personal communication,

Nga Whetū, Hei Whai Conference, Rotorua, 2011). There are a number of factors that prevent a direct comparison between the economic capability and capacity of the Osoyoos Band and iwi in New Zealand. One is the size of the Band (450 individuals) and the other is the different circumstances around the Band's land base. The Osoyoos are established on their 32,000 acre tribal reservation in which the majority of their membership lives, works and participates at some level in the economic and social development of their tribal collective. By contrast, iwi members are demographically and geographically diverse with differing levels of participation between members and the hau kainga. Population levels are much higher than in the Osoyoos Band and, along with dispersed membership, this has its own set of challenges in terms of managing resources collectively and in the distribution of social and economic benefits to all tribal members. These obvious differences do not preclude, however, a comparison with the underlying principles that reflect iwi aspirations towards self-determination. Like the Osoyoos Band, these are based on [iwi] cultural values, beliefs and practices, and associations with land. The similarities allow for comparative analysis of indigenous development models reflecting business principles that "instill 'nativeness' into the business ... and are socially, culturally and land driven principles" (personal communication, Chief Clarence Louie, Nga whetū, Hei Whai Conference, Rotorua, 2011). Iwi are also discovering that economic development is an important key to cultural survival, and that to increase economic performance, the tribal membership need to build capacity and capability among their members. Education then, as with the Mondragón example, is one of the key factors in increasing economic and social development in culturally relevant ways, and is also a key component of the tribal strategies for the Osoyoos Band.

HISTORIC MĀORI DEVELOPMENT

Economic and Social

Early writers such as Raymond Firth (1973) observed that although arts and crafts, religion, traditional language and history all have scholars, little attention has been given to Māori social, organisation and economic development. Traditionally, the construct of Māori culture was whānau, hapū and iwi, organised by a highly sophisticated governing system that emphasised the collective good. Individual freedom was subject to social constraints and enforced through a kinship system. Land was owned by the community and only people who had immediate rights to it could use it. However, the capital was supplied by the workers, as they provided their own food and tools. Members of the working body would direct and provide the required skills. In some cases a chief or person of rank to whom the initial incentive was due and who shouldered the ‘business risks’, provided the working capital. For example, Te Rangi Hiroa Buck (cited in Firth, 1973) provides a description of the method of netting inanga (whitebait, *Galaxias maculatus*) from canoes. When the canoes came ashore with their catch, the women were waiting with baskets and all received their share. Te Rangi Hiroa Buck writes that in those communal days, nobody went away empty, but at the same time, a distinction was made in favour of the workers. As was usual, a man was appointed to portion out the catch and doled out the fish in double handfuls into the waiting receptacles. It was necessary that he be an upright person who would not favour his own relatives and provide them with an unduly large share. The criterion

of distribution is interesting “[m]ore was given to the women of those who had got wet skins through working. The phrase used was ‘engari tena; he kiri maku’ (That one is right, a wet skin). On the other hand, when the women-folk of a non-worker approached with their baskets, the cry was ‘hirangi, hirangi he kiri maroke’. Hirangi means not deep; hence the significance of the phrase is easily understood. Not deep, not deep; a dry skin.” (Reminiscences and Maori Stories, 21–2 cited in Firth, 1973). The economic concept at play here is tohatoha, or distribution according to contribution and/or need.

Historical challenges to Māori asset holdings

In 1769, with the arrival and rediscovery of New Zealand by Captain James Cook, Māori were eager to acquire all the benefits of European technology without compromising or surrendering their social institutions, core values or distinct way of life (Firth, 1973). Within 30 years of the arrival of the plough, Māori had moved from subsistence gardening to successful commercial farming. The Treaty of Waitangi, signed between Māori iwi and the British Crown in 1840 opened up New Zealand for Pākehā settlement. At first this offered opportunity for iwi to increase trade beyond the small number of resident groups of whalers, sealers and missionaries. In 1856 the Auckland-based newspaper, *New Zealander*, described Māori as “landlords, farmers, graziers, seamen, ship owners, labourers

and artisans” (Kingi, 2009). In Waikato, the mid 1800s were known as the golden years, where Māori iwi, through their various flour mills, muka or flax mills, produced merchandise that was traded both nationally in Auckland, Far North and Te Waipounamu, and internationally, with such countries as Australia and America. In Auckland a daily sight was the large number of Māori canoes, laden with vegetables, pulled up on the beaches. In Taranaki they exported food direct to Melbourne to feed gold-diggers. Māori bought their own schooners and carried out their own coastal trade, and these Māori commissioned schooners were the basis of the local shipbuilding industry (Petrie, 2006). However, increased Pākehā settlement meant an increase in the Pākehā desire for land—Māori had it and Pākehā wanted it, as it was the basis for any successful economic development. In 1856 the Colonial Government was established to govern New Zealand. Between 1860 and 1886 Pākehā settlement increased from 100,000 to 600,000, which put enormous pressure on the Colonial Government to obtain Māori land for sale. The settler demand for land culminated in the passing of the first native land laws in 1862, which established the Native Land Court. From that point all Māori-controlled land was to move through the Court and individual title of ownership awarded, thus destroying the communally governed and managed land tenure system. This restricted Māori access and control over land-based resources which impeded the growth of iwi and hapū economic performance and, ultimately, impacted on economic growth and social development. In the case of sea-based resources, legislation such as the Oyster Fisheries Act, 1863, took away iwi and/or hapū opportunities for commercial gain from their shellfish resources—again stifling economic and social growth. The 1860s land wars fought between Māori and the British Crown (with assistance from settler militia) also saw vast tracts of Māori land confiscated. One controversial example which still resonates today is the confiscations of land belonging to Ngāti Awa and Whakatohea in

the Eastern Bay of Plenty. Another key example is the Waikato/Maniapoto raupatu which was the subject of a successful treaty settlement between the Crown (the New Zealand Government) and the Tainui Confederation of tribal groups. For this tribal entity at least, the treaty settlement enabled economic performance to grow and provide the means to develop the social well-being of the Tainui peoples.

The Native Land Act, 1863 added the ‘ten-person rule’ to the Court’s awarding of land title—meaning that no certificate of title could be awarded to Māori if ownership exceeded 10 persons. This effectively cut out hapū ownership and made it relatively easy for Pākehā to convince individual owners to sell their portions of land. For an economy based in communally managed assets, this was to have dire consequences for Māori in terms of building an iwi and hapū economic base. The individualisation of Māori land title meant that land could be sold out of the hapū-controlled sphere. The second part of the 1863 Act (Section 23), forbade any tribal title to be issued, unless the land exceeded 5,000 acres in size. The Court often allowed tribal title, but with only ten owners listed. Other laws changed the way land could be inherited, meaning that many land trusts today have multiple owners thus rendering them difficult to manage and to realise any economic or social benefit. Ranginui Walker noted that, “fragmentation of land holdings and multiple ownership became the greatest impediment to Māori land development” (Walker, 2000). The Native Land Court was the primary government agency for alienating Māori land, and by 1995 there had been close to 1,100 pieces of legislation that allowed for Māori land alienation.

The Treaty of Waitangi meanwhile, had passed into obscurity in Pākehā eyes and law and it was to take until the 1975 Treaty of Waitangi Act³ before it was again recognised and griev-

3 The Treaty of Waitangi Act, 1975 installed the Waitangi Tribunal which was designed as a Commission of Enquiry to hear Māori grievances, as a consequence of Treaty of Waitangi breaches, post 1975. In 1985 the Act was

ances begun to be addressed. The ensuing years meant that Māori slipped behind Pākehā in economic development, health and education. In 1995, the Ture Whenua Māori Act was passed, which changed the way land could be owned and administered. The Act was two-fold in intent: to retain Māori customary land in Māori ownership; and the development of that land for the benefit of owners (Kingi, 2009, p. 1). However, what land remained was often tied up in Land Court-initiated complex ownership models, which made successful development improbable. This is still the case for much multi-owned land blocks today, prompting Tanira Kingi to state that “Māori land under the current land tenure system is choked with excessive numbers of owners” (Kingi, 2009, p. 1) and that the problem of too many owners with exclusion rights is a “tragedy of the anti-commons” (Buchanan and Yoon quoted in Kingi, 2009, p. 1). Kingi goes on to explain that if common property rights encourage over-use or resource depletion, than the anti-commons problem encourages an under-utilisation of resources, such as that for Māori land (2009, p. 1). Kingi suggests that Māori land could become a viable economic resource for Māori, in a way that could turn communal ownership into a positive state. He suggests that land be collectivised, which would replace “undivided beneficial and equitable interest in Māori freehold land with a structure that reflects customary values and traditional practices where owners have an equal stake and the land is returned to tribal ownership” (2009, p. 1). Kingi likens this to the collective settlements currently negotiated between iwi and the Government, where the iwi holds all assets collectively on behalf of the beneficiaries (iwi membership): “Under these arrangements there are no individual claims to the settlement. Instead the settlement

allocations are to iwi or hapū and benefits are distributed to individuals that have registered with the tribe” (Kingi, 2009, p.1). Several challenges immediately come to mind, not least the challenge for individual and whānau land owners to place trust in iwi governance and give up their individual land title into a wider collective system. This idea also challenges the notions of ahi kā (tradition-based land inheritance models) that are determined through whakapapa, use and participation. The notion of giving up a tikanga-determined access to land for a collective agreement in order to achieve tikanga-based management is ironic to say the least. This opens up a future topic for discussion with the six participating iwi involved in this research programme—what is their view on collectively owned iwi assets at the expense of hapū- and whānau-led land trusts, many of which are very successful. The answer may be to develop more collaborative approaches to development between land trusts and iwi governance bodies such as rūnanga. The notion of turning collectively owned land into a positive development strategy will be discussed during future iwi-led wānanga, and the research team hopes to identify iwi-led strategies to overcome this challenge.

Some international indigenous models based on collectivism of resources do exist. One in particular is the United League of Indigenous Nations (ULIN), a group founded in August 2007 that consisting mainly of US Tribal Nations, Aborigine Nations of Australia, First Nations of Canada and New Zealand’s Bay of Plenty-based Ngāti Awa. The ULIN has been incorporated under the laws of the Lummi Indian Nation as an independent, non-profit corporation which took advantage of “the US law that recognises the authority of US Tribal Governments to charter corporate entities and protect their legal status” (Parker, et al., 2011). First, the group developed a booklet to advise indigenous groups on climate change but it has recently moved into developing international indigenous trade relations. The resulting Tribal

amended to enable grievances tracing forward from the 1840 signing of the Treaty, to be heard and addressed by the Tribunal. This allowed historical grievances to be heard; many of which deal with land loss and subsequent economic and social disadvantage.

Trade Development Project has three main purposes: to develop tribal and indigenous nations trade agreements; to research and identify tribally ‘branded’ trade products; and to design an internet-based and copyright protected trading platform, a virtual marketplace for the selling of tribally branded projects among native and indigenous peoples (Parker, et al., 2011). Although based on international relationships, the ULIN’s trade project is one example of how relationships built between indigenous groups can provide mutual economic and social benefits.

The recent formation of the Māori cooperative dairy company Miraka provides another example of collectivism, this time at a local level. Miraka demonstrates how Māori are capturing the dairy industry in terms of building capacity and capability and realising opportunities through collaboration of key Māori industry players, who have 54 per cent ownership. Māori owners have also partnered with global players such as Vinmilk (Vietnam) and Global Dairy Network, capitalising on markets in Asia and the Middle East. Miraka’s owners share the vision that it is a majority Māori-owned company focused on “long-term returns for current and future generations, from land that will never be sold” (Miraka, 2011). The values that underpin the vision are kaitiakitanga, integrity, excellence, tikanga and innovation—all values espoused in the iwi strategic plans that were reviewed for this publication and are considered important values to underpin any Māori tikanga-based organisation. The similarities between these initiatives and those of the Osyoos Indian Band are the focus on intergenerational growth within the iwi collectives and the uncompromising stance on land ownership—land that will never be sold—also underpin other international indigenous economic development philosophies.

The Treaty of Waitangi has provided an implied constitutional basis for a distinct set of Māori institutions and underpins the model of Māori economic development and

corporate governance, which is unique to Māori. Māori organisations today often struggle to operate within a dual context of the New Zealand political, social, cultural and commercial objectives and their own tikanga. Reference to tikanga may be found in the constitutional documents of many Māori organisations, for example:

- *Te Rūnanga a Iwi o Ngāpuhi* Establishment principle is “to promote, safeguard and advance the interests of the collective whānau/hapū and marae of Ngāpuhi, in accordance with our values, tikanga and tino rangatiratanga”.
- *Te Whānau of Waipareira Trust* We will always rejoice in our Māoritanga and accept change and progress in the continuing redefinition of our tikanga.
- *Wakatū Incorporation* A business of land and seas—he taonga tuku iho—for profit, social and cultural growth through professionalism, honesty and diligence and embracing our tikanga (<http://www.wakatu.org.nz>).
- *Te Ohu Kai Moana* Principal obligation is to protect and enhance the interest of iwi—individually and collectively—primarily in developing fisheries, fishing and fisheries related activities (Te Ohu Kaimoana, 2008).

The new iwi organisations embody features not found in Western organisations or Western forms of economic development. For example, membership of a Māori organisation is a right that comes with whakapapa, which brings with it obligations and responsibilities to participate in the political and social processes in order to access benefits where the nature of those benefits is determined in and through a collective decision making process (Barrett, 2005). Although Māori organisations openly acknowledge the important role economic growth plays in their development “... there is a sense that economic development using Pākehā institutions creates

a risk of people losing their ‘Māoriness’, when this ‘Māoriness’, is at the core development” (NZIER, 2003, p. 45).

Developing Post Treaty Settlement Models

In attempting to develop post-settlement governance and management models, many Māori would argue that this must not be to the detriment of tribal identity. For example, Mason Durie argued:

... [d]ifferent concerns about modern tribal governance structures have ... been raised in connection with the emphasis on business models, which appear to corporatise iwi. Tribal members are aware of the corporations in Alaska which have all but ousted traditional structures and are keen to avoid creating economically orientated organisations which fail to capture the essential cultural basis of the tribe (cited in NZIER, 2003, p. 2).

The Law Commission Report (2002) identified that there is no uniform settlement model “able to adapt to meet the particular needs of each individual settlement group and its members” (p. 1) defining the core functions of those responsible for stewardship of the settlement of assets. In addition, there is no model mechanism to ensure that, when disputes arise among members of settlement groups they can be resolved in a manner consistent with Māori tikanga. Although the development of Treaty settlement issues is at an early stage, useful information can be derived from the Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development (no date). The Harvard Project found that tribal decision makers are likely to make better choices than non-tribal decision makers about the future development of the tribal group. A strong tribal culture was “found to be a resource that strengthened tribal governance” (Law Commission Report, 2002,

p. 6). Among the distinguishing features of successful tribal governance structures identified by the study were: (i) a governance structure that separates the functions of elected representatives and business managers; and (ii) the ability to settle fairly. Each settlement group will have different needs, some will place an emphasis on economic development, others on social development and others may seek a holistic approach to Māori development (Law Commission Report, 2002). Tikanga Māori lies at the heart of Māori society and is unique to each iwi. Hirini Mead stated:

There are some citizens who go so far as to say that tikanga Māori should remain in the pre-Treaty era and stay there. To them tikanga Māori has no relevance in the lives of contemporary Māori. That body of knowledge belongs to the not so noble past of the Māori. Individuals who think this way really have no understanding of what tikanga are and the role tikanga have in our ceremonial and in our daily lives. It is true, however, that tikanga are linked to the past and that is one of the reasons why they are valued so highly by people. They do link us to the ancestors, to their knowledge and to their wisdom. What we have today is a rich heritage that requires nurturing, awakening sometimes, adapting to our world and developing for the next generation. (cited in Law Commission Report, 2002)

Tikanga Māori is a pervasive influence with each tribal grouping having its own variations. In addition, the constitution of a settlement entity would need to take account of tikanga tangata (social organization), tikanga rangatira (leadership), and tikanga whenua (connection to the land) (cited in Law Commission Report, 2002). Tikanga Māori needs to be central to any process that governs and manages settlements. However, the current regime imposes two limiting factors: (i) the criteria laid down by the Crown must be complied with in order for the settlement group to receive assets, and

TABLE 1. Summary of Available Legal Entities.

Entity	Adaptable to Reflect Tikanga of Group	Accountable to Beneficiaries	Dispute Resolutions	Other
Māori Trust Board Act 1955	No	No, only to the Minister of Māori Affairs	Yes, but recourse to Minister paternalistic	Governance rules contained in Act. Not suitable for commercial context.
Incorporated Societies Act 1908	No	No. Accountability primarily to Registrar	No, recourse to the Registrar or ordinary Courts	Not suitable for commercial context. Debarred from pecuniary gain.
Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993	No	Yes, but note the role of the Court	Yes, Māori Land Court	Not suitable for commercial context
Charitable Trust Board	No	Primarily to Registrar	Ordinary Court	Potential problem with kin/ blood group relationships
Private Legislation	Perhaps	Per Act	Unknown per Act	No longer available as viable option
Trust	Possibly, within limits	Yes, per Deed	Ordinary Courts	Expensive to set up for settlement groups
Proposed Statutory Model	Yes, to be decided by group	Yes, core obligations of statutory entity	Domestic, tribunal or Māori Land Court	More accurately reflect Māori values

Adapted from the Law Commission Report (2002).

(ii) expression of tikanga is limited by the types of entity available and most entities were created without Māori values in mind and derive from English law (Table 1, Law Commission Report, 2002).

It is notable though that the overall contribution to the national Māori economy from Treaty settlements is very low. In the 2006 figures, Treaty settlements made up only 1.5 per cent of the overall Māori economy, then worth NZ\$16 billion. This contribution has not grown considerably in recent years. The most important factor from Treaty settlements is not their contribution to economic performance, but their longer-term contribution to iwi economic development: socially, culturally and politically. The Treaty settlements allow iwi to reassert mana—particularly the recognition of their mana over the various regions, resources and people that form their whakapapa. The recognition of iwi mana is realised through the willingness of non-Māori groups and organisations to engage with the iwi in question. This may be at an economic level, but also at a level where iwi have restored confidence in asserting their claims and rights within their own regions in matters pertaining to the overall management and development of the resources within it. Councils have certainty as to which group has the mandate for consultation and although there is still resistance from Councils and other local agencies, iwi cannot be ignored as was once the case. At a national level too there is more political leverage for iwi who command attention because of an increased recognition of their relationship with various regions within New Zealand. Non-Māori organisations may not understand it as mana, but they understand that iwi need to be included. The iwi leaders' groups that act as collective voices for iwi over various matters of national interest are one example. Regardless of criticism, they are listened to and command a level of engagement from non-Māori organisations and government agencies that is underpinned by the knowledge of their collective economic power. At

an individual iwi level, the treaty settlement will not only provide the recognition of mana, but also the means to build social and cultural confidence. At best, the settlement provides them money to begin social and cultural development, which has spin-off effects of increased confidence and status. As with the Osoyoos Indian Band and other notable iwi examples, growing an economic base leads to overall well-being of an indigenous group.

Iwi Strategic Plans and Social Capital

A number of iwi strategic plans and one iwi annual report were analysed to determine common elements that offer insights into iwi development rather than development as practised by iwi (2020 Taupo-Nui-a-Tia Action Plan; Ara Mai Whakatohea Strategic Plan 2009–2013; Muaupoko Tribal Authority Inc Strategic Plan 2008–2020; Ngati Rangi Strategic Plan 2009—A Tona Wa; Te Ara Poutama o Ngati Awa Strategic Pathways to the Future 2010–2015; Te Runanga o Nga Puhī Strategic Plan 2009–2014; Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Corporate Intent; Te Runanga o Ngati Mutunga Strategic Plan 2008–2013; Te Runanga o Ngati Porou Strategic Plan 2009–2010; Te Runanga o Te Rarawa Annual Plan 2009; Vision 2025). The plans were all similar in construction and ideals which allowed for a comparison of the components that were important to iwi, and how these would form part of the future strategic direction. Without exception, each iwi vision and mission statement placed the wellbeing of the marae, whānau and hapū as the key objectives. One example from Ngāti Mutunga stated that the iwi's vision was to ensure that it “is culturally strong, secure in its identity and economically prosperous” (Te Runanga o Ngati Mutunga Strategic Plan 2008–2013). The Ngāti Mutunga mission is “to facilitate the growth and development of our people and our culture, Ngāti Mutungatanga ... To prudently accelerate the growth of our assets.”

(Te Runanga o Ngati Mutunga Strategic Plan 2008–2013). Whakatōhea stated the purpose of their strategic plan was to enable them “to grow our iwi/hapū to prosper and sustain throughout this changing and challenging world” (Ara Mai Whakatōhea Strategic Plan 2009–2013), while Muaupoko claim that by 2010 they will have achieved the empowerment of their hapū and whānau and marae, protected their identity and “enhanced our economic wealth, culture, health and well-being.” (Muaupoko Tribal Authority Inc Strategic Plan 2008–2020). Others from Ngāi Tahu, Ngāti Awa, Tuwharetoa, Ngāti Porou and Ngā Puhī, Te Rarawa, Ngāti Rangi and Tuwharetoa all espoused similar objectives, visions and missions. Perhaps the most striking similarity of all the strategic plans is the emphasis on empowering hapū and whānau and strengthening marae, seen as the powerhouse of hapū and whānau. In all cases, economic development is considered to be a means to an end—ensuring the total wellbeing of the people—and is part of a set of strategic directions. In most cases it is placed within strategies for wellbeing and does not stand alone. This suggests that the human resources are key components to iwi development and future sustainability (2020 Taupo-Nui-a-Tia Action Plan; Ara Mai Whakatōhea Strategic Plan 2009–2013; Muaupoko Tribal Authority Inc Strategic Plan 2008–2020; Ngāti Rangi Strategic Plan 2009—A Tona Wa; Te Ara Poutama o Ngāti Awa Strategic Pathways to the Future 2010–2015; Te Runanga o Nga Puhī Strategic Plan 2009–2014; Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Corporate Intent; Te Runanga o Ngati Mutunga Strategic Plan 2008–2013; Te Runanga o Ngati Porou Strategic Plan 2009–2010; Te Runanga o Te Rarawa Annual Plan 2009; Vision 2025).

Further evidence of this comes from the strategic direction statements which emphasise the hapū and whānau as the beneficiaries of all outcomes. Ngāpuhi for example state that communications and identity strategic direction is for “developing positive and effective

relationships between Rūnanga, whānau and hapū and marae to meet current and future aspirations” (Te Runanga o Nga Puhī Strategic Plan 2009–2014). Evidence was sought in the strategic plans as to how this was to be achieved. In most cases it was through raising cultural awareness and participation in iwi, hapū, whānau and marae affairs, increasing level of understanding and proficiency in te reo Māori and tikanga as pertaining to individual iwi, social development, and advancing mātauranga-a-iwi, which was described by one iwi as “promoting among whānau, hapū and marae, the retention of tūturu knowledge and the acquisition of new knowledge” (Te Runanga o Nga Puhī Strategic Plan 2009–2014). The management of resources, social development and economic development were other key objectives to ensuring the realisation of culturally strong and self-determining iwi populations. Thus, the three main objectives are to further community (including the environment in which they are situated), culture and commerce and to do this in a way that interlocks all three.

All the iwi listed sets of values and guiding principles which underpin the strategies, management and governance mechanisms, processes and systems. These components were listed as tikanga, leadership, quality (in management practices and the way all things are done), respect, communication, accountability and integrity (Te Runanga o Nga Puhī Strategic Plan 2009–2014; Te Runanga o Te Rarawa Annual Plan 2009). Others such as Whakatōhea chose to emphasise strengthening, collaboration, caring, respect and awakening of “all things Whakatōhea” (Ara Mai Whakatōhea Strategic Plan 2009–2013). In all cases, the values were listed in te reo Māori and English. Translations were provided by each iwi group. For example in the Strategic Plan from Ngāti Mutunga, manaakitanga was translated as “respect, humility and confidence in our own identity”. Kaitiakitanga is explained as “obligation to protect the spiritual well-being of our

people and our natural resources within our mana”, and rangatiratanga is about commitment to uphold “the rangatiratanga of Ngāti Mutunga whānau, marae and iwi to protect and develop what belongs [to the iwi]” (Te Runanga o Ngāti Mutunga Strategic Plan 2008–2013).

It is evident then that iwi are insisting on developing strategic directions, including economic direction, from frameworks “based upon and influenced by [iwi] specific tribal values” (Bishop & Tiakiwai, 2002) with the primary beneficiaries being the members of the hapū and whānau. The marae is considered the iwi-specific space from which to achieve the well-being of the tribe, and hence some of the economic strategies are aimed at ensuring these are maintained and improved for the future generations. Resources, including land, are considered paramount to providing an economic base from which initiative and innovation in economic direction can spread. Underpinning iwi aspirations, including economic, are the values, guiding principles and knowledge that will frame the governance and management structures, relationships and processes.

There are two main themes that are apparent within all the strategic plans. Firstly, the unshakeable idea that iwi knowledge (including the values and tikanga processes) is the understood constant in how to achieve these objectives, visions and fulfil the iwi missions. The second theme is that iwi are endeavouring to build the capabilities and capacity of their people—hence building their social capital.

Māori and iwi knowledge is based on traditional ways of understanding the world and the way it works. As such it has its own set of guiding principles or whakaritenga, “the foundation principles upon which your strategies and processes of development and well-being are grounded” (M. Roderick, March 2011, personal communication). These guiding principles as suggested by the various iwi strategic plans include kaitiakitanga, manaakitanga, rangatiratanga, tikanga and kawa. At the heart of all of these is whakapapa, which evidences who

iwi are and how they belong with specific landscapes. Whakapapa orders the relationships that iwi and Māori have with each other and with everything that is part of the environment over which they exercise mana. As Apirana Ngata once said, “it is the key to unlocking the mass of facts” that explain Māori political, economic and social organisation (cited in Carter, 2004, p. 1).

Māori and indigenous peoples across the world have a holistic world view. These are societies who maintain continuity with the past, which is reflected in the transmission of knowledge, institutions, values and practices from one generation to the next (Carter, 2004, p. 5). There has been a growing inclination to include a holistic understanding of the world in development contexts (Sillitoe, et al., 2002). Posey and Sillitoe both discuss the importance of understanding the interconnectedness between culture, land and knowledge. Posey in particular states that allowing indigenous peoples to record and utilise their own knowledge “is the only way that the study of indigenous knowledge can advance without fragmenting the cosmic connectedness between land, culture, and knowledge” (Posey, 2002, p. 39). However, the validity of indigenous knowledge has been and still is contentious (Sillitoe, et al., 2002). Current thinking is that tradition equals timelessness and as such it remains unchangeable over time (Sillitoe, 2002, p. 109). This presupposes that tradition is locked into an inflexible, prescribed set of values, knowledge frameworks and principles and therefore does not allow for the dynamic and ever-changing nature of knowledge. One way to overcome the hesitancy to accept indigenous traditional knowledge as a norm is to change the focus of the term ‘traditional’ to ‘tradition-based’. By rephrasing ‘tradition’ to ‘tradition-based’ it will assist the study of Māori economic development to be couched in iwi and Māori knowledge frameworks and driven by tikanga practices and processes. This involves referring to past experiences to provide guidelines for working

through new challenges and situations. Michael Oakeshott refers to this as “a conversation that is continued with each generation” (Oakeshott, 1969, p. 489). Over a person’s lifetime, the growth in knowledge from each changing circumstance will add to the many layers of tikanga and kawa and continue the process for the next generation. A tradition-based society is not a static society and neither is its knowledge base. It has the ability to change and develop as required when each new challenge presents itself. There is a practical side to all actions (*ira tangata*). There is also a spiritual side (*ira atua*) and both of these need to be in balance. The actions and knowledge come from past experience to help us to understand the present. It also allows for knowledge to be moved into the future through the intergenerational knowledge transmission. Tikanga principles founded in past experiences and knowledge frameworks will underpin the strategies put in place for future development (Carter, 2004).

The second common theme to emerge from the study of iwi strategic plans has to do with building the capability and capacity of the marae, whānau and hapū, or building social capital.

Social capital theory became popular in the middle of last century and was a way of introducing the “social dimension into economic interactions” (Chalupnick, 2010, p. 1230). The transfer from one discipline (sociology) to another (economics) has meant that social capital theory has become “confused and obscure” and often varies in emphasis within each context (Chalupnick, 2010, p. 1230). The earliest proponent of social capital theory was Pierre Bourdieu, who linked the idea of transforming social capital into conventional economic gain. He claimed that to do so, however, “depends on the nature of the social obligations, connections, and networks available to [the individual]” (Bourdieu, 1986, cited in Chalupnick, 2010). Chalupnick claims that the immediate tension within Bourdieu’s theory is between “social capital as an asset of an *individual* and the importance of its *social*

context’ (2010, original emphasis). This tension led to two schools of thought on how exactly social capital can transfer to economic gain. James S. Colman is credited with treating social capital as the “amount of the individual’s obligations and expectations that ‘can be conceived of as a credit slip held by A to be redeemed by some performance by B’” (Colman, 1988, 1990). Robert Putnam (Putnam, 1993, 2000) and Alejandro Portes (Portes, 1998) were both of the other view that stressed the importance of the individual’s embeddedness in his/her social environment with Portes maintaining that in this case social capital “is features of social organisations, such as networks, norms, and trust, that facilitate action and cooperation for mutual benefit” (Portes 1988 cited in Chalupnick, 2010). There have been a number of variations on both these theories with Chalupnick offering some examples of how social capital varies from altruistic exchanges and how it can be considered capital in the economic sense (2010). In order to do this the exchange is conditional on the recipient recognising the exchange as an investment by the resource provider, and thereby the mutual obligation on both parties to produce an outcome that will benefit both. There is also a sense of on-going obligation and reciprocity involved. Altruism on the other hand is when the exchange from a resource provider has no sense of investment or on-going reciprocal obligation—such as a donation to charity (Chalupnick, 2010). From this brief outline of social capital theory there are emerging a number of variables that must be present in building social capital among individuals and communities: reciprocity, obligation, exchange, community embeddedness, networks, norms and trust. These are the reasons why it has become tempting to investigate indigenous economic exchanges and gifting through a social capital theory lens.

Indigenous peoples are community focused; they operate through longstanding networks that are sustained through obligation and trust

and they are, in general, totally embedded within their environments—either physically or spiritually or both. In this context, Jaco Vermaak considers “social capital as a collection of resources...that could be used to satisfy a wide variety of community needs, particularly those of rural communities in the developing world” (Vermaak, 2009, p. 399). Vermaak is investigating how rural African communities may use the idea of social capital accumulation as ways of measuring how successful community-driven economies are in applying indigenous ways of knowing and understanding to all aspects of exchange. He maintains that:

social capital can thus be compared with physical capital in the sense that it is productive... economic development has a better chance of flourishing in social systems with strong social networks, well-developed associations and a high degree of civil engagement. (Vermaak, 2009, p. 401)

Vermaak cites the example of rotating savings and credit associations found in South Africa as “Indigenous informal norms [that] allow individuals to pool their resources for their mutual benefit” (2009, p. 406). In the Pacific region there are also examples of communities converting social capital for economic gain. The Samoan practice of remittances from diaspora communities back to Samoa implies reciprocal obligations and strong social networks and trust. The practice of remittances is considered a norm within both Samoan and Tongan society and is enmeshed within cultural values and practices (Tu‘itahi, 2005). Evans and colleagues describe a similar situation where the African diaspora communities in London have introduced a savings scheme that is used solely for economic development in home villages in Africa. The African diaspora communities have taken remittances one level higher, because they specify the purpose and use for which the funds may be applied, thus having strong influence

over the distribution and direction of economic development in their homelands (Evans, et al., 2009).

Other social theorists have also related the links to social networks including the World Bank which has “recognised social capital as a reflection of the value of cooperative social activity” (as cited in Vermaak, 2009, p. 402). And according to Grootaert, “social capital is the glue that holds society together” (Grootaert, 1998, p. 2)

In 2001 a paper was produced to help understand social capital in New Zealand (Robinson & Williams, 2001). The paper set out to define social capital, “how it is formed and used, and to introduce a framework for understanding the concept in Māori terms” (Robinson & Williams, 2001, p. 52). They discuss social capital in a Māori context set within the limits of voluntary actions. They defined voluntary actions, as understood by Pākehā, as giving, and as understood by Māori as cultural obligations—either way, the actions were carried out in a voluntary capacity (2001, p. 52). To develop their framework they began with the assumption that the:

whole story about social capital is the story of the social setting or context in which actors give and receive...The context includes actors’ knowledge of each other’s interests and resources, the opportunities that exist for exchange, and the inducements and disincentives associated with the norms of giving. (Robinson & Williams, 2001, p. 53)

Robinson and Williams defined social capital as:

The collection of resources to which an individual or group has access through their membership in an ongoing network of mutual acquaintance. Features of this social structure, such as relationships, norms and social trust, help develop coordination and cooperation for common benefit. (2001, p. 54)

One of the most important findings of the paper is that a Māori conceptualisation of active participation with their community is “separate from and does not include the notion of voluntary, but rather refers more to fulfilling cultural obligation” (Robinson & Williams, 2001, p. 60). They state that confusing the two different concepts—voluntary community work and cultural obligations—confuses and misinterprets what Māori are engaging in (Robinson & Williams, 2001, p. 60). The authors qualify this by saying that with voluntary work the action lies outside of the market and is not therefore viewed as an action that will produce an economic return. In the Māori context of cultural obligation, the community action is based on cultural obligations and reciprocity. Regardless that the reciprocal action may not be immediate it is still expected that actions will take place to impose a future obligation and reciprocal act—hence a return (Robinson & Williams, 2001, p. 60). For example, working or contributing in some way at a tangi when it is held at the actor’s marae may not be reciprocated until years later when the actor dies and others are obligated to return the respect and actions he/she will have carried out in the past. Robinson and Williams refer to this as sharing, not giving, which “better reflects the cultural norms and reciprocal obligations in Māori society” (2001, p. 61). These activities were also considered to be beyond monetary compensation:

we are driven more by manaaki, tautoko etc, concepts underpinned by collective responsibility ... for example it is an obligation to extend manaaki to the manuhiri. It is part of the kaupapa, behaviour associated with cultural imperatives. (Williams cited in Robinson & Williams, 2001, p. 65)

In this respect the obligation to reciprocate at some point in the future is a storing of capital—in this case storing social capital. For any relationships in Māori society to be successful

there is always a balance being sought. This can be described as a continuum of actions that move progressively together—for every action there will be a consequence and these are repeated constantly either consciously or unconsciously.

Another study on the concept of mahi aroha (volunteering by Māori) and its implications for Māori social capital was undertaken by the Office for the Community and Voluntary Sector (OCVS) in 2001. The terms of reference for the report were to:

... obtain a comprehensive understanding of volunteering by Māori in terms of the nature of the activities undertaken, Māori terms or concepts that best describe the nature of those activities, factors that motivate Māori to participate in such activities, and meanings and value that Māori attach to those activities and their participation in such activities. (Ministry of Social Development, 2007, p. 4)

Perhaps the first important difference between this report and the Robinson and Williams paper is that the report assumes mahi aroha to be volunteering, while Robinson and Williams point out that this will cause misunderstandings about the actions Māori carry out as part of their cultural obligations. The OCVS report does state that it will highlight “the extent of Māori volunteering and fulfilment of cultural obligations” (2007, p. 4), but by linking it to a Pākehā concept of voluntary work it narrows the ability of mahi aroha to be considered as social capital in the context of future investment and economic usefulness. This was an important concept brought out in the Robinson and Williams paper.

The 2007 OCVS report lists a number of cultural concepts to the ideas of mahi aroha and these are supported by comments from interviewees who participated in the research. A statement in the report says, “To understand contemporary Māori work, paid or unpaid, it

is essential to have an understanding of Māori conceptions of self and the cultural values and systems related to these” (2007, p. 11). The research team utilised Mason Durie’s *Tapa Whā* model (Durie, 1994) and Rangimarie Turuki Rose Pere’s *Te Wheke* model (Pere, 1991) as ways of measuring mahi aroha. The cultural values and concepts in these two models are similar, but Pere has extended hers to accommodate more spiritual aspects. The four cornerstones of *Te Whare Tapa Wha* emphasise Māori health and wellbeing: whānau (family health), tinana (physical health), hinengaro (mental health), and wairua (spiritual health). The components of Pere’s *Te Wheke* use these plus whānaungatanga (extended family across the universe), mana ake (the uniqueness of the individual and the extended family), mauri (the life-sustaining principle in people and objects), hā a koro mā a kui mā (cultural heritage) and whatumanawa (relating to emotions and senses) (Ministry of Social Development, 2007, p. 12). The OCVS research participants were asked what motivated them to carry out ‘mahī aroha’ and these were mapped in a model consisting of overlapping circles for tikanga, cultural survival and recovery, and extent of need (2007, p. 20).

The OCVS report also highlighted that the action of mahī aroha may be acknowledged through the giving of a koha. Koha has been described as having “wider implications and connotations than the mere presentation of a physical gift...and may represent part of a system of exchange, or begin a new exchange relationship” (Mead as cited in Ministry for Social Development, 2007). This opens up a new dimension to understanding mahī aroha as social capital. Koha simply understood means a gift that is given with an expectation of return at some stage in the future. This comes closer to the idea of storing social capital than does ‘aroha’ which is defined in the report as a gift “given from the heart” (Ministry of Social Development, 2007, p. 14) with no (re)payment expected—similar perhaps to

altruism discussed earlier. We may of course be moving in to the murky waters of trying to explain Māori concepts like aroha and koha in Pākehā terms; however, both the OCVS report and the Robinson and Williams paper do this, although not so much in the latter example. What both reports do accomplish is highlighting the tikanga processes behind iwi and Māori community and individual actions in pursuit of cultural sustainability; whether through ‘sharing’ (Robinson & Williams, 2001), or through ‘mahī aroha’ (Ministry of Social Development, 2007). The Robinson and Williams paper goes further to introduce the idea of economic implications from social cohesion, and the way that social capital is a useful theory for understanding community strength and growth towards future economic sustainability.

In practice, the successful storing of social capital relies on everyone who may be involved understanding the rules for engagement. If, for example, some of the members of the iwi/hapū/whānau have little knowledge of expected behaviour then the social capital capacity and capability will be limited. As explained earlier, one element in the iwi strategic plans was to build capacity and capability of all the whānau and hapū. This was to be achieved through education and knowledge sharing on marae in the form of wānanga or cultural hui that encouraged learning te reo-a-iwi and mātauranga-a-iwi. These aspirations and the earlier research on Māori social capital calls for further exploration by this research team into the way that iwi build the capacity and capability of whānau and hapū and, hence, engage in economic development that utilises all their respective resources including people. Further investigation is also needed in how the large percentage of iwi members who live outside their respective iwi territories are to be fully engaged, so as to secure the labour force and skills base that will be needed for future economic and social growth. As one member of the iwi participant group, Te Whānau-a-Apanui

explained, “iwi are where the people are”⁴, thus initiating further discussions around the concept that location may not be as important as whakapapa relationships.

⁴ Riki Gage, comment expressed as part of the iwi wānanga session for the MED Programme.

MEASURES OF THE ECONOMY

International Measures of the Economy

Since 1948, gross domestic product (GDP) has been the most dominant measure of economic growth. For consistency, we have used the definition published as part of the 2011 report to the Māori Economic Taskforce, May 2011.

GDP is defined as a total market value of all final goods and services produced in a country (or economy) in a given year, equal to total consumer, investment and government spending, plus the value of exports, minus the value of imports. (BERL, 2011, p. 18)

In the future discussions we need to move beyond GDP and there has been extensive research and discussion on the appropriateness of this measure of economic progress. The commentary dates back as far as 1973 in an article entitled “Is Growth Obsolete” by Nordhaus and Tobin. Since then, the limitations of metric measures of the economy have been investigated further. Stiglitz, Sen and Fitoussi assess the weaknesses of current metrics in a report entitled “The Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress Revisited” (Stiglitz, et al., 2009). Key comments about the limitations include:

- The statistical concepts may be correct, but the measurement process may be imperfect.
- When there are large changes in inequality, gross domestic product (GDP) or any other aggregate may not provide an accurate

assessment of the situation in which most people find themselves.

- Commonly used statistics may not be capturing some phenomena which have an increasing impact on the wellbeing of citizens.
- The way in which statistical figures are reported or used may provide a distorted view of the trends of economic phenomena.
- It has long been clear that GDP is an inadequate metric to gauge wellbeing over time particularly in its economic, environmental and social dimensions.

We are almost ‘flying blind’ when the metrics on which action is based are ill-designed. Today, there is a broad consensus that we need better metrics and that we need to understand the limitations of the existing metrics. (Stiglitz, et al., 2009, p. 6)

The report is:

simultaneously a plea for revisions of our national account system, a call for the end of the dominant use of GDP in assessing everything—performance, wellbeing, quality of life, etc.—and an appeal for the gathering of more information that would enable us to assess and monitor economic performance and social progress better, so as to reflect those things that citizens care about. (Stiglitz, et al., 2009, p. 4)

Consequently, there has been considerable work done by the OECD, EU, UN, New

Economics Forum (NEF; Abdulla, et al., 2011; Dawnay & Shah, 2005; Lawlor, et al., 2009; Michaelson, et al., 2009) and The Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress (CMEPSP). All concur that there is a need for measurements of wellbeing as an effort to place people in the forefront as benefactors of economic growth. A number of frameworks and methodologies have been developed. Some of these include the notion of Social Return on Investment (SROI) developed by the Scottish Government (Cabinet Office of the Third Sector, no date), Stiglitz Commission (no date) measure of well-being and NEF Conceptual framework for Societal Progress. The Human Development Index (HDI) developed as part of the UN's Human Development Programme gained considerable traction as a framework of socio-economic progress.

These frameworks view the economy as being a means to an end, rather than the end itself, recognising the value of GDP as a measure.

Human Development Index (HDI)

The Human Development Report is prepared and published annually by the United Nations Development Programme and aims to “shift the focus of development economics from national income accounting, to people centered policies” (Haq, 1990). The conceptual framework was developed and launched by Pakistan Economist and Nobel laureate Mahubub ul Haq in 1990. The Human Development Index includes life expectancy at birth, mean years of schooling and expected years of schooling,

and GNI per capita. In 2010, New Zealand was ranked third of the 169 countries involved in the study, and New Zealand's values are shown in Table 2.

Measures of the New Zealand Economy

In New Zealand, we emulate other countries by referring to GDP as the primary metric measure, and the Monthly Economic Indicator releases from New Zealand Treasury list GDP as the first measure of the New Zealand economy. Other measures include the consumer price index inflation, consumption deflator, labour market statistics, retail sales, and confidence indicators/surveys. In addition, the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAF) have an annual publication that provides an economic overview and outlook for all primary industries. Other industry groups such as Tourism NZ and the Seafood Council also release data about progress in different sectors. The industry specific forecasts and measures serve more as industry datasets, rather than informing government policy.

On a regional basis, EDAs or TLAs often purchase regional economic profiles. An example of this is the TOI-EDA regional profile for the Eastern Bay of Plenty (including Kawerau, Whakatāne and Opotiki Districts; TOI-EDA, 2011). This is produced quarterly with key indicators being population, household/dwellings, nominal GDP, annual economic growth estimates, employment and unemployment rates. This is also includes a summary of the national (New Zealand) economic outlook.

TABLE 2. New Zealand Human Development Index Results (2010)

Indicator	Score
Life expectancy at birth (years)	80.5
Mean years of schooling(of adults) (years)	12.5
GNI per Capita (\$US)	\$27,520

HDI and New Zealand Economic Indicators

The HDI has been integrated into the measurement of the New Zealand economy with a publication entitled “2011 Economic Indicators”; a joint initiative between the Ministry of Economic Development (MED), the Treasury and Statistics New Zealand (Ministry for Economic Development, 2011). The 2011 publication is the fourth of this kind in New Zealand. Earlier reports were published in 2003, 2005 and 2007.

The 2011 report proposes a “broad range of indicators relevant to New Zealand’s economic performance”. (Ministry for Economic Development, 2011, p. 8). These include measures of wellbeing and prosperity. These indicators consist of the DI rating, HDH HDI rating and the Economist Intelligence Unit’s *Quality of Life* index. The report also identifies the immediate drivers of income growth as (i) labour utilisation, (ii) labour productivity, and (iii) composition of the New Zealand economy. Furthermore, it identifies a number of underlying determinants of productivity growth such as innovation and entrepreneurship, investment, saving and financial market development, and international linkages.

In its entirety, the report looks at both social and market determinants of economic performance. The authors acknowledged that, “A growing, open, and competitive economy is a key means of delivering permanent higher incomes and living standards to New Zealanders. Without higher economic growth, the economy will not deliver higher living standards or the quality of life to which New Zealanders aspire” (Ministry for Economic Development, 2011, p. 8).

Measures of the Māori Economy

A number of reports have been published that estimate the size of the Māori economy. Some

of these include 2003 and 2007 estimates by NZIER and the most recent in 2010 by BERL (BERL, 2011).

The size of the Māori asset base has been of particular interest and calculations to date illustrate that the composition of the Māori asset base is dominated by Māori small medium enterprises (SMEs), Māori Trust/Incorporations, and Rūnanga (Collective Assets). A common accompaniment to the asset base review is a social accounting matrix (SAM) which models household and individual data, including labour force statistics, household incomes and net savings. In most cases a comparison is often undertaken against the “rest of New Zealand” if modelling has been undertaken on a national scale. Regional comparisons are also made if modelling has been undertaken on a regional scale.

The most recent review of the Māori asset base and SAM was completed in 2010 and published by the Māori Economic Taskforce (MET) in May 2011. According to the MET reports, the Māori asset base is estimated to be worth at least \$36.9bn. This represents a \$20.5bn increase since 2006 (MET, 2011a; BERL, 2011, p. 4). This increase is a result of actual growth, but is also due to a difference in methodology than that used by NZIER in the 2007 estimate. In 2010, the Māori economy directly contributed around six per cent to New Zealand’s GDP when measured by production and over eight per cent when measured by incomes, wages and salaries (MET 2011a; BERL, 2011, p. 5). Furthermore, the MET project on Māori economy and science and innovation modelled a number of scenarios for the Māori economy. Both a ‘productivity-focused’ and ‘export-focused’ approach could result in an extra \$12bn contribution by Māori economy to New Zealand’s economy. This equates to an additional 150,000 jobs and an increase in exports of more than \$12bn per annum in 2061. (MET 2011b; BERL, 2011, p. 6).

On the contrary, a scenario titled “do nothing” estimates a five per cent drop in GDP and

a loss of 35,000 jobs per annum in the New Zealand economy (MET 2011b; BERL, 2011, p. 7). These scenarios illustrate the interconnectedness of the Māori economy with the New Zealand economy. Based on the figures, a productive Māori economy creates a 20 per cent increase in GDP for the New Zealand economy by 2061 (Table 3).

Measures of regional Māori economies mirror those that model the Māori economy at a national level. One example in particular is the report titled *Te Ripōata Ohanga Māori mo te Waiariki* prepared by BERL for Te Puni Kōkiri in February, 2010 (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2007, 2010).

It is appropriate to note here that the relationship between Māori economic development and New Zealand economic development is still unknown, although there is considerable anecdotal evidence available. Further engagement with the project's six participating iwi will allow us to develop the anecdotal evidence as more formal data—particularly in how the iwi see themselves contributing to the wider New Zealand economy.

At a more micro level, a review of a sample of Annual Reports indicated that many Rūnanga, Trust and Incorporations and Post-Settlement Government Entity (PSGE) reports are predominantly financial information. Within these balance sheets is spend on education grants, which indicates a level of social wellbeing is

being considered. The annual reports provide commentary on the initiatives being undertaken, which is more than likely the information reported back to iwi members in the form of annual reports presented at annual general meetings. Financial information (i.e. balance sheets) remains the predominant indicators, reporting the financial position of the entities. These financial reports illustrate dividend payments made to shareholders as well as education grants if applicable. Annual reports often have commentary of some of the non-financial benefits and efforts including development of te reo, provision of education and training, housing initiatives and environmental management issues. A number of iwi are also undertaking to measure their economies at an iwi level. For example, two of the six iwi involved in this research programme have undertaken iwi-specific analysis. The models developed through the analysis focus on the labour force available to fill jobs, and roles of the local iwi within their rohe. While the iwi specific assets are part of the regional economies, the models map iwi labour to job opportunities in the regional economy, rather than iwi labour to iwi job opportunities (BERL, 2011).

The Census data are also a fundamental dataset with Statistics New Zealand producing iwi-specific reports as part of Census publications. Information includes population statistics, distribution of population by regional territorial authority, proficiency in te reo, education levels, religion, household composition and labour force. In addition, it summaries annual income, household ownership, access to phone, internet and fax as well as smoking status and number of children that are born to women over the age of 15.

Measures for Māori Economic Development

Mason Durie's paper *Māori Development: Trends and Indicators* provides one framework that could work as a Māori model for measuring

TABLE 3. Māori Asset Base 2010

	Asset base value (\$bn)
Self-employed	5,440
Employers	20,837
Trusts, Incorporations, Boards, MIOs, PGSEs, Holding Companies	10,620*
Total	36,897

* Treaty Settlement \$\$ figures are included in this category of asset. In actuality, it is a small portion of the Māori asset base value.

Māori economic development. Durie cautions that, “In order to quantify and monitor Māori development, new types of indicators will be necessary” (Durie, 2005, p. 7). He highlights three issues: first, over the past two decades Māori development indicators relied heavily on comparisons with non-Māori; second, that there is limited data that can measure the “nature of the relationship that individuals have with groups (such as whānau)”; and third, “levels of participation were frequently used as indicators of progress” (Durie, 2005, p. 8). He suggests that there are two main parts of Māori development that need to be considered in future measures. These are “an aspect that that recognises Māori interest in being part of a wider society and enjoying similar standards of living to other groups within society, and an aspect that recognises Māori as an indigenous population”. He labels these as universal factor and indigeneity factor, respectively (Durie, 2005, p. 8). He proposed the characteristics of indigeneity to include primary and secondary characteristics which include outcome measures that “need to take into account the dual aspirations of Māori: to enjoy similar rights, standards of living, and opportunities as other New Zealanders and to enjoy the benefits of Te Ao Māori” (Durie, 2005, p. 9). Durie identified three broad goals of Māori development: the participatory goal, the indigeneity goal and the equity goal, and developed a framework for measuring of Māori development.

He Ōranga Hapori is a model for raising Māori community wellbeing that was commissioned by the SME work stream of the Māori Economic Taskforce, and was published in May 2011. *He Ōranga Hapori* is a term used at Te Wānanga o Raukawa to describe community wellbeing or Māori economics and is defined as “the management of the resources, systems, rules and behaviours in a Māori society that contribute to the wellbeing of the people and the environment using a holistic approach” (MET, 2011a, p. 4). The aim of *He Ōranga Hapori* is “to progress thinking related to the

wellbeing of Māori communities with emphasis on the indicators that should be used to assess that wellbeing” (MET, 2011a, p. 4). The following indicators were developed within the context of whānau, hapū and iwi wellbeing, and were grouped into a number of categories that included whakapapa, manaakitanga, puke-ngatanga, te reo, whānaungatanga, kotahitanga and ukaiputanga.

A report prepared by Motu in 2004 entitled “Māori economic development – Glimpses from statistical sources” suggested that indicators of Māori economic development include “population size and age structure; life expectancy at birth, land ownership; urbanization; education attainment; participation in labour market; and attainment in the labour market.” They also include some “data levels of proficiency in the Māori language, which can be viewed as an indicator of cultural wealth” (Colman, et al., 2005, p. 5).

In summary, while GDP remains the primary metric measure of the economy both nationally and internationally, there has been considerable movement towards the creation and implementation of more societal wellbeing measures of the economy. This sets a solid foundation for Māori and iwi to adopt and adapt measures that best suit them in order to provide evidence of the progress, or otherwise, of achieving the aspirations identified in their strategies. Movement away from pure market metric measures and the development of HDI holds well for improving precision and relevance of models for measuring the Māori economy. Frameworks such as Mason Durie’s *Characteristics of Indigeneity and Goals and Indicators*, as well as *He Ōranga Hapori* are important steps to developing more appropriate measures for Māori economic development.

So What Does This Mean for Māori?

In order to understand the appropriateness of these measures for measuring the Māori

economy, it is important to understand the conversation about the interrelatedness of economic growth and human development.

Human Development and Economic Growth

In the case of the Human Development Report, the key message is that “while growth in national production (GDP) is absolutely necessary to meet all essential human objectives, what is important is to study how this growth translates – or fails to translate – into human development in various societies” (Haq, 1990, p. iv). The report continues:

In this line of enquiry lie promising seeds of a much better link between economic growth and human development, which by no means is automatic ... The basic objective of development is to create an enabling environment for people to enjoy long, healthy, and creative lives. This may appear to be a simple truth. But it is forgotten in the immediate concern with the accumulation of commodities and financial wealth. ... the primary objective of development is to benefit people. ... Of course, people also want higher incomes as one of their options. But income is not the sum total of human life. (Haq, 1990, p. 9)

Consequently the excessive preoccupation with GNP growth and national income accounts “has obscured that powerful perspective, supplanting a focus on ends by an obsession with merely the means” (Haq, 1990, p. 9).

As mentioned in earlier sections of this literature review, income is a means not an end.

Human development, by contrast, brings together the production and distribution of commodities and the expansion and use of human capabilities. It also focuses on choices – on what people should have, be and do to be able to ensure their own livelihood.

Human development is, more over concerned not only with basic needs satisfaction but as with human development as a participatory and dynamic process. It applies equally to less developed and highly developed countries. (Haq, 1990, p. 11)

Ranis and Stewart in their paper *The Priority of Human Development* state that “although many observers accept that economic growth affects human development, and that human development (interpreted as ‘human capital’) affects economic growth, the important implication of the interrelations between the two are rarely taken into account” (Ranis & Stewart, 2000, p. 38). They continue, “It is clear from this discussion of the various links in the EG-HD [economic growth–human development] chain, that, in general, we expect important casual connections to exist between the economy and HD achievements, but these connections are not automatic” (Ranis & Stewart, 2000, p. 41).

Our investigation into the determinants of HD progress and EG has clearly demonstrated the importance of a two-way relationship between them.... Because of the two-way relationship between EG and HD, one has to promote both to sustain progress in either. Economic growth, which is an important input into HD improvement, is itself not sustainable without improvement in HD.” (Rains & Stewart, 2000, p. 46.)

Amartya Sen in his paper *Development; which way now?* believes:

... that the real limitations of traditional development economics arose not from the choice of means to the end of economic growth, but in the insufficient recognition that economic growth was no more than a means to some other objective.... It is important to note that in this context the same level of achievements can be seen in countries with widely varying income per capita...China and Sri Lanka with

less than a seventh of the GNP per head in Brazil or Mexico, have similar life expectancy figures to the two richer countries. (Sen, 1983, p. 753)

Māori can take comfort that the challenge of market metrics (specifically GDP) has begun and efforts of development economists have laid the foundation. What we can take from the work of Sen, Ranis and Stewart is that the opportunities that come from the Māori economy will not

automatically provide benefits to Māori. This is confirmed through scenarios developed by BERL as part of the MET project. The \$12 bn and 150,000 jobs are a contribution from the Māori asset base to the New Zealand economy. If we are serious about making a change to the quality of lives for Māori, then we need to work to ensure a solid connection between economic growth and the outputs of the Māori economy that contribute to the human development of Māori.

CONCLUSION

This literature review was designed to answer a number of questions that are deemed by the research team to be key to achieving the three project objectives: establishing an aspirational framework for Māori economic development; design a set of innovative models and scenarios that could be used as tool for use by iwi towards developing best practice development models; and developing futures frameworks towards models for iwi economic development. Current and past literature from a variety of sources was reviewed in order to capture a sample of what has been said to date about economic development and Māori economic development.

We, therefore, investigated themes around development, indigenous development and economic development, and economic performance from historic, national and international sources. Several ‘silences’ in the literature became apparent early, notable among these is the lack of available primary information on the Hui Taumata (Māori Economic Development) held in 1984. As a relevant historic discussion around Māori economic development, the project team hope to include some of the ideas and recommendations within future reports and to assess what, if anything, has become part of current models and/or economic strategies. These have been added to the questions to be posed to the six participating iwi during their initial wānanga sessions, and answers or thoughts will become part of the overall research programme. These include, but are not limited to, definitions of economic development, and therefore

definitions of Māori and iwi economic development; the underlying cultural philosophies and practices that drive Māori and iwi aspirations, strategies and plans; and limitations and challenges to achieving total wellbeing for iwi and Māori, and how can these be overcome.

Several measures and models for measuring the economy have been reviewed and indicate unsurprisingly that GDP is currently the main market measure of the economy regionally, nationally and internationally. Review of the ‘Māori economy’ indicates a clear growth over the last decade. Furthermore, there is considerable potential in the assets that form the Māori asset base; an extra \$12 bn and 150,000 additional jobs for the New Zealand economy by 2061. New thinking and debates have set foundations to ensure that those focused only on the ‘means’ (i.e. the money) are kept honest about the importance of ‘people’ and specifically, their development as a key outcome of economic growth. This should resonate well with Māori and we should take heed of the findings and thinking of the development economists and establish frameworks that bind the connections between economic growth and human development.

There are also considerable silences about specific Māori indicators for economic development, making it difficult to assess whether the ‘ends’ are currently being met by the ‘means’. Therefore, with the six participating iwi we will concentrate on how they will take the money and use it to achieve their aspirations

for successful economic development according to their way of doing, seeing and being. This is listed time and time again as an important long-term outcome in the iwi development strategies and also is deemed the key outcome in both the international models reviewed here (Mondragón and Osoyoos). Hence, it will be key to reaching proposed project outcomes. The resulting aspirational frameworks may not necessarily align with the various development models, but it is too early for an adequate assessment. This will be informed by each iwi's definition of economic development and will become more evident as the iwi wānanga progress through the research programme.

Another area for further research and discussion is that of collectivism and collaboration and its place in Māori and iwi economic development. Two examples were detailed here, Miraka and the Iwi Leaders' forums, where iwi have collaborated to grow assets and social development for the collective. Challenges concern the way that Māori land is administered and therefore the way that related resources are managed and distributed for maximum benefit to the iwi membership. Some areas for further research concern the demographically diverse iwi membership and how this will be managed in the future so as to grow the capability and capacity of the membership for the benefit of

the collective. Another will be the way that both local and national levels of collectivism can benefit the Māori economy. The challenges from current land ownership models were highlighted by Kingi (2009) and he suggested one solution—collectivise under the iwi governing body. This brings its own challenges and the thoughts from participating iwi to answering this will be an innovative part of future frameworks for development.

This review is in no way exhaustive and further research will include an investigation of past and present research frameworks that are considered 'Māori' in focus, design and implementation; closer examination of core economic data and models; business models (both Māori and non-Māori); and initial findings from wānanga with participating iwi.

There is a significant disparity between what is 'known', that is, what has been formally stated in literature, and what is repeated as anecdotal information on Māori economic development. There is limited formal literature available on Māori economic development. The Te Pae Tawhiti project team intends to pursue and capture, with the six participating iwi, government agencies and wider Māori communities and business organisations, the information required to address the themes of the overall research programme.

REFERENCES

- 2020 Taupo-Nui-a-Tia Action Plan. (2004). Taupo: Tuwharetoa Māori Trust Board Environment Waikato. Available from www.taupoinfo.org.nz
- Abdulla, S., Mahoney, S., Marks, N., Michlealson, J., Seaford, C., Stroll, S., et al. (Eds.) (2011). *Measuring our progress. The power of well-being*. London: New Economics Foundation.
- Ara Mai Whakatohea Strategic Plan 2009–2013. (2009). Opotiki: Whakatohea Māori Trust Board.
- Barrett, M. (2005). *Accounting and accountability in Māori organizations in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Glasgow Caledonia University, Glasgow, UK.
- BERL. (2011). The asset base, income, expenditure and GDP of the 2010 Māori economy. Wellington: BERL and Te Puni Kōkiri.
- Bishop, R., & Tiakiwai, S. J. (2002). Building capacity for sustainable iwi development. *Journal of Māori and Pacific Development*, 3, 31–39.
- Cabinet Office of the Third Sector. (no date). A guide to social return on investment. Downloaded from <http://www.socialevaluator.eu/ip/uploads/tblDownload/SROI%20Guide.pdf>
- Carter, L. (2004). *Whakapapa and the state. Some case studies in the impact of central government on tradition-based Māori groups*. Unpublished PhD thesis, The University of Auckland, Auckland.
- Chalupnick, P. (2010). The CAPITAL in social capital: an Australian perspective. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 69, 12330–12350.
- Colman, A., Dixon, S., & Mare, D. (2008). *Te oranga o te iwi. A study of Māori economic and social progress*. Māori economical development: *Glimpses from statistical sources*. Wellington: New Zealand Business Round Table.
- Colman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, S94–S120.
- Colman, J. S. (1990). *Foundation of social theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Dawnay, E., & Shah, H. (2005). *Behavioural economics: Seven principles for policy-makers*. London: New Economics Foundation.
- Durie, M. (1994). *Whai ora: Māori mental health*. Auckland: AUP.
- Durie, M. (1999). Māori development: Reflections and strategic directions. *He Pukenga Korero*, 5(1), 4–11.
- Durie, M. (2005). *Māori development: Trends and indicators*. IAOS Satellite Meeting, Wellington.
- Edlin, B. (2005). Nepotism and kinship. *New Zealand Management*, April, 18–19.
- Evans, M., Mercer, C., & Page, B. (2009). *Development and the African diaspora. Place and the politics of home*. London and New York: Zed Books.
- Firth, R. (1973). *Economics of the New Zealand Maori*. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Grootaert, C. (1998). Social capital: The missing link? Retrieved from www.worldbank.org/socialdevelopment
- Haq, M. (1990). *Human development report. United Nations Development Programme*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kingi, K. (2009). *Māori land ownership and economic development*. Paper presented at the LEANZ/NZAE Conference, Waikato University, Hamilton.
- Law Commission. (2002). *Treaty of Waitangi claims: Addressing the post-settlement phase. An advisory report for Te Puni Kōkiri, the Office of Treaty Settlements, and the Chief Judge of the Māori Land Court*. Study Paper 13 (NZLC SP13). Wellington: The New Zealand Law Commission.
- Lawlor, E., Kersley, H., & Steed, S. (2009). *A bit rich. Calculating the real value of society of different professions*. London: New Economics Foundation.
- MET. (2011a). *He ōranga hapori*. Wellington: Ministry of Māori Affairs.

- MET. (2011b). *Māori Economic Taskforce 2009–2011*. Wellington: Ministry of Māori Affairs.
- Michaelson, J., Abdullah, S., Steuer, Thompson, S., & Marks, N. (2009). *National accounts of well-being*. London: New Economics Foundation.
- Ministry for Economic Development. (2011). *2011 Economic development indicators*. Wellington: Ministry for Economic Development.
- Ministry of Social Development. (2007). *Mahi aroha. Māori perspectives on volunteering and cultural obligations*. Wellington: Office for the Community and Voluntary Sector.
- Miraka Ltd. (2011). Miraka vision statement. Accessed at <http://www.miraka.co.nz>
- Mondragón. (2011). Corporation documents. Accessed at <http://www.mondragon-corporation.com/ENG/Co-operativeism/Co-operative-Enterprise-Experince>.
- Monin, P. (1995). The Māori economy of Hauraki 1840–1880. *New Zealand Journal of History*, 29(2), 197–210.
- Muapoko Tribal Authority Inc Strategic Plan 2008–2020. (2007). Levin: Muaupoko Tribal Authority Inc.
- Ngāti Rangi Strategic Plan 2009. (2009). A Tona Wa: Te Kahui o Paerangi Ngāti Rangi iwi Rūnanga.
- Nordaus, W. D., & Tobin, J. (1973). *Is growth obsolete? The measurement of economic and social performance*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- NZIER. (2003). *Māori economic development: Te ohanga whaneketanga Māori*. Wellington: NZIER and Te Puni Kōkiri.
- NZIER. (2007). *Māori participation in the New Zealand economy*. Wellington: NZIER.
- Oakeshott, M. (1969). *Rationalism in politics and other essays*. Indianapolis, IA: Liberty Press.
- OIB Development corporation website. (2011). Accessed at <http://www.oibdc.com.htm>
- Parker, Alan. (2011). *The inter-tribal trade development project*. Presented at the Nga Whetu, Hei Whai Conference, Rotorua.
- Pere, R. T. R. (1991). *Te wheke: A celebration of infinite wisdom*. Gisbourne: Ao Ako Global.
- Petrie, H. (2006). *Chiefs of industry. Māori tribal enterprise in early colonial New Zealand*. Auckland: AUP.
- Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 1–24.
- Posey, D. (2002). Upsetting the sacred balance. Can the study of indigenous knowledge reflect cosmic connections? In P. Sillitoe, A. Bicker, & J. Pottier (Eds.), *Participating in development. Approaches to indigenous knowledge* (pp. 24–42). London: Routledge.
- Puketapu, B. T. (2000). *Māori organisation and contemporary Māori development*. Unpublished Report.
- Putnam, R. (1993). *Making democracy work – Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone – The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Ranis, G., & Stewart, F. (2000). *The priority of human development*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Robinson, D., & Williams, T. (2001). Social capital and voluntary activity: Giving and sharing in Māori and non-Māori society. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 17, 52–71.
- Ryan, K. (2011). Lessons from the whale watchers. *New Zealand Management*, February, 26–27.
- Sen, A. (1983). Development: Which way now? *Economic Journal*, 93(372), 745–762.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Sillitoe, P. (2002). Globalising indigenous knowledge. In P. Sillitoe, A. Bicker & J. Pottier (Eds.), *Participating in development. Approaches to indigenous knowledge* (pp. 108–138). London: Routledge.
- Sillitoe, P., Bicker, A., & Pottier, J. (Eds.). (2002). *Participating in development. Approaches to indigenous knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- Stiglitz Commission (CMEPSP). (no date). Stiglitz Commission (CMEPSP) measure of well-being. Downloaded at <http://www.stiglitz-sen-fitoussi.fr/en/documents.htm>
- Stiglitz, J., Amartya, S., & Fitoussi, J. P. (2009) *The measurement of economic performance and social progress revisited*. Available from <http://www.stiglitz-sen-fitoussi.fr/en/documents.htm>
- Te Ara Poutama o Ngāti Awa Strategic Pathways to the Future 2010–2015. (2010). Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Awa.
- Te Ohu Kaimoana. (2007). *Strategic plan*. Downloaded from <http://teohu.maori.nz/publications>.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. (2007). *The Māori commercial asset base*. Wellington: Te Puni Kōkiri.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. (2010). *Te ripoata ohanga Māori mo te Waiariki: report on the Māori asset base in the Waiariki economy. An economic strategy for sustainable growth*. Wellington: Te Puni Kōkiri.

- Te Rūnanga o Nga Puhī Strategic Plan 2009–2014. (2009). Te Rūnanga o Nga Puhī.
- Te Rūnanga o Ngai Tahu Corporate Intent. (2011). Christchurch: Te Rūnanga o Ngai Tahu.
- Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Mutunga Strategic Plan 2008–2013. (2008). Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Mutunga.
- Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou Strategic Plan 2009–2010. (2009). Gisborne: Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou.
- Te Rūnanga o Te Rarawa Annual Plan 2009. (2009). Te Rūnanga o Te Rarawa.
- The Harvard Project on American Indian Development. (no date). Available from <http://hpaied.org>.
- TOI-EDA. (2011). *Eastern Bay of Plenty Region economic monitor June 2011. Whakatane* Available from <http://www.toi-eda.co.nz>.
- Tu'itahi, S. (2005). *Langa fonua: In search of success. How a Tongan kainga strived to be socially and economically successful in New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Directorate of Pasifica, Massey University.
- Vermaak, J. (2009). Reassessing the concept of “social capital”: Considering resources for satisfying the needs of rural communities. *Development Southern Africa*, 26(3), 399–412.
- Vision 2025. (2000). Christchurch: Te Rūnanga o Ngai Tahu.
- Walker, R. (2000). *He wha whai tonu matou. Struggle without end*. Auckland: Penguin.



NGĀ PAE O TE
MĀRAMATANGA

© Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga

www.maramatanga.ac.nz