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INTRODUCTION

This paper discusses the concept of sustainable entrepreneurship within the New-Zealand tourism industry from an Indigenous standpoint. Case studies of eight Māori owned and managed businesses are used to illustrate and provide a sample determination from the Māori cultural context if sustainability is based on profit maximisation or do Indigenous cultural values determine sustainability. Can it be both … or is it something else? All of the businesses examined are coincidently small to medium enterprises (SME) and family run enterprises.

The discussion begins by looking at recent literature on what is a Māori entrepreneur and how they work within the tourism industry, are they different to non-Māori or is there a serious of characteristics that make them different. The concept of sustainable entrepreneurship will then be addressed followed by the research questions, an analysis of the findings and concluding discussion as to the impact of this research in the often misunderstood area of cultural issues within entrepreneurial studies.

Tikanga will be referred to throughout the paper, for those not aware of this concept; tikanga can be described as general behaviour guidelines for daily life and interaction in Māori culture. Tikanga is commonly based on experience and the learning that has been handed down through generations. It is based on logic and common sense associated with a Māori world view. While these concepts of tikanga are constant, the practices that give effect to them can vary between āiwi (tribe) and hapū (sub-tribe). For example, the way in which one hapū greets and welcomes visitors may differ from another’s practices. However, both will ensure that they meet their responsibilities of manaakitanga (hospitality) to host and care for their visitors. In business it can be summarised as:

- Whanaungatanga – future benefits for the next generation
- Rangatiratanga & Mana – empower others
- Kaitiakitanga & Manaakitangi – incorporate Tikanga principles
- Utu & Wairua – most successful business possible (Tu Puni Kokiri 2006).

Discussion begins on what is Māori entrepreneurship.
Māori Entrepreneurship

The Global Entrepreneurship Monitor Report (GEM) ranked Māori as world class in terms of entrepreneurial innovation engaging in commercial activity, just as entrepreneurial as their non-indigenous counterparts, proactively engaging in the economy facing the same challenges as all NZ enterprises (Frederick 2004; Frederick & Henry 2004; Reihana et.al. 2007). In the 2005 GEM report, Frederick & Chittock reinforced previous findings for Māori as they ‘... distinguish themselves in terms of opportunity entrepreneurs ...comparable to Canada, Austria and the United Sates ... are top-rank in business optimism ... are amongst the “least fearful” when it comes to launching a new business” (2005: 9-11).

The history of colonisation and Māori entrepreneurship provides a background as to the possible success of Māori business. In the early years of European contact, Māori were allowed economic independence. In fact the survival of both the fledgling New Zealand colony and the Australian colony in Sydney was dependent on Māori commerce and agricultural skill (Petrie 2006). Māori were the innovators, the leaders in commerce adopting the plough, building flour mills, clearing pasture and tilling the soil, mastering boat construction and owners of numerous ocean going vessels. They were conversant with international trade and intensive land use management practices (Petrie 2006). Economic decline commenced in the 1840’s for a myriad of reasons. The overall loss of military power in the 1860’s and the rapid loss of traditional lands by the glutinous demands of the settler culture ensured that by the end of the 19th century Māori were facing an ever decreasing economic base (Maaka 1997) which has not been reversed until the 1980’s and 1990’s following a reversal of government policy (Barcham 1998). The population during the 19th century also followed a rapid decline, a similar fate with other Indigenous peoples ‘colonised” by the British with the rapid spread of disease, attrition by war and subjugation by the ‘white’ European (Petrie 2006). The establishment in 1985 of the now defunct Mana Enterprises programme to assist Māori into business was the beginning of several government and Māori initiatives to promote Māori economic development (Jones 2007). The Vision of the Māori economic forum of 2005 has been to focus on expanding economic pathways in the development of people, enterprise and assets. Māori micro-enterprise initiatives within tribal and urban communities is substantial even though the impact of colonisation and Government mechanisms have historically undermined both value systems and tribal knowledge that sustain community relationships as well as social and economic rights (Reihana et.al. 2007).

Māori ‘... are unique people with aspirations, needs and desires distinct from non-Māori’ (Reihana et.al. 2007: 643). These unique aspirations and needs are significant in Māori involvement within the tourism industry. New Zealand in general has benefited by the growth in tourism (Ryan 1997) with the New Zealand tourism industry using the ‘... Māori image ... as a marketing tool’ (Maori Tourism Task Force 1987: 25). Yet the use of this imagery has been done without the consultation and with little commercial benefit for Māori. Māori were stereotyped into guides, carvers and entertainers (Barnett 1997). The resurgence in Māori economic independence in the 1980’s following the establishment of economic initiatives resulted in Māori demanding autonomy, no longer ‘... the optional extra, ... the add on, tear off coupon side event. We do not want to provide ... tacky plastic Maori experience’ (Mahuta 1987: 1). Māori no longer wish to be the stereotype or have their culture misrepresented; which is a driving force of their business activity. This has resulted in an increase in Māori entrepreneurial activity, especially within the Tourism industry for tourism provides;

- economic opportunities for establishing businesses as well as employment (an escape from a culture of dependency),
- through economic well being there is support for social structures around the marae, iwi and hapu,
- a reinforcement of activities like other business enterprises and Māori language revitalisation,
- reinforcement of the importance of Māori culture and,
- the control over Māori culture and the use of its symbols as tourist assets (Ryan 1997:271).

Ryan also explains that in comparative terms with other industry, the economic returns from tourism are comparatively small (1997). It is the contribution to cultural and social sustainability that Māori entrepreneur seeks (Horn, 2007; Warren & Taylor 1999). Yet what distinguishes the Māori from the Pakeha (non- Māori) entrepreneur? Love and Love (2005)
identify five common features of Māori business which are: they have management control; responsibility and accountability exists to a broader range of beneficiaries and stakeholders; tikanga (cultural practices) is applied in the business environment; there are obligations to an extended family group as opposed to focusing solely on individual advancement; and the organisation has an ethos that mirrors the broad goals, values and aspirations of the Māori world.

The difference between Māori and non-Māori is more in the business practice than in the perception (Jones 2007). Jones expands this in that Māori consider people as well as profits. Often the Māori entrepreneur adopts a holistic view of their goals taking into account the wellbeing of others, often through their own networks applying distinctive cultural values at the governance and management level within the market place (Durie 2003; Jones 2007). This generates options for Māori as consumers as they have the choice of dealing with businesses that also use principles that add to the concept of a distinctively Māori business ethic (Jones 2007). The strength in the utilization of these resources and contacts allows a preferred alternative to mainstream, which is arguably similar in many ways with that of Ethnic Enclave theory (Portes and Bach 1980) and Co-cultural theory in the ability of Māori: ‘… to bring to light the clandestine forms taken by the dispersed, tactical and [makeshift] creativity of groups or individuals’ (Certeau 1984: 17), whilst living in a society in which they are not a part of the dominant culture (Orbe 1998). Or as illustrated by Petrie (2006) they were once dispossessed from the 1840’s and it was not until the 1980’s that Māori became a part of a bicultural New Zealand (Barnett 1997).

In closing this literature study of what are Māori entrepreneurs, research by Zapalska’s, et. al. (2003) indicates that they are highly motivated to succeed, driven by a desire to improve living standards and secure a livelihood for their families. This motivation to succeed is based on cultural value systems within their tribal affiliations and family. Success in business is also valued as a means of acquiring social status, ‘social eminence in the community’ (Zapalska, et. al. 2003: 171). To achieve eminence within the community they must also practice tikanga, their cultural values which supports the work of Durie (2003) and Jones (2007). Māori businesses focus on achieving outcomes and practices that reflect Māori values and concerns, they need to at least break even financially and they also focus on interconnections with family, community and culture; no matter what the product or service (Frederick & Henry 2004; Horn 2007; NZIER 2003; Warren & Taylor 1999; Zygadlo et. al. 2003; Zygadlo et. al. 2004).

‘… entrepreneurship is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon' (Frederick in Frederick & Chittock 2005: 7), the reader can begin to understand the Māori entrepreneur’s complexity and multifaceted layers of business/stakeholder involvement. From the researcher’s analysis when they are compared with other Pacifica Indigenous peoples and considering the literature studied, the Māori entrepreneur is indeed unique in many ways. This paper will hopefully add to literature that illustrates to interested parties Māori (tourism) entrepreneurs individuality.

We have discussed the entrepreneur; the following section will review what sustainable entrepreneurship is to the Māori entrepreneur.

What is Sustainable Entrepreneurship?

This paper does not set out to define, refine or redefine a definition of what is ‘sustainable entrepreneurship’; rather it is a review, discussion and application that allow the research to provide a possible interpretation. Based on the work of Dean and McMullen (2007) entrepreneurship is a process of exploiting market opportunities. To understand sustainable entrepreneurship it is obviously the opportunity recognition of and then the exploitation of these market opportunities but in a way that provides a product life span that integrates external factors that include (and are not limited to) the environment, renewal of product and continuance of demand. Harris and Lieper refer to it as a form of managed economic growth that occurs within the context of sound environmental stewardship (1995: xx). There are many different and confusing interpretations of sustainability when applied to entrepreneurial business development. As an illustration Pearce et. al. (1989) identified over 20 different definitions with several other authors concluding that sustainable development - entrepreneurship was an ambiguous concept, perhaps even an oxymoron (Brower 1992; Lele 1991; O’Riordan 1988; Suzuki 1993). The contradictory nature of the concept ensures that sustainable entrepreneurship differs substantially from sustainable social entrepreneurship which is ‘mission-driven’ rather than profit-driven (Dees 2001; Mort et al. 2003).
A wider opinion in this discussion believes sustainability in New Zealand businesses is likely to mean something different to the rural verses the urban business (Springett 2003). I disagree, rather; it is the interpretation of what is sustainable in the bottom line that really differs, not the geographic location. It would appear that it is the bottom line assessment which is dependent on the cultural and environmental factors that influence the Indigenous entrepreneur. Springett is partially correct in the interpretation of ‘sustainability’ as it relates to environmental issues as most people connect the concept with environmental sustainability. However economic sustainability is possibly uppermost on the minds of people wanting to build a sustainable business (Horn 2007). ‘Ecopreneurs’ on the other hand identify the environmental innovations and market opportunities that stem from them, successfully developing products and services accordingly, however they still have to break even financially (Lober 1998; Pastakia 1988; Petersen & Schaltegger 2002).

As previously mentioned it is the bottom line in general that is seen as the most important consideration for a business and in our discipline and training in full cost accounting we confirm that concept as it: ‘refers to that which is most important to the survival of any business: the capacity to generate income to meet expenses and generate profit’ (Aotahi 2005: 14). Previous research on Indigenous entrepreneurs in Hawaii and Australia revealed that Indigenous entrepreneurs do not just consider the economic bottom line (Foley 2000; 2003; 2005a; 2005b; 2006). Money was not stated as a motivator in these studies rather the well being and care of the Indigenous family was seen as the primary motivator (Foley 2005a). The GEM Report of 2005 also reinforced that wealth creation for Māori is not the driving force in business (Frederick & Chittock 2005). Indigenous entrepreneurs (in general) also consider; ‘things that sustain us as human beings; our environment, our societies and the diverse cultures that make up the reality of what it is to be human’ (Aotahi 2005: 14). Māori strongly consider the contribution that business activity has to cultural, social sustainability and independence (Frederick & Chittock 2005; Warren and Taylor 1999). When defining sustainable entrepreneurship the answer can be found within the balance between business development and environment demands/issues. The United Nations 1987 Brundtland Commission noted that sustainability must ensure that the needs of the present are met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. This ability to not compromise future generations is perhaps duplicated in other Indigenous research (Foley 2005a). The Indigenous business motivator in providing for children (a future generation) is commensurate with the Brundtland report (1987).

Some would say that sustainable entrepreneurship ‘… has the potential to slow the degradation and even gradually improve the earths ecosystems’ (Cohen & Winn 2003: 30). Cohen & Winn have defined sustainable entrepreneurship by slightly altering (see italics) Venkataraman’s (1997) entrepreneurship definition as ‘… the examination of how opportunities to bring into existence future goods and services discovered, created, and exploited, by whom, and with what economic, psychological, social and environmental consequences’ (2003: 35). Cohen and Winn’s definition fails to address an important concept that Indigenous entrepreneur’s value. Based on the authors previous research this definition fails to address the cultural applications of sustainability. Culture being ‘… regarded as the set of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features of society or a social group, and that it encompasses, in addition to art and literature, lifestyles ways of living together, value systems, traditions and beliefs’ (UNESCO 2002). Culture for both Indigenous (and some non-indigenous ethnic groups) can be an important sustainable concept. The term social is not encompassing enough by either Venkataraman (1997) or Cohen & Winn’s (2003) definition for the concept ‘social’ in ‘… its meaning is at times vague, suggesting that it is a fuzzy concept’ (Kokabu, Katai, Shiose & Kawakami 2005).

This might sound pedantic to some readers however when we combine literature that includes cultural studies, (almost anthropological by its research foundation) and entrepreneurship literature there is a massive amount of generalist rhetoric that can easily be adopted by the haste driven researcher. Well meaning non-indigenous scholars who have dabbled into the genre of Indigenous entrepreneurship have created a foundation of poor definitions together with over-cited scholarly articles based on the exotic that tautologically enforce post-colonial interpretation of the ‘Indian: the brave [hearted]’ or the ‘modern noble savage: the Aboriginal’ (Foley 2008). It is of the utmost importance when we look at definitions that are applied to topics that concern Indigenous issues we critically, without bias consider the Indigenous standpoint otherwise if we adopt definitions over Indigenous people.
we are re-enforcing neo post-colonial constructs that continue to subjugate Indigenous people (Marchetti 2006; Smith 1999).

The reader can begin to understand that sustainable entrepreneurship for Indigenous peoples is indeed a more complex issue due to Indigenous value systems that are essential components of what is culture. The researcher must respect and have experience in this area. Sustainability for the Indigenous is more than ecological, it is also cultural. The views of Spiller and Lake (2003) and later Aotahi (2005) consider four levels of understanding in entrepreneurial sustainability;

- the economic level (the bottom line)
- the environmental level (the duel bottom line)
- the social level (the triple bottom line) and,
- the cultural level (the quadruple bottom line) (Aotahi 2005: 16).

Māori are considered at the forefront in developing a fourth bottom line that measures the impact of business on culture (Aotahi 2005). Management of the cultural bottom line ensures that valuable cultural patterns and heritage in Aotearoa survive and prosper within the dynamics of a changing commercial world. This is what this paper and field research critiques; for Māori entrepreneurs, do they consider one, two, three or four bottom lines in their business undertakings as entrepreneurs?

METHODOLOGY

This project is structured around a qualitative case study analysis using a grounded theory approach (Strauss & Corbin 1990: 1998) utilising an Indigenous standpoint theory process (Foley 2002, 2003a, 2003b) in accordance with Kaupapa Māori epistemology (Smith 1999). This epistemological approach also required independent third party academic and cultural guidance. The Māori academic support team of Puukenga, UNITEC and Aunty Ella Henry, from the Auckland University of Technology together with the academic support of Professor Howard Frederick from UNITEC provided the core independent support network. Several other Māori advisers assisted in introductions to tribal groups (iwi) that included the Ngāti Porou (East Cape) and Ngāi Tūhoe (Eastern North Island). These iwi were significant to the author for their sociological importance and reputation.

The framework of the study involves a cross-comparative case study approach (Yin, 2002: Eisenhardt, 1989). Cross comparative as each entrepreneur or entrepreneurs from distinct iwi’s were treated as individual groups which is the foundation of a separate study investigating the maintenance of distinct cultural heritage within entrepreneurial values. The primary source of data was one-on-one interviews and individual case study analysis of Indigenous entrepreneurs. These were then analysed, collated and compared as representative sets. A semi-structured interview format applying substantive coding (open coding and constant comparative coding) was used for the analysis of interview data (Glaser 1992). The semi-structured format allows the individual case studies from across distinct cultural (tribal - iwi) groups to have commonality in analysis of key data sets, strengthening validity, consistency and reliability (Weiss 1994). Snowball sampling was used to locate the participants adopting culturally accepted introductions from third parties. Participants were located in a geographic area that covered Auckland, Whakatane, the East Cape, down to Hastings, across to Rotorua and Taupo. This area has the largest concentration of Māori populace (Statistics NZ 2002). The deduction would be that it also would have the highest representation of Māori entrepreneurs.

Research was undertaken from July 2007 to February 2008 with the assistance of funding from the Department Education, Employment and Workplace Relations Australian Endeavour Research Grant and in kind administrative support from the Faculty of Business, UNITEC New Zealand.

Participants were sole traders, partnerships, and trading - registered corporations. No trusts, Indigenous ‘community’ type groups or Indigenous groups established on a communal basis were studied. Participants were stand-alone commercial operators.

The studies involved emersion into the family operations over several months enabling the researcher to apply not only a semi-structured interview process of recording data, this also allowed active participation and extensive observation to determine the participant’s application of cultural ethics versus economic needs. In accordance with ethical standards the names, geographic location and type of business remain anonymous. Many of the SME’s did not undertake one business activity, rather they were integrated activities. As examples; two accommodation businesses (B&B and backpacker style) also ran fishing
charters and or small tailored cultural tours, another included a road contract service for the local council, another involved a B&B/Backpacker with a take-away food service and catering business, another a general freight and bus service. Another involved full scale tourist charters from five stars to economical school type packages, another is an up-market charter business exclusive for the international market together with a small weaving company. All eight business studied did not rely on one type of service delivery, in five examples they incorporated accommodation services with other supportive business integrated within the tourist experience. This complicated the study as to what was in fact cultural sustainability for in effect they practiced horizontal and vertical integration in their business operations, diversifying income streams with support industries. Each separate business had a distinct business purpose with varying obligations to other stakeholders. 

**The Research Question**

This paper is a part of a much wider study however for the purposes of this study the specific research questions are;

1) Do you value the economic bottom line and concentrate your efforts on profit maximisation?

2) Or, do you practice business sustainability? If so how do you measure it?

**RESULTS**

To simplify and separate the participant’s core business activity and secondary business activities the following table has been used. If the participants identify a component of their business activity as a ‘sustained’ activity this is highlighted in the right hand column with the type of sustainability. The core business activity was determined by several characteristics which included capital investment, time spent involved in the business, and did the other businesses operations radiate around any one business. These often involved discussions with the entrepreneurs allowing their personal input in deciding what were their core business. To illustrate the table Case study 1 is illustrated.

The immediate question is, are they an accommodation provider, a tour guide operator, a fishing charter business or a road maintenance contractor? By self analysis they determined subject to external commitments such as tangi (funeral) or important hui (community meetings) that they were an accommodation provider 365 days a year, a fishing charter company only in the summer months, tour operations also tended to be seasonal (summer) and they stated emphatically that the road maintenance contract was their ‘bread and butter’ business. It was their dependable financial resource, it was not however why they were in business. Rather it was a ‘dependable’ supplementary income. When the concept of sustainability was included into the discussion the fishing charter business was sustainable ecologically. This was based on an ancient tribal harvesting formula. The fishery was protected under tribal law and the entrepreneur respected and acted within that law at times defending the resource against other non-indigenous commercial operators. Even when fish were caught by international anglers, the catch was shared with the elders of the clan. The accommodation which coincidently was built on a tribal area also had to be environmentally sustainable in management of limited water supplies, waste management, propagation of foodstuffs from waste to ensure fresh produce, conservation of energy and energy generation by solar and wind, and above all a cultural sustainability in that way guests are treated as family, rather than a means to earn income. The business is an extension of family hospitality, displaying Māori cultural values in sharing that allows the consumer, the customer to experience far more than just accommodation. The customer experiences (subject to their willingness) cultural immersion – an escape from their non- Māori daily existence (Hipwell 2007; Ryan & Huyton 2002). In cultural tourism, Māori are often uncomfortable putting a price on something they have produced or a traditional practice – giving not selling. This presents a barrier to business development (Frederick & Henry 2004; Horn 2007; Warren and Taylor 1999). In the comfort of an accommodation business; participant 1 can manage Matauranga (knowledge) for the tourist without ‘selling’ their culture short (Horn 2007). The accommodation business is an example of cultural sustainability.
### Table 1: Comparative analysis of the cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Core business</th>
<th>Secondary business’s</th>
<th>Emphasis on sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case 1</td>
<td>Accommodation (B&amp;B, backpacker)</td>
<td>- fishing charter</td>
<td>1. fishing charter – ecological &amp; cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- tour guide</td>
<td>2. accommodation - cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- road maintenance contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2</td>
<td>Accommodation (Backpacker)</td>
<td>- take away food</td>
<td>1. accommodation - cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- catering company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 3</td>
<td>Accommodation (B&amp;B, backpacker, camping ground)</td>
<td>- fishing charter</td>
<td>1. hunting &amp; fishing – ecological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- tour guide</td>
<td>2. accommodation - cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- hunting tours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- freight service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 4</td>
<td>Accommodation (backpacker)</td>
<td>- tour guide</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- transport service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 5</td>
<td>Fishing Charter</td>
<td>- accommodation</td>
<td>1. fishing charter – ecological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- tour guide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- weaving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 6</td>
<td>Tour company</td>
<td>- transport shuttle</td>
<td>1. tours - cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- arts &amp; crafts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 7</td>
<td>Accommodation) Motel</td>
<td>- laundry</td>
<td>social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Tour company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 8</td>
<td>Cultural tours</td>
<td>- catering</td>
<td>1. tours - cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- video hire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case study 2 is different, whilst accommodation is in their interpretation their main business; they (like Case study 1) see it as an extension of their family and do not allow it to rule their life, rather they see as a cultural extension and is a ‘aspect’ of their life. They also can manage Matauranga (knowledge) for the tourist without ‘selling’ their culture short (Horn 2007) ensuring that they combine business activity, the modern culture alongside their traditional beliefs (Zeppel 2002).

Case 3 is similar in many ways to Case study 1. Their greatest natural asset is a bay that was once polluted and devoid of marine life. Since the adoption of a sustainable land-use practice the area now teems with wildlife which is a two edged sword, increased occupancy increases the chance of pollution through waste or human contact. A strict embargo on the number of guests is enforced to ensure a balance between tourism demands and natural resources remain intact which effectively increases demand. Their accommodation facilities both include cultural sustainability in the practice of values similar to Case 1 and 2, refer literature previous referenced (Frederick & Henry 2004; Hipwell 2007; Horn 2007; Ryan & Huyton 2002; Warren and Taylor 1999: Zeppel 2002). Case study 3 also conducts fishing charters, cultural tours, hunting tours and a freight service. The fishing charters and tours are seasonal and do not follow the same Indigenous law as does Case study 1 in their fishing charter. Whilst ‘3’ endeavours to be cultural and ecological sensitive they confirm that they are businesses and need to cover costs. They are only run when they are profitable and maximise returns for the angler or hunter. Ecological sustainability is not abused; however the business operations are not pre-determined by them. This entrepreneur also runs a freight/bus service on a regular basis which was an opportunity that arose following the unreliable and expensive service offered by the non-Māori competitor. There are many Māori accommodation centres, cafes, stores and Māori people in their isolated area. Independent travellers need transport and his competition also needed both reliable transport for their customers and freight in addition to the local Māori population requiring a reliable bus and freight service which was flexible and compassionate to cultural requirements. After compiling a hastily drafted business plan and securing the pledge from other Māori operators they now run a regular bus and freight service which is self-funded and profitable. In summer it runs daily, in winter two to three times a week. A Māori transport service operating for the Māori

Case study 5 fishing charter is their primary business, situated in remote idyllic topography aimed at the high end of the specialist market providing a lodge style accommodation service, personal one-on-one tour guide and surprisingly an independent weaving factory keeping old traditions alive. The sustainability of the core business was ecological - maintaining fish stocks, managing pristine streams on private landholdings. The weaving factory although basic is arguably culturally sustainable as well even though the participant did not rate it. The business teaches flax growing, management, harvesting, dying and weaving styles pertaining to the cultural links of the weaver's iwi, totally devoid of tourist pollution. ‘...Māori culture is presented with dignity and not as monkeys in cages’ (Te Maori News 1995: 4). This is achieved by being away from the tourist gaze (Urry 1990). There is no process of 'exoticization' (Ryan 2002) as there is no tourist observation or intervention. The products are sold to established tourist outlets at set prices based on a standard mark-up added on to the cost of manufacture calculated on the degree of difficulty and hours of manufacture, another example of niche entrepreneurship acquiring social eminence in the community by the practice of tikanga which offsets community criticism of the core business which is seen by some as a commercial non-Māori operation.

Case studies 6 and 8 were similar in their core business being Tour Company's that are both culturally sustainable. Case study 6 offers a range of cultural tour experiences from the one-on-one couples, small groups, to a bus load and large youth groups. They have specialised flexible tailored packages to their consumers needs be this an ecological tour swimming in pristine oceanic environments, walking on black sand, overnight camping 'off' the tourist track' in private lands or reserves. Product diversification also includes intensive swimming trips of a few hours to days discovering hand made Māori fashion, or spend an afternoon with a Māori artist enjoying home made scones and tea discussing their art or carving aimed at the more affluent middle class international tourist to large 'budget' groups trekking across ancient Māori pathways. Winners of several prestigious awards the operators continue to apply their ancestor's values in business. They practice a sustainability ensuring modern culture is featured alongside that of traditional (Hipwell 2007; Zeppel 2002). The result for the consumer is a unique cultural experience. Literature tells us that tourist are seeking an escape from their daily existence (Ryan & Huyton 2002). Case study 6 provides that experience in many of their tailored tour packages.

Case study 7 The motel operators believed that theirs was a lifestyle choice however they were controlled to some extent by the large capital outlay and borrowings exerting constant pressure to service loans. Their use of tikanga was unique. In the summer, spring and autumn months they relied on the independent traveller and international tourist both in coaches and car hire networks to utilise their facility which was recently constructed and modern. This gave them economically sustainable patronage nine months of the year. In winter they initially operated at a large loss. To improve this situation their children undertake increasing labour based roles to offset wages costs and they use wider networks offering large discounts for Māori family groups to stay there. This increases their patronage to an acceptable occupancy rate that is above break even and allows large family groups the opportunity to stay in motel accommodation which they would not normally have access to. Downstream marketing has allowed them to mitigate the effects of a competitive seasonal market to an extent (Lau, Man & Chow 2004; Wolff & Pett 2006). Without the Māori patronage their business would not be financially viable. By offering large discounts they not only maintain viability they are also seen as providing an important service to their people. This is in effect an increase of the proprietor's mana (or prestige – influence and status). Mead (2003) would place it in the category of Whakahuihui Tangata, an increase in social groupings, thus economic sustainability in this example is determined by the values of Tikanga Māori. Having been a student of cultural theories (Orbe 1998; Stanger 1992; Waldinger 1985, 86a, 86b, 93, 96) the applications of Meads (2003) work and its applicability to Māori entrepreneurship is both fascinating and complex.

Case study 8 enjoys the diversification of income in a video hire. The downside is most of their working capital is tied up in its structure, the upside is that it provides a most sought after income during the off-season (winter) when income from tourism 'evaporates'. Their sustainable business is based around an immersion activity that is unique with no Māori
owned competitor which makes them unique. They are well versed in the cultural aspects of the operation as it pertains to that iwi also used for training Māori youth and trainee Māori tour operators.

Of the eight businesses studied, case study 4 did not feel that any of their activities were subject to any form of cultural sustainability for the products they offered were in a commercial competitive market and was not dependent on Indigenous goodwill or longevity of Indigenous elements. Their operations needed to produce a financial profit however the economic – financial bottom line was not their driving force, rather it was the third bottom line, a lifestyle, a social level (Aotahi 2005).

CONCLUSION

The conclusions reached provide an insight into the growing Indigenous participation at the SME level within Aotearoa relating to Māori cultural values. The concept that is Kaupapa Tikanga was revealed by the participants and researched by the author as it applies within both the realm of the individual's entrepreneurial activity and within the tourism industry. Often the choice between cultural values verses economic values result in short-term financial losses, the Māori entrepreneur has to decide which path they should choose.

Of the eight case studies all practiced various levels of Tikanga looking at lifestyle as a key business pursuit. Only one had a core business they valued as an ecologically sustainable business pursuit. Two held non-core fishing operations as ecological however their core operations were accommodation which they considered to be a culturally sustainable business. Overall six business operations hold the cultural level of business sustainability as the 'quadruple bottom line' (Aotahi 2005: 16), supporting the concept that Māori are at the forefront in developing a fourth bottom line that measures the impact of business on culture (Aotahi 2005). Management of the cultural bottom line ensures that valuable cultural patterns and heritage in Aotearoa survives and indeed should prosper within the dynamics of a changing commercial world. Reiterating all eight case studies practiced Tikanga, their Māori value systems within their business operations (Tu Puni Kokiri 2006).

To answer the research questions, all valued the economic bottom line yet none concentrated their efforts on profit maximisation, rather in the one case that did not have sustainable cultural or ecological businesses as their core business they held lifestyle as the crucial determining factor. Participant seven due to their large capital debt was the only one preoccupied with profit ratios, yet even in their situation it was the ability to pay the mortgage, to cover costs, it was not about wealth creation. The remaining six valued cultural sustainability in business and they measured it by their continuation of success, without commercialising their culture, by maintaining their position within their iwi building prosperity for their families.

Tourism literature advises us that; ‘... the interaction between tourist and indigenous person might be construed as a liminoid phenomenon because it is individualised and contractual’ (Turner 1982: 54), it is a ritual activity (Ryan 2002), a staging of culture for an authentic cultural experience that over-signifies the identity of difference as a repetitious inscription of essential Maori-ness (Taylor 2001). Hipwell (2007) provides an insight into how the modern Māori culture can exist alongside the traditional which negates to a large degree the previous stereotypical images of Māori. This paper supports Hipwell in that Māori entrepreneurs within the tourism industry are indeed modern yet maintaining cultural sustainability, complex and a multifaceted phenomenon (Frederick & Chittock 2005) not a static contractual liminoid phenomena. Maori entrepreneurs it would seem based on this small sample practice sustainability valuing the cultural level of their business pursuit which is a pursuit of the fourth or quadruple bottom line, thus supporting the work of Spiller & Lake (2003) and the writings of Aotahi (2005).
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