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BACKGROUND

The term “Critical Management Studies” (CMS) has lately gained more currency, with a number of New Zealanders participating in gatherings such as the CMS conference at Cambridge in July 2005 and the CMS division at the Academy of Management in Hawaii this year. This event builds from the informal gathering at Massey in March 2004. The event focuses sharply on the intersections of the critical and the local and asks what is Critical Management Studies in Aotearoa / New Zealand?

Conference papers and Expressions of interest also address the more detailed questions of:
- What critical systems of thought are available for CMS?
- What might be the key topics of organisational analysis for CMS in this country?
- How can issues of locality and location be approached from critical perspectives?
- How central to CMS are issues of power relations?

Conference Proceedings take two forms: as a short peer reviewed position paper addressing the questions raised in the call, or an Expression of Interest (EoI) that identified the ideas and themes they contributed to the conference.
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PART I: PAPERS
Central to any discussion of what critical management studies in Aotearoa/New Zealand might look like is how we think about locality and location. Given our individual and collective biographies location is often framed in terms of a relationship between ‘here’ and some ‘other’ location – be that geographical, cultural, economical, empirical or theoretical. Thus, exploring the politics of locality and location becomes an examination of the ways in which ‘the other’ is inscribed in/onto ‘the local’. Landscape presents a highly visible account of these inscriptions of the other onto the local context. Thus, we can read some of the politics of Aotearoa/ New Zealand locality from our landscape. The presence (and absence) of particular trees - the ‘exotic’ apple, pine, poplar, oak and macrocarpa, for example- leave enduring traces of other places on the local landscape. At times these monuments from elsewhere outlive the social organizations that produced them. For example the apple trees that were the result of rail passengers throwing their apple cores out of the train window still line the now absent Central Otago railway track. These trees signal a very important point about how locality and location should be approached from a critical perspective. In short, they represent the complex multiplicity of inscriptions of the other onto the local context. In addressing the complexity and multiplicity of the relationship between here and there, it is important that our critical questioning considers how historical inscriptions of ‘the other’ become embedded into contemporary accounts of ‘here’. For example, the apple trees introduced to Central Otago through the historical railway are a current feature of the Central Otago Rail Trail tourist experience of local landscape. Reading the politics of locality from our landscape therefore, provides us with important access to the complex weaving of particular histories into contemporary organization and identity practices within
Aotearoa/New Zealand. I will support my position through a brief analysis of the politics of location and identity in the Wakatipu Basin development dispute.

Queenstown is a key destination in the tourism imaginary of Aotearoa/New Zealand. Fundamental to the status of Queenstown as an international tourist destination is the ‘natural’ landscape of the area. The Wakatipu Basin is an area of land adjacent to the urban centre of Queenstown. While this basin is framed with high rocky peaks—including the 1,651 metre high Coronet Peak—it also contains approximately 225 square kms of rolling foothills, flat lands and the river terraces of the Lower Shotover. These foothills and low lands have supported sheep farming—and more latterly viticulture—through the 20th Century. In the last ten years however, an increase in visitor numbers to Queenstown and the expansion of the local tourism industry have generated pressure to build housing developments in the Wakatipu Basin. The dispute that has emerged is generally constituted in terms of ‘how to handle development pressure, while protecting the landscape values of the district’ (Warwick Goldsmith cited by Williams, 2000). My reason for bringing the Wakatipu Basin to your attention is to illustrate how the very particular histories of landscape mobilized by agents involved in this dispute serve to embed historical colonial inscriptions into the contemporary landscape. In so doing, these monuments from elsewhere become a naturalized feature of the way in which this location is thought about. Before I do this however, I need to define the theoretical framework through which I engage with location, locality and landscape.

My suggestion that landscape offers us valuable access to a critical examination of locality and location in Aotearoa/New Zealand is premised on a particular theorization of landscape. As stated by Gieryn (2000: 464) ‘place’ refers to a ‘unique spot in the universe’. In this paper I use landscape to refer to the specific physicality of the place known as Wakatipu Basin. While landscape translates place into a physical entity the meaning ascribed to that entity may be diverse and contested. In this sense I am adopting Doreen Massey’s (1991, 1995, 1996) formulation of the meaning of place and landscape as the outcome of a political process. In other words, ‘the boundaries which we draw in space, the ‘places’ we define (indeed all spatial definitions)...rather than being based on some eternal principles, are in fact expressions of, and exercises in, social power’ (Massey, 1996: 117). This social
power operates through the way that places are ‘interpreted, narrated, perceived, felt, understood, and imagined (Soja, 1996 cited by Gieryn, 2000: 465).

‘Nature’ occupies a central and privileged position in the social imaginary of the Wakatipu Basin. Whether constituted as an economic tourist resource or an aesthetic quality, it is the natural qualities of the Wakatipu Basin landscape that the agents against urban development seek to protect. For example, from a Wakatipu Basin resident:

*I sincerely hope that other landowners join with groups .... And call for sensible planning ...with emphasis on retaining the unspoilt nature of this most beautiful area (Humphrey, 2000).

As Wilson cautions, ‘when our physical surroundings are sold to us as “natural” … we should pay close attention’ (Wilson, 1992: 12). The important thing about the ‘naturalness or purity’ of nature is that it is constructed to be so at the level of the ‘social imaginary’ (Shields, 1991). The value given to a particular landscape therefore, is a product of the social imaginations invoked to give it meaning.

Bell (1996: 29) suggests that New Zealand has

two versions of romanticised landscape. Landscape is either beautiful but potentially dangerous: sanctified, visited, enjoyed, photographed, then left; a vision to inspire. Or it is beautiful and beautifully cultivated, a tribute to both nature itself and to the efforts of human labour’.

In the Wakatipu Basin these two versions of romantic landscape are spatially connected. In terms of landscape identity practices however, the important point is that both of these images of landscape – the mountain and the pastoral scene – are invested with the natural and therefore sacrosanct myth.

“This is about protecting the environment. It’s a wake-up call,” he says.

“People realise that if they don’t do something they’re going to lose forever an environment that has been sacrosanct” (Revell Buckham cited by Ansley, 2000: 23)

This connection not only high-lights the centrality of the ‘natural’ myth within the place-identity practices of the Wakatipu Basin, it also serves to disappear the early colonial inscriptions on this landscape.
Quite simply, the colonial inscriptions missing from the constitution of the Wakatipu Basin as natural are fire, exotic grasses and sheep. Miller (1949) describes a fire in 1860 where the colonial gentlemen Rees and Von Tunzelman used a match to clear native fern, speargrass and matagouri in preparation for their return with three thousand sheep (Miller, 1949). This fire was not the product of carelessness or mindless vandalism. Rather it was a product of a social imagination of place that ‘tied their local and immediate experience [of this landscape] to the Anglo and European worlds’ (Dunlap, 1999: 98). In other words this was the remaking of an alien and ‘inhospitable land’ into a familiar European pastoral scene. As Dunlap (1999: 46-47) argues, ‘(t)he settlers destroyed and re-created, appreciated the beauties of the land, and sought to bring it closer to their own ideal, and they did it on a grand scale’. Thus, following the fire came the exotic grass, the sheep and the Arcadian spatial imagery. One of the powerful settler myths of New Zealand as an *ideal society*, claims Fairburn (1989: 29), was that New Zealand was a land of Arcadian plenty.

Of the themes constituting the Arcadian conception of New Zealand, the most common was the notion of New Zealand as a land of natural abundance...The assumption had all the power of a legend. Not only was it taken for granted and extraordinarily popular, it also had its own predictable rhetoric and met with little resistance let alone reasoned skepticism.

It is this Arcadian pastoral imagery that has been mobilized as the history of the Wakatipu Basin landscape in this dispute. Accordingly, the rhetoric of Arcadian mythology is drawn explicitly into the debate. For example,

‘Judge Jon Jackson told them that they were threatening the character of the district and would have to fit into “a pastoral or Arcadian landscape in the poetic sense”’

(*Ansley, 2000: 23*).

In addition, in a 20/20 television report (Langston, 2000), Wakatipu landowner Jeff Williams describes the area that surrounds his own renovated historic cottage as

“still relatively unspoilt. Its still a beautiful piece of Arcadian landscape and it’s a very important part of the landscape, it’s a very historical part of the landscape down here”.
Issues of location and locality are central to any discussion we might have of what critical management studies in Aotearoa/New Zealand might look like. The landscapes of Aotearoa/New Zealand can provide us with important insights into the multiple and complex ways that other locations become inscribed onto and merged into this place. Within the Wakatipu Basin development dispute for example, those opposing urban development constitute this landscape as a place of natural beauty that needs to be preserved and protected for future generations. The landscape that these agents are defending is the pastoral Arcadian scene of green pastures and grazing sheep. Submerged within this landscape however, is another natural landscape that was erased by early colonial pastoralists in 1860. To rephrase a letter to the editor\(^1\), the ‘rampage by an unguided super-tanker of development’ 150 years ago, rather than being a lament for generations to come, worked a piece of land into a very particular natural landscape that is deserving of protection today. Approaching location and locality therefore, demands that we not only attend to the multiple histories of landscapes but also to the ways in which these inscriptions from other places enter into normalized responses to this land.
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Discriminating Ethics:
Local truths - critical authority?

This paper explores unresolved ambiguities and contradictions in empirical CMS research between a particular manifestation of the ‘local’ and the ‘critical’ (i). Specifically, we highlight tensions between i) CMS scholar’s appreciation of the irredeemably local, partial or subjective nature of organizational subject’s knowledge about organization, including ethical judgments about organizational ends and means, and ii) the authority assumed by the CMS scholar in the text to publicly accuse, denounce, judge or critique that which they ‘know’ to be oppressive or exploitative behaviour in organisations.

The above issues are examined through reflection upon the nature of ethics in organisations and in academic research. We explore the unsettling implications of an anti-foundationalist ethics for our understanding of both ethically informed behaviour in organisations and the ethical warrant of Critical Organisation Studies/ Critical Management Studies (CMS) research.

Organisational scholars in recent years have displayed an increasing interest in the issue of ethics. Parker (1998), in the introduction to his influential edited text Ethics and Organizations, suggests this rise in interest is due to a combination of four factors: first, the increasing prominence in the wider academy of anti-foundationalist theoretical approaches such as social constructivism and postmodernism. Such approaches distrust the privileging of truth or authority as the basis for academic knowledge claims and thereby raise the need to explicitly reflect upon the ethical warrant of academic work. Second, there has been a greater attention in work organisations to issues such as equal opportunities, whistleblowing and environmental responsibility. These are increasingly being explored utilising ethical discourses within such fields as Business Ethics and Corporate Social Responsibility. Third, Parker notes what he calls the cultural or humanist turn in theories of organisation and management. This is evidenced in a disenchchantment with dehumanised, mechanistic or bureaucratic constructions of organizations.
and movement toward a seemingly more progressive and ‘human centered’ organizational discourse. Finally, there is evidence of greater ethical reflexivity amongst a number of ‘critical’ organisation and management scholars, who are explicitly questioning their role and purpose in serving, or subverting, dominant corporate interests.

In addition to providing this context, the contributions to Parker’s book also illustrate the form that much of the recent academic interest in ethics in Critical Management Studies has taken. Despite drawing from a diverse range of theoretical traditions including feminism (Brewis 1998), Marxism and post-modernism/post-structuralism (Letiche 1998; Willmott 1998), CMS authors’ engagement with ethics may be understood as informed by the aforementioned anti-foundationalist approach to ethics. This can be summarised as: (a) a deep suspicion of appeals to authority, universal laws or codes as a way of resolving, or avoiding ethical, differences or debates; coupled with (b) an appreciation that all descriptions of others’ ethics, including apparently ‘neutral’ empirical accounts, are in fact inescapably normative (Willmott 1998).

Since the publication of Parker’s book this anti-foundationalist ethical approach has been used to good effect by a number of CMS authors to critique corporations’, managers’ and certain Business Ethics academics’ assumption of the authority to define and enforce organizational-wide ethical codes to which others are expected to submit (Jones 2003; Parker 2002; ten Bos 2003; also Sorell 1998 in Parker 1998). Other CMS scholars have usefully drawn on this understanding of ethics in their empirical research to question the morality of influential managerial discourses such as ‘customer service’ (e.g. O’Connell Davidson 1994), ‘corporate social responsibility’ (e.g. Roberts 2003); ‘employee health programs’ (e.g. Haunschild 2003), or the presumption of manager’s moral muteness in the face of an organisation’s instrumental rationality (e.g. Watson 2003 and 1998).

Like the texts cited above, this paper is a piece of empirical CMS research that draws upon an anti-foundationalist understanding of ethics to examine an organisational issue replete with ethical implications. The empirical data that lie at the centre of the work focuses upon the
actions and ethics of three academic staff [‘Jonathan’, ‘Kay’ and ‘Lawrence’ (ii)] of a post-compulsory UK education institution and explored what we named as these subjects’ collusion in and/or failure to resist sex discrimination against one of their colleagues (‘Maria’).

The paper seeks to build upon the approaches of previous CMS research of ethically challenging organizational practices, however, in that it not only utilizes an anti-foundationalist ethics to critique other organizational subjects’ problematic agency, but it also explored the implications of this ethics for CMS academics’ own ability to name a research subject’s behaviour as problematic. This ability to name others’ problematic behaviour as such (as, for instance, oppressive, exploitative, or discriminatory) is central to CMS’s anti-oppressive stance (Alvesson and Willmott 2003; Fournier and Grey 2000). But, to reiterate, by drawing upon an anti-foundationalist ethics we understand the basis of any such judgment by the academic author to be inescapably normative and, therefore, in ethical terms, ambiguously authorised. The implications of this argument for the ethical status or warrant of CMS’s own empirical critiques have yet to be seriously and explicitly explored by the field. This paper is both a call for the field to begin to do so and an initial attempt to embody this call. It is organized into two sections.

In Section One ‘Research ethics in an adversarial context’ we explore some of the complex ethical challenges that this work raised for us as ‘critical’ researchers. We explore the ethical choices that we made in the context of writing critically about the actions of three research subjects, in an emotionally and legally adversarial case in which we were personally involved. Attempting to embody ethical research practices in such a context illustrates an uneasy distinction between what we found to be possible and what we may regard as ideal. In addition to exploring the specific context of our research, we would also suggest that our attempt to make explicit the ethical ambiguities of our research may be of wider interest to the field of Critical Management Studies - a field that, as one of us has argued elsewhere, too often neglects
explicit reflection upon the ethics of its own research practices in its published research
(reference omitted for reviewing purposes).

In Section Two ‘Moralising Discrimination’ we explore the ethics of discrimination in
organisations, focussing upon the agency of Jonathan, Kay and Lawrence. We interpret these
subjects to have discursively constructed themselves as moral agents acting morally. Our,
subjective, reading of the data leads us to argue that these discursive moralities did not serve
merely as a post-hoc rationalisation, but that they also enabled the intensification and
escalation of what we argue to be problematic agency. Far from constraining discrimination
as we might expect ethics or morality to do, we argue (referring back to the title of this paper)
that evidenced here is a ‘discriminating ethics’ – discrimination both legitimised and enabled
through the mobilization of ethical discourses.

However, taking seriously the anti-foundationalist ethical position that any representation of
other’s agency is always at the same time more than mere ‘representation’, but also entails an
ethical discrimination on the researcher’s part – a discrimination between what is
problematised and how, and what is endorsed in the text – we use this section also to reflect
critically upon our warrant as researchers to name other’s ethically informed agency as
problematic. In our Discussion we explore the difficulties of assuming or establishing an
ethical basis for critique when working within a tradition such as CMS that is rightly
suspicious of foundational claims. Specifically, we do this by rereading the data through the
lens of postmodern/ poststructuralist feminist ethical theory so as to explore what, if any,
basis we may have as Critical Management scholars to differentiate the ‘ethical’ from the
‘unethical’ in research subjects’ agency.

Of the wide range of theoretical traditions that inform CMS (see above) we draw upon feminist
ethics in our analysis for a number of reasons. First, it is possible to produce a reading of this
tradition that resonates with the discursive understanding of ethics we use to present our data.
To this end we draw upon an anti-universalising/ anti-essentialising feminism, a feminism that resists prescriptive understandings of women and their roles, and one that understands morality as we do, as self-constructed and self-constructing, rather than self-evident. Given the rich variety and volume of feminist engagement with ethics, which cross a wide range of theoretical and conceptual boundaries (see for example Card 1997; Frazer, Hornsby and Lovibond 1992; and Fricker and Hornsby 2000 for useful reviews), we are necessarily selective in the feminist resources we draw upon in making this reading. Such a non-universalising feminist ethics has been usefully informed by engagements with postmodern and post-structuralist theory in the last few decades (see Brewis 1998; Nicholson 1990). As a result we draw centrally but not exclusively upon postmodern and post-structuralist feminist resources. By drawing upon feminist ethics to explore the events surrounding the sex discrimination of a female subject, Maria, we have chosen an ethical framework that might appear to offer us as CMS academics the promise of a compelling basis upon which to evaluate research subject’s agency.

As we explore in our Conclusion however, ultimately our analysis in the paper provides little secure ethical foundation for such a critique. Rather it raises some disquieting implications for how we understand ethics in organisations and in academic research. First, the idea of an organisational member’s sincere engagement with ethics acting as some kind of ‘critical’ defence against what we argue to be deeply problematic local behaviour in organizations is profoundly questioned. Second, our analysis seems to destabilise further the ability of Critical Management Studies research to authorize its ethical critique of other’s agency. Thus the ‘critical’ of Critical Management Studies is apparently collapsed into the ‘local’ subjective ethics of the author. Though, we argue, this does not thereby end the potential for critical scholars to critique it does have implications for the status of the critical in CMS that the field has yet to convincingly engage with.
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Footnotes

(i) The full version of this paper has recently been published as Collins and [Author] (2005) ‘Discriminating Ethics’ *Human Relations* 58(6): 799-824.

(ii) Jonathan, Kay, Lawrence, and Maria are all pseudonyms.
I live at the edge of the universe,
like everybody else. Sometimes I think
congratulations are in order...
- Bill Manhire, from The Milky Way

Living in Aotearoa/New Zealand A/NZ we are more conscious than many of our
‘international’ colleagues of living at the edge of the universe, but, of course, as Bill
Manhire points out, we all do. I am interested in ‘localising’ all knowledges, not just
‘our’ local ones. But of course we have local issues. Manhire’s poem invokes a sense
that identity and locality is a kind of ‘problem’. This sense still haunts any accounts of
the ‘national’ in Aotearoa/New Zealand, certainly for those of us who are not Māori.
I think this is quite a different problem from the one proposed by those contemporary
theorists who want to say that the ‘nation’ is now dead; it all depends on what ‘nation’
you are talking about, and who is talking. In fact a recent resurgence of nationalism
and even a new patriotism are characteristic of A/NZ in recent years, re-working the
classic ‘kiwi ingenuity’ and ‘on the edge’ themes.

From this ‘edge’ position I see three key concerns for ‘Critical Management Studies’
in Aotearoa/New Zealand:

- The possibility of a distinct and sceptical view of ‘Critical Management
  Studies’ as a discourse located in certain northern hemisphere settings
- The need for a critical genealogy of management studies in A/NZ
- The question of engaging with the ‘local’ with ‘practitioners’ in A/NZ.

I will take each of these in turn.

A distinct and sceptical view of ‘Critical Management Studies’

Critical Management Studies (CMS) is a discursive formation which has originated
in and, is ruled from, the UK and, to a lesser extent, the USA. This discourse may
occasionally be decorated by references to postcolonial critique, and even by the
occasional example of such work, but, as Anshuman Prasad has argued (2003), these
token appearances have barely grazed its surface. In this sense CMS differs only
slightly from the whole range of academic practices - degrees, publishing, ranking,
conferences, and so on - where for New Zealand academics the ‘local’ must mean the
provincial (and therefore the less valuable or prestigious), and the ‘local’ journals and
other practices of the large northern metropolitan centres are taken to be
‘international’ (and therefore the more valuable or prestigious). These practices have
an endless myriad of effects, not least of which is the tendency to downplay the local
as a topic of research and publication, unless its localness can be either discreetly
minimised or played up as exotically marginal to the ‘centre’. More generally among
the practices of CMS, there is an ignorance of difference within: while the literature does include some papers referencing feminism and race, for instance, they are not core to CMS and to the western philosophical canon that is its basis (and, more widely still, the basis for contemporary organisational theory. The continued re-reading and rewriting of this philosophical tradition into CMS has the effect of reinforcing the western canon over and over. There is little consideration of the implications of this repeated move, or of going ‘outside’ this canon to marginalised knowledges as sources of inspiration for CMS. There is little reflexivity, and minimal attention to ‘who’ are the writers dominating CMS, their embodied differences, their professional practices, their locations within new forms of globalisation, and most importantly, the power/knowledge relations that are being re-produced. To me, these absences run against the grain of the various aspirations of Critical Management Studies to challenge injustice and to ‘generate radical alternatives’ (CMIG, 2004). While what CMS is/should be continues to be debated (e.g., Fournier and Grey, 2001), I do not in these debates see call for attention to difference within CMS, including issues of location, and the related issues of who/what is excluded from ‘CMS’ as it currently operates.

A critical genealogy of management studies in/for Aotearoa/New Zealand

I am most fortunate to have feminism as central to my own discursive autobiography, or intellectual/political genealogy. Feminist theory teaches the analysis of difference within seemingly ‘neutral’ philosophical premises, and a profound scepticism for the western philosophical tradition. At the same time, feminists have confronted their own difference within—in Aotearoa/New Zealand, most profoundly through the encounter between Māori and Pākehā women. This experience, combined with post-structuralist challenges to ‘universal’ narratives of truth and justice, engenders a political reflexivity which examines one’s own discursive positioning as well as those of others. In critical terms, autocritique is a central aspect of critique. I would like to see this autocritique applied to/as part of CMS, along with the critique of ‘management’ and organisation. Foucault has introduced genealogy as a tool of critique (and by extension, autocritique). Genealogical inquiry for us would inquire: How do we get to have the kinds of accounts of ‘management’ and organisation that we have in A/NZ right now? This question could include a look at our connections to CMS as a global formation, as well as looking at mainstream management theory and its locations and histories. Do we have the management and organisational theory we want? Where does it come from? Whose purposes does it serve?

This kind of inquiry about identity and location has been going on for a long time in the New Zealand humanities, as well as in our arts and popular culture. In the world of New Zealand literature it would now be considered very strange to argue that a writer based in New Zealand could never write a globally important book, or a book that is considered ‘as good as’ books produced elsewhere. Yet in academic life the ‘colonial cringe’ lives on, and it is still considered normal to assume that ‘international’ (i.e. NATO) knowledges, bodies and texts rule.

Engaging with the ‘local’ with ‘practitioners’ in Aotearoa/New Zealand

It seems a no-brainer that any research and teaching in A/NZ should engage first with local practice. The dominant tendency of CMS in the UK has been the critique of management from ‘outside’ (often a disembodied and dis-located ‘outside’). In A/NZ
the critique of management and of business more broadly has not been carried out most prominently by management academics but by academics in areas such as law - Jane Kelsey - (2002), and by independent writers and researchers such as Bruce Jesson (1999) and Nicky Hager (2002). This kind of critique could be part of a local CMS agenda – at least, our work should be fed by it.

The other key area for local engagement is direct relationship with practitioners – ‘alongside’ or even ‘within’ rather than ‘from outside’. Some writers have identified an absence of such an engagement with the performative as a key gap in CMS (Fournier and Grey, 2001). A counter to this tendency is the work of feminists whose research is explicitly in support of certain groups of research participants – e.g., in this country, Māori and Pacific Island entrepreneurs (Pringle, this conference) or feminist and Māori activists within organisations (my own work). Similarly the emerging work of Māori scholars (e.g., Panaho, Pihema, and Riuwhiu and Wolfgamm, this conference) engages with Māori workers and organisations. Such Māori scholarship is an inspiration – providing not only local ‘content’ but local theoretical frameworks, and confidently addressing the global from a strong place to stand in the local. Rather than problematising an engagement with the global, a commitment to the local provides the ground which makes it possible.

It's a case
of working out what's here
for the long haul
and if we want to be part of it.
It's marvellous, abominable, confusing,
exultant: the way things are,
the way it is.
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The Establishment and Growth of Kaupapa Māori as a form of Critical Management Study in Aotearoa

He aha Kaupapa Māori?
What is kaupapa Māori?

He aha te mea nui o te Ao?
What it the most important thing in this world?
He tangata, he tangata, he tangata
It is the people, it is the people, it is the people

“In essence this whakatauki explains Kaupapa Māori “
(Pihama et al 2002)

J Panoho
Department of Management
Massey University, Papaioea
jpanoho@massey.ac.nz

This paper attempts to trace the development and nature of the ‘Māori voice’ in Western institutions over time. Attempts to connect early political governance and contemporary scholarly activity are made. I begin with a description of the changing landscape of Māori leadership during early colonisation, outlining subsequent 20th century political representations. I then describe the development of the Māori academic voice proposing that the Kaupapa Māori discourse, a significant Māori voice of today, speaks from an indigenist position, a position arrived at with the assistance of the tools of critical theory.

The leadership vacuum
It is widely acknowledged that the European arrival in New Zealand generated the founding violence (Veracini 2003) experienced by other colonised peoples. Christianity, disease, muskets, and land alienation collectively led to unprecedented population decline. As a result Māori socio-political structure, in particular, the leadership of the chief irrevocably changed; mana amongst rangitira was irretrievably lost. The self regulating leadership triad – the Rangatira, the Tohunga, and the Kaumātua was extinguished. Leadership attributes of the Kaumātua and Kuia were elevated and universalised (Winiata 1967) intensifying their role whilst also isolating them in their leadership tasks. Within this chasm, amidst this crisis arose a number of charismatic leaders in the Weberian sense. Te Whiti and the Hauhau, Tamihana and the Kingi movement, Te Kooti and the Ringatu were all charismatic ‘protest leaders’ (Winiata 1967 57) during what was noted as a ‘time of turbulence’ (King 2003 211), the New Zealand wars. At this time the Māori population declined to such a level that Māori culture was threatened with extinction (King 2003, Winiata, 1967)

Fortunately, by the early 20th century, Māori population was stable and recovering with intermarriage amongst Pakeha increasing. These children of mixed marriage, cultural hybrids (Bhabha 1994), consequentially had access to higher education and were emerging as a new breed of leader. They became national leaders; they were recognised and celebrated as such by Māori and Pakeha alike. Men such as James Carroll, Apirana Ngata, and Maui Pomare, were known as the ‘Aristocrats of
Knowledge’ (Winiata 1967) or simply, ‘the educated Māori’ (Walker 1993). These ‘new leaders’ became parliamentarians and were able to politicise “Māoritanga” by simply placing themselves in that Western arena. The term, used initially by Sir James Carroll in 1920 was later defined by Sir Apirana Ngata as the “inculcation of pride in Māori history and traditions, the retention as far as possible of old time ceremonial, the continuous attempt to interpret the Māori point of view to the Pakeha in power” (Walker 1974 45, cited Pihama, Cram et al. 2002 31). These men were able to give voice to the colonised:

Their scarcity value as Māori academics, their break into fields previously reserved to Europeans, gave them status among both Māori and European. And their intellectual training, combined with personal experience of the processes of Māori-European interaction, gave them insights which were necessary to guide the Māori people. (Winiata 1967, 149)

Carroll and Ngata’s term Māoritanga, whilst contentious, persisted for decades as a more or less agreed upon term to mean ‘the Māori way’. The Māori way however does not sit well with the more essentialist approaches amongst Māori. The word Māori, originating in a Pakeha encounter was ‘colonised’ by Pakeha to mean the collective indigenous people of New Zealand. The notion of one people, a homogenous group, known as ‘Māori’ was generated by Pakeha. Prior to European contact whanau and hapu organisation dominated, with ‘iwi’ as a concept, an ideological and spiritual connection to an eponymous ancestor. The notion of ‘iwi’ was realised only in times of conquest and challenge. The colonial pressures and administration led to iwi being reconstituted as an ever present and dominating identity (Ballara 1998). Today, this leads to the neo-colonial creation of iwi authorities redefined with Western governance mechanisms as sites for resource allocation (Panoho and Stablein 2005). The descriptive term ‘Māori’ then is entrenched in colonial and indeed postcolonial discursive practices.

Contention aside, the crucial discourse of Māoritanga was adopted by the Department of Education and expanded to include, Tikanga Māori (tika – right), Taha Māori (taha – side) and Kaupapa Māori during the 1980’s. The education field, in particular the Auckland University Education department, proved to be fertile ground. It was to become the birthplace of the Kaupapa Māori Research constructs. The critical pedagogical work of Paulo Freire appears to have been catalytic for the then few Māori scholars in education at Auckland. The term Kaupapa Māori, superseding others, has become established internationally across multiple disciplines as both an epistemological and a methodological approach.

Unlike ‘Māori’, the term Kaupapa retains its indigenist meanings even when projected into contemporary understandings and exists independently of its more modern scholarly adaptation. In a more relaxed usage organisations are assumed to have their own kaupapa or agenda or strategy. In the formal sense, the term has been attributed to the old knowledge of spiritualism and traditionalism, emerging from ‘old knowledge’ (Sharples, cited Pihama et al 2002 32). Kaupapa Māori in a research context has become a specialised and meaningful term that has been drawn into scholarly circles.
Education and Freire

Freire, a 1921 Brazilian born Philosopher in Education focused his work on the education of illiterate peasants, developing a methodology for teaching literacy described as a ‘new unity of theory and praxis’ (Shaull 1972 11). Freire, himself politically oppressed and exiled to Chile in 1964, believed that the ‘delivery’ of education was “an exercise of domination …… with the ideological intent of indoctrinating them [the oppressed] to adapt to the world of [their] oppression” (Freire 1972 52).

Freire was heavily influenced by a mix of the early critical theorists; Marx, Fromm, Marcuse and de Beauvoir; some postcolonial philosophic influences – Fanon and Memmi, and the political activist Che Guevara. It is no surprise then that his critique was radical, his address emancipatory and his methodology one of praxis. He concluded that education was a powerful tool of oppression, a tool that dehumanised the recipients. Observing that education was delivered in a way that resembled placing a deposit (of knowledge) in a bank (a passive student), he proposed that instead education should take the form of ‘problem posing’ with interactional dialogue with acts of cognition as an outcome:

The teacher is no longer merely the-one-who-teaches, but one who is himself [sic] taught in dialogue with the students, who in their turn while being taught also teach. They become jointly responsible for a process in which all grow. In this process, arguments based on ‘authority’ are no longer valid; in order to function authority must be on the side of freedom, not against it. (Freire 1972 63)

These principles sit well with, and are arguably parallel to the same central idea utilized in Kaupapa Māori praxis. The Freirian emancipatory notion of becoming fully human through reformed education praxis also embodies Kaupapa Māori education principles. The Kōhanga Reo and the Kura Kaupapa philosophies and practices reflect Freirian principles:

The struggle by Māori for control over how Māori children and young people are educated has led to the establishment of Kaupapa Māori education initiatives across all educational levels….The term kaupapa Māori captures Māori desires to affirm Māori cultural philosophies and practices. In short, Kaupapa Māori is about being ‘fully’ Māori. (Pihama et al, 2002 30)

Of additional note is the considerable contribution feminism has made to the Kaupapa Māori discourse although seemingly limited to those that are post-positivist and indigenist (Smith 1999). The challenge issued to positivist methodology from feminist theory and critical theory, the creation of Māori-led and controlled education (Kōhanga Reo), and the establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal collectively propelled the notion of Māori-led and Māori-determined research forward (Smith 1999).

Kaupapa Māori Scholarship

As noted it was amongst scholars at the Education Department at Auckland University that the term was first discussed and adopted. While there were many earlier scholars doing masters research at Auckland included, probably the most noted are the Smiths, Linda and Graham.
In 1988 the department, as a commitment to address the serious shortfalls in Western education for Māori, established the Research Unit for Māori Education. The unit was staffed by two part time academics, Graham and Linda Tuhiwai Smith. By 1996 this unit had transformed into an International Research Institute for Māori and Indigenous Education (Smith 1999). By 1997 Graham Smith had completed his doctoral thesis, The Development of Kaupapa Māori: Theory and praxis, and in 1999 Linda Smith published her powerful text, Decolonising Methodologies. Both were pivotal publications.

Kaupapa Māori praxis amongst Māori educationalists has become accepted and has spread rapidly, the researched Māori have now become the researchers (Smith 2005). Māori Education academics have progressed through into masters and doctoral studies and have formed a small yet powerful and close community. This rapid growth, acceptance and cohesion amongst scholars can be readily confirmed. A 2002 literature review of Kaupapa Māori Research published in a Canadian Education Journal revealed that most of the work reviewed was published during the 1990’s by Auckland scholars. Furthermore, of the thirty-seven 37 references noted, 20 were from masters thesis, and 3 from PhD dissertations (2 of which were previous Masters Thesis). In addition, work by Walker, Awatere, Bishop & Glynn, and Freire were prominent in this review.

Is Kaupapa Māori Research essentialist?

There is no doubt the discourse has essentialist features and that elements of socio-political resistance within the paradigm place boundaries around the ‘Western’ scholar. There is every reason to be protective and cautious about the (on-going) Western representation of the ‘Māori’. One need only to open ones eyes to the institutional tragedy and misery endured by generations of whanau through education, housing and health to conclude that the West has not yet heard the Māori voice. Smith articulates some of this frustration and pain in the following way:

> Our colonial experience traps us in the project of modernity. There can be no ‘postmodern’ for us until we have settled some business of the modern. ….we are still being colonised (and know it) and we are still searching for justice.

(1999 34)

However, despite the frequent rejection of the West there are encouraging signs that there will be more examination of other critical perspectives by Māori as post-colonial Māori voices become heard.

Smith and Bishop (2005) continue to broaden their Kaupapa Māori understandings and speak to even wider audiences, each contributing a chapter to the key handbook on qualitative research. These publications signal possibilities for the extension of the Kaupapa Māori research methodologies into more mainstream social sciences such as management.
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Deploying renditions as modes for indigenous critique: Why indigenous communities must kidnap and torture the language, theory and practices of critical management studies to renew ideas of organisation, identity and locality

Wayne Pihema

Paper for Organization, Identity and Locality (II)

We have a go situation…

It’s obvious. The critiques launched by nomadic bands of critical management studies (CMS) scholars to counter the increasingly ‘perfect and severe’ forms of social striation within New Zealand are imploding politely, but impotently against the hardened thighs of late-capitalism in its’ unrelenting march against indigenous communities and the whole of society.

The contemporary practice by the United States’ Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) of ‘extra-ordinary’ renditions (the kidnapping and often torture of terrorism suspects who are citizens of other nations) offers indigenous communities a means for articulating their own critiques.

The key issue is to reset the language, theory and practices of CMS to work in a way that directly engages the problematics of indigenous communities while no longer constrained by the limits of their critiques within CMS. This will mean torture through the ‘twisting’ distorting and creating of abnormal turns within the CMS’s language, theory and practices. But it must be done to save our freedom.

Without consideration for questions of philosophical ontology or epistemological/theoretical commensurability indigenous communities need to ‘kidnap’ that is take by force if not strategy the language, theory and practices of CMS out of the CMS milieu and without clear permissibility to do so enclose them within an indigenous communal problematic. Contesting the power of late-capitalism (acting through the global corporate nexus of the industrial complex) to shape indigenous meanings of identity and locality here within New Zealand is one such problematic that easily comes to mind.

Some may be familiar with Audre Lorde’s emblematic phrase:

‘The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House’

Indigenous philosophical positions and epistemologies are more often then not incommensurable with colonial philosophical positions, epistemologies and the practices they underpin. It is not only paradigmatically incommensurable but more importantly, indigenously uncool to not have your own techniques and strategies, your
own brand of voodoo-shit - to point at de Massa’s house and his tools (the discourses and practices of subordination).

Yet there another phrase I prefer for the possibilities I argue it offers to counter late-capitalism through a radicalizing of critical management studies language, theories and practices.

‘If your house burns down warm your hands by its’ flames.’

The paradoxical response to what would be a shattering event is nested within a pragmatism toughened by the unending series of refusals and compromises. However lets increase the phrase’s power to dissemble by including these more provocative conditions and possibilities and relate them to the ‘master’s tools, house, sausages and beer. So the phrase is radicalized as so:

‘If his house burns down (from his matches - that you took and used), then warm yourself by its’ flames (as you cook the sausages and drink the beer you took from his fridge).’

That radicalizing gestures clearly states my intention to use and reconfigure ‘by all means possible’ the language, theories and practices of critical management studies, in this case through a certain kind of torture and kidnapping.

Most disappointing has been the inability of the education sector to protect itself through dialogue, sustained critique and finally protest action. Yet no civil enclosure or institution remains unscathed, or fundamentally unchallenged. Within the tertiary education sector small nomadic bands of academics continue to wage their own critiques against late-capitalism that must be compromised to some degree, by the broader political topography that their institutions must find their way within - a route that is put under increasing surveillance and control. Increasingly instrumental means of control such as the PBRF’s central position in job evaluation and promotion creates and maintains a need to publish work that is broadly acceptable to the academy. As institutions and the journals they publish become more conservative to resist controversy the lure of political quietism grows.

Yet my task is not to dwell on the invidious position critical academics find themselves in but rather to discuss the implications for indigenous communities who might have been sheltered by the critiques raised against late-capitalism.

Late-capitalism is well-organized and well-resourced. Its’ logic is wide-spread and accepted as canon within business and management schools (which is part of the problem of accepting the broad premises of management and business school thinking).

Rightly so there has been violent disagreement recently against those cannons and also the instrumentality inherent within the business and management schools own management practices and the philosophical/theoretical positions that under pins them.
Indigenous communities must now find alternate modes for raising their own forms of critiques. If those who offer the critiques within the business and management schools are themselves unable to mount any serious and sustained defence of their own conditions within their own sector, perhaps it’s time to look for strategies of intervention in darker more explosive settings.

We must take the CMS critiques hybridized and radicalized within the theories, languages and practices of the indigenous problematic to use them as a battering ram to derail late-capitalism’s project of subordinating indigenous identity and localities within the striated space of a society increasingly disciplined and controlled.

In response many of the country’s white middle-class find themselves scrambling to reassert ideas of their identity and what this locality means to them through political ideologies and material objects whose conspicuous consumption entails socio-cultural practices that seek to maintain and reify a ‘culture’ no longer to be found within a New Zealand awakened but largely unreconciled to its Asiatic future.

The economic long-boom of the 1950s-70s that raised many from their working class origins into the middle class is largely forgotten except over a few jugs in the now smokeless RSA’s and suburban bowling clubs.

Trust me. I know what I’m talking about. Maori drawn from rural communities to the cities in the 1950’s and 1960’s were unprepared for the sudden and massive structural reforms of the 1980s. During the 1970’s Maori sought markers of identity and socio-cultural meaning to clearly stake out their immutable connection with this place in response the growing frustration over loss of land resources, cultural identity and an inability to be received as ‘Maori’ within the broader civil enclosures and institutions of society.

From the nostalgic yearnings for rural childhoods - to the reconstruction of the mythic narratives of creation Maori asserted through modern media/techniques such as literature, songs, film, public and private dialogues, protest action and organized their own narrative of who they were and what was the place. The wearing of specific forms of dress and cultural artifacts also became materially emblematic of a metaphysical need to express, maintain and enhance Maori identity and locality. When I see state houses not only as the exhibition material not only at the Dowse Gallery in Lower Hutt, but also at Sergeants Gallery in Wanganui and on an increasing number of white middle class pedestrians I think: ‘Hell, we used to be shamed we lived in one!’

This and a thousand other traces tells me that white middle-class New Zealanders are now confronting something Maori communities had to deal with 25 years ago. Labour was too easily forgiven for that betrayal. They did not wreak as much havoc in the white middle-class compared to the ‘blended’ working class (which Labour had already deserted), but now it’s different.

The contemporary right-wing politics and politicians of Labour, National, Act and New Zealand First are all broadly interchangeable in terms of not only their central policy objective – to install the ideologies and practices of late-capitalism within all
aspects of life within New Zealand - but also in terms of their faces and bodies. They have become not only written into the politics of this locality and its identity but they have been inscribed by it to such a degree that translation of their facial characteristics as a form of specificity is no longer possible.

This is why they have become not only indifferent to penetrating the complex and self-replicating miasma that separates the white middle-class from their own social, cultural and political aspirations within this country – but more than that - politicians have simply become part of the miasma. They take direct part in capturing and redirecting the flow of our life-blood, of our toil through an ever increasing range of levies and taxes on our economic, spatial and temporal being.

Yet they are also clearly implicated because it is not that they merely fail to confront the global corporate nexus of the industrial complex that drives late-capitalism, but they welcome it openly and all its fettered minions into this country.

The industrial complex and political work together Not as openly as in 1984, more much more insidiously. So we must work more yet are paid less. We have less privacy at work and home, and less time to be our selves within this place whether its work or home. Everything and everywhere becomes merged into a social space smoothed by the capitalist logic of the factory – we now work at home, take the kids to work, maintain social relations through and at work – work and the social intertwine.

The key civil enclosures and institutions within New Zealand become ethereal and are increasingly removed from spatial localities within society to virtual modes within electronic-networks transforming embodied relations into a pure event of hyper-bureaucracy. We have embodied contact with civil institutions almost only during the deployment of techniques of control, police become increasingly mobile, and like inland revenue officials are able to reach out for you – but unable to be reached by you. These are the catastrophic consequences of that ignoble betrayal by Labour following their 1984 elections. That unrelenting march by late-capitalism has forced all civil enclosures and institutions such as home, the church, the family, factories and schools to re-orientate themselves to the logic of late-capitalism and the practices it requires. It is time to act. Now!
Dancing with the stars: notes on constructing a critical management studies locale in Aotearoa/New Zealand
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Abstract

Like most social science researchers working in Aotearoa/New Zealand and other non-metropolitan sites, Management researchers face a choice as to the kind of response and relations they develop with the core of our field located, in the main, in the metropolitan centres of the United States and the United Kingdom. In this paper we use points from our own work on music in organizations to identify three possible responses that researchers take up: ‘franchise’, ‘margin’ and ‘locale’. We suggest that developing a critical management studies locale in this place involves challenging both ‘franchise’ and ‘margin’ approaches and developing a position that works with local empirical and theoretical materials and issues, and challenges and re-appropriates, in distinctive ways, imported theoretical/conceptual machineries.

Introduction

As compared with management researchers working in the United States of America or the United Kingdom, management researchers working in Aotearoa/New Zealand confront an extra challenge as a consequence of their location: what relation to develop with the ‘centre’ of their discipline which for the most part is located ‘elsewhere’. As to the kind of relations involved, we might identify three different kinds of responses. Firstly there is the ‘franchise’ response. This involves importing and applying as precisely as possible the research questions, methods and frameworks developed elsewhere. In some opposition to this importation/replication relation we would identify the ‘move to the marginal’ response. Here researchers seek out and develop unorthodox, non-mainstream and possibly marginal problems and resources in part as a response to their marginal location. A third response, involves turning our location into a locale (Fiske, 1993; Prichard and Willmott, 1997; Prichard, 2000). Developing a locale does not involve ignoring or dismissing the ‘centre’s’ theoretical machinery but involves challenging and appropriating this as part of a response to the empirical and theoretical materials found or experienced in this location. Developing a ‘locale’ also involves speaking ‘back’ to the dominant theoretical and conceptual machineries of the ‘metropolitan centres’.

Below we identify some of the dynamics of centre-periphery relations in the research game as it is being elaborated locally and globally. Then using points from our own work that explores music in organizations, we discuss how it elaborates each mode, and how we are looking to strengthen the possibility of doing ‘distinctive/extraordinary’ work that is both of this place and talks ‘back’ to a theoretical canon that originates in the situations and subjects of ‘those places’ namely the UK and the USA. Our hope is that by discussing our work within the context of the changing nature of the research ‘game’ as it is developing in this place,
(e.g. Performance Based Research Fund), we can promote discussion about the development of a more coherent critical management research ‘locale’ in this place.

**The Challenges of Our Location**

National and institutional research audit processes, such as New Zealand’s Performance Based Research Fund (PBRF) place a premium on ‘world class’ or ‘internationally competitive’ research (see Figure 1). In the introduction to the 2003 PBRF results the higher education funding body, the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC), reported that it ‘makes no apologies for establishing a high benchmark for the achievement of world-class standing and for requiring the 12 peer review panels to apply the agreed assessment framework in a rigorous and consistent manner. A relentless focus on verifiable quality is essential if the tertiary education sector is to achieve and sustain internationally competitive levels of research excellence. (2003:85)’

![Figure 1 Research Categories](image)

1. “A” signifies research of a world-class standard
2. “B” signifies very good quality research
3. “C” signifies good quality research
4. “R” signifies that the Evidence Portfolio did not meet the requirements for a “C”.

(TEC, 2003: 6, ‘Overview and Key findings’)

Recently a briefing to the new Ministry of Education (released to the public) (2005) provided a short discussion of OECD figures on how New Zealand research ranks alongside other nations. The Ministry noted that New Zealand ranked second of 22 countries included in the scale in terms of research outputs per million dollars invested (two-thirds of outputs come from universities). New Zealand researchers ranked tenth (10), or just above the median, in terms of the number of outputs produced per person. It also noted, without comment, that New Zealand researchers ranked twentieth (20th) of 22 in terms of the citations of their work (2005:69 my emphasis). These rankings suggest an anomaly. Average level of productivity, one might assume, might result in, as ranked against other nations, average levels of recognition or citation. Sadly this is not the case. Recognition does not follow productivity or investment. How might we explain this? If we assume that citation is a reasonable indicator of contribution to a field of research then perhaps the work is poorly done, is poorly recognised or diverges, or is distinctive, from whatever it is that

---

2 As many are aware the audit processes for which New Zealand Tertiary Education Commission ‘makes no apology’ involved the evaluation of a research portfolio from more than 8000 New Zealand academics in 2004. Working in secret and without the possibility of review or feedback to those submitting their portfolios each of 12 subject panels assigned individuals a ‘quality category’ (A, B, C, R) based on (but not determined by) a numerical formula. Here features of the submitted portfolio were assigned numerical values with the sum of these located on a scale where ranges of scores were assigned the characters ‘A’, ‘B’, ‘C’ and ‘R’. Each of these categories was then further identified as signifying a particular kind of research with the letter (see figure 1). An ‘A’ category was identified as ‘world class’ or ‘internationally competitive’ research activity. The secrecy of the panel deliberations, the lack of any review or possible challenge together with the numerical method aim to assure those involved that the ascription of a quality category is objective measure unsullied personal, political, disciplinary or institutional differences and dynamics. Just 5 percent of the 8013 submissions to the PBRF were rated ‘A’ – that is world class (figure 1).
we take to be 'international' research. All three explanations are possible. We do not discount the first at all, but will focus on the latter two more directly here. In other words, explanation for this divergence not related to resourcing or productivity, but in location-related factors.

Recent scholarship that explores the character of international research practice highlights the centrality and dominance of the United States and Britain in the construction of 'international research' (Paasi, 2005; Uskiken and Passadeos, 1995; Westwood and Clegg, 2003). This is not simply due to the sheer numerical concentration of researchers in these locations but more importantly to the concentration of publishing outlets (particularly journals), learned societies, and more recently citation technologies in these locations all controlled by the local inhabitants (Paasi, 2005). The effect here is that social science research undertaken by the 'locals' and published by 'local' journals in the US and the UK particularly (and particular locations within each of these places) amounts to 'NATO’ 'headquarters' has become institutionalized as 'international' research.

In management and organization studies the dominance and centrality of 'North Atlantic theories of Organization' (NATO) in defining and reproducing the field (through its journals, conferences and societies) is well-known (Clegg et al, 2000; Westwood and Clegg, 2003; March and Sullivan, 2005; Prichard et al, 2004; Prichard, 2005; Usdiken and Pasadeos, 1995). The upshot of this is that location — particularly the distance and difference from the networks of researchers, key institutions and the associations that amount to the ‘core’ of the field — has a strong bearing on the character and recognition of the work done (even when productivity or resourcing is average or above average). Researchers located at the core of the discipline or field find that what is recognized as ‘world-class’ or ‘internationally-competitive’ is, largely, directed and organized by their own local research communities. In other words researchers located 'here' confront a problematic that their colleagues at ‘NATO HQ’ can ignore: how to engage in research whose content, method, and format is at a distance and to varying degrees distinct from the particular location in which they find themselves. Of course there are dynamics that reduce these divergences, including the dispersal of US and UK researchers to peripheral locations, the training of researchers in metropolitan locations, international collaboration, and conference and study leave. While we acknowledge these, and engage actively in these ourselves, we recognise that these elements do not, in and of themselves, lead to 'international recognition'. What is required is something else which we identify as a response to the 'centre-periphery'. In our view there are at least three kinds of responses to this problematic.

Perhaps the most widespread response to centre-periphery relations of a particular field is imitation or mimesis. This might be called the ‘franchise’ response. Work done ‘there’ is repeated ‘here’ in similar or refined form. Under this arrangement institutions and frameworks are imported that attempt as far as possible to reproduce the conditions, approaches and frameworks of the ‘centre’ in peripheral locations. Such work requires high levels of international mutuality, engagement, support and interconnectivity. Establishing the same epistemological traditions, conceptual models and theoretical stances in a new location is problematic. Particular economic, social, political and historical contexts often furnish implicit nuances that shaped those traditions and constrain their reproduction elsewhere. At the same time our peripheral location has its own particular conditions and dynamics that are unlikely to make it receptive to importation. The ‘franchise’ may simply not make sense in a different location. Local empirical conditions and resources might enliven certain features. But they might disable others in ways that lead to weak or poor recognition by metropolitan researchers. For example the population and size of institutions in
New Zealand make institutional governance research problematic and potentially weakens the relevance of the findings based on the sample from this location.

An alternative to the ‘franchise’ approach is the *divergence and marginality response*. We might call this the ‘margin’ response. Such work seeks out marginal research traditions whose very character, motifs and sensibilities speak to one’s context and allow a level of non-compliance with the field’s core traditions. In a sense marginal positions are proxies for questioning of the ‘franchise’ (importation/reproduction) response without raising the indifference, domination, subordination, subjection and exploitation that are part of these relations. The pursuit of the margin signifies difference, divergence, diversity without resistance or challenge. More positively the pursuit of the ‘margin’ allows context specific research activity, celebration of the local, and disengagement from what is taken to be the ‘orthodoxy’ of metropolitan agendas. Of course ‘marginality’ is unlikely to be recognized or identified as internationally competitive or ‘world-class’. Such a response we would suggest explains the relative strength of critical management studies in non-US locations such as New Zealand and Australia.

A third route, and the one we seek to propose as the necessary next step for critical management studies scholars in New Zealand and other non-metropolitan locations neither makes a virtue of marginality nor seeks to replicate the work underway in metropolitan centres (or provide empirical produce for the metropolitan theoretical ‘chefs’). Our ‘third route’ meanwhile attempts to create a locale from the empirical concerns and experiences of the location, and to challenge and possibly appropriate for different purposes, imported theoretical and conceptual machineries. Creating a ‘locale’ involves responding to the colonial and neo-colonial aspects of academic knowledge production and speaking ‘back’ to NATO. The creation of a ‘locale’ recognizes that one cannot do without the ‘centre’, but neither should one emulate it or assume or manufacture marginality as a response to it. What’s involved is appropriating and changing and ideas, concepts and voices that speak to the centre.

Of course Critical Management Studies is a metropolitan creation (Fournier and Grey, 2001). Its key protagonists are located on both sides of the Atlantic and its key conferences and events are held in the UK and as part of the US Academy of Management. And yet as various commentators note, CMS has always been more of a political movement than a theoretical or empirical project (Tinker, 2002; Rowlinson and Hassard, 2000; Zald, 2003). It key feature is the attempt to bring discussion of issues of domination, discrimination and exploitation to the analysis and engagement with management knowledge and practice. In recent times it has also begun to explore problematics related to the global distribution of resources, forms of knowledge and post-colonial themes. As such then, CMS is not attempting to build a theoretical apparatus or position. Rather, CMS is more a position from which to engage with a set of issues that include relations of power and distribution of resources – including intellectual resources and the power relations embedded in academic research. CMS as a label is simply a point of convergence that provides a means by which management researchers located ‘here’ could begin with local issues and concerns and critically appropriate and challenge the theoretical and conceptual machinery of metropolitan centres. Furthermore, given the critical eclecticism at the heart of the CMS project, we would suggest that it is no coincidence that researchers located in marginal geographical positions find it a useful ‘label’ around which to organize and develop their research locale. For us the inspiration for such a position begins in the embodied and intrinsically localized practice of listening to music in a place, and performing music as an expression of community solidarity. In the remainder of this paper we explore how our own work expresses the various positions noted above.
Constituting the locale: start with the local, start with oneself

In 2003 Craig Prichard, Janet Sayers and Ralph Bathurst, all of Massey University pitched for a small amount of internal research funding for three projects that all address music in workplaces and organizations. The broad research question is: how does musical consumption and/or performance help to organize work and the management of that work. The research involved three case studies of: a refugee community that supported a music group, a factory where managers had banned the use of personal music machines after more than 20 years of supporting their use, and an investigation of music in commercial exercise regimes (group fitness sessions, aerobics or jazzercise).

As some of our colleagues have noted, music is not a central topic of organizational analysis. Of course the music industry is a relatively frequent empirical site for research work in management and organization studies, but the study of music itself and its relation to work and organizing is a marginal endeavour (see Albert and Bell, 2002; Prichard, Korczynski and Elmes, forthcoming). By taking up this topic we can be seen to be adopting a ‘margin’ response (as discussed above). At the same time this response is also an attempt to begin the conditions and experiences in which we are personally located into our professional work. Music is not just a topic. It speaks to each of us intimately in different ways. Each of us in different ways has an embodied, aesthetic and emotional relationship with music (and dance). In this sense the music at work project is not simply a move to the margin, but a means of bring what is local and meaningful for us in our everyday lives into our work. In what follows we discuss each of the three projects in more details in relation to the response framework outlined above.

Janet Sayers
My research project in the music@work research group has been on the work of group fitness instructors working with music. We have conducted 12 interviews (with

---

3 As often happens with New Zealanders, Craig and Janet, who work in different locations, had met each other on a bus between the destinations of Critical Management Studies Conference in Lancaster and the SCOS Conference in Cambridge in 2003 — needless to say, both held in the UK. In discussing research interests Janet mentioned to Craig Ralph’s PhD research into organizational aesthetics and orchestras, and as Craig had just convened a stream at the CMS conference on music at work, Craig contacted Ralph on his return to NZ, and the group was formed.

4 Ralph’s theoretical proclivities and his background have led him on a PhD journey through musical philosophy and aesthetics, with a side-trip through the music@work group into researching how refugees in New Zealand use their musical cultural capital to gain economic and social footage into New Zealand society. His orientations are primarily philosophical, ontological and aesthetic, and his international conferences and networks are in Arts Management and in the relatively new Art of Management conferences. Janet is interested in the interface between popular culture and management and organization, especially as it relates to service experiences. Standing unsteadily between traditional labour process interests, and cultural studies, she attends CMS events but is more drawn towards the SCOS group, because of their interest in symbolism and openness to ‘wayward’ ideas. Craig Prichard academic education is found in critical organizational analysis and higher education research. Since returning to New Zealand in 1998 he has also developed a strong interest in the problematic of location as a signifier of academic and professional work.

5 Ralph is an ex-orchestral viola player and music teacher, Craig spent the last five years playing guitar and singing in a Celtic band and Janet (while declaring she has no musical talent whatsoever) takes embodied interest in dance and musical consumption.
the help of a research assistant and a colleague) with group fitness instructors and
have been doing participant observation work also, which basically means we have
been attending group fitness workouts. We have collected secondary materials: organizational material such as training and marketing material and speeches. In addition we conducted a large survey of in the fitness industry which aimed to replicate a study on aesthetic labour conducted by a team based at Strathclyde University (reported in Nickson et al., 2000; Nickson et al., 2001), a relationship that developed because of a visit to the UK in 2003. I have now written a stream of conference papers attempting to position the work in ways that might fit into NATO theoretical frameworks. My first attempt at writing on this subject was presented at Manchester at the Work, Employment and Society Conference, 2004 (Sayers & Bradbury, 2004) in a theme on emotional and aesthetic labour. A second paper explored one idea originating in the first paper: that group fitness workers’ ‘labour’ in 1-2-3-4 time, the musical timing of the workout, in conjunction with the customer. This paper was submitted to *Time and Society* and is still in review (Sayers, 2005, in review). In a third paper I explored the symbolic nature of the musical embodied experience of dancing to music in an exercise workout at the SCOS Conference in Stockholm this year, whose theme was Excess (Sayers, 2005). A small audience of about 7 was rather bemused by my presentation, but I was buoyed up by the encouragement of two ‘overseas’ academics whose work I read and admire.

In addition to attempting to mix it with NATO, I have also been working with a ‘sports’ academic (Dr. Trish Bradbury) and aiming the work into a more practical and applied audience. Trish has delivered several papers on our behalf at sports conferences (Bradbury & Sayers, 2004; Bradbury & Sayers, 2005) focusing on the ‘appearance’ work of group fitness workers.

As you can see from the activities above, we have done a lot of work in this project, and delivered at a number of international conferences, but the focus now is on getting at least one ‘decent’ (i.e. Europe or US) journal article out of it. We now intend to submit a paper to a Special Issue of *The International Journal of Work, Organisation and Emotion*, on: “Emotion and Aesthetics” (edited by Philip Hancock, Melissa Tyler and Sam Warren). Ralph Bathurst has come on as co-author in order to help with theorising the relationship between emotions and aesthetics, an area of his expertise. In addition, a more applied paper is planned which will engage with the particular ‘style’ of one well-known group fitness franchise (including both musical and visual aspects to style). We are hoping to link the ‘style’ of this group fitness franchise to its iconic New Zealand identity.

**Craig Prichard**

My music at work research involves two strands. Both begin with ‘local’ empirical problematics that coincide with an effort to bring some connection between my professional work as a researcher and my music. As noted above, the empirical target was the attempt to explain the withdrawal of personal music machines (walkmans) from a factory environment after more than twenty years of use by production workers (Prichard, 2005). The case is not unique as there are other factory environments in New Zealand that have also recently withdrawn music

---

6 As an initiation into the international dynamics of academic discourse I recall vividly at this conference a discussion I had with a renown labour process person in the UK who advanced the view to me that nothing outside of the UK on the labour process was theoretically significant because the Europeans can’t speak English, although the Americans were grudgingly said to be doing a few interesting things.
machines and still others that continue to allow and even support their use. Indeed it seems clear that the use of music machines is part of the general struggle between workers and managers over non-work practices in the workplace. The second empirical project, not supported by the research funds, is work on the use of ‘charivari’ by academics involved in challenging change processes at Massey University in 2001 (Prichard, 2004). This instance of use is set within and alongside a long history of the use of music and noise as both a form of protest and control. This project aims to explain the particular dynamics that music/noise unlocks as a weapon for re-ordering and organizing social relations.

Ralph Bathurst

My research among musician-refugees grew out of two important life experiences. Firstly, I began my working life as a music teacher in a large secondary school, in an age of booming science departments. The arts, and especially music, were at best considered irrelevant and at worst a waste of time. For many of my students, music was a marginal activity that bore little or no relevance to their future working lives, and they resented being forced to study it and take it seriously. In response, I found myself being as much a persuader as an educator — persuading them of the value of music to their becoming fully rounded human beings. Secondly, in recent years, I acted as a volunteer support person for refugee families settling in New Zealand. Families, estranged from their home lands (Middle East, Asia and Africa) are invited to settle into an unfamiliar country, where the cultural values are often at odds with their past experiences. As a result, they feel marginalised and uncomfortable with their new surroundings, and many struggle for years before finally identifying with the label *Kiwi*.

Musical refugees, then, represented an ideal opportunity to discover how people at the margins use their cultural capital as a way of integrating into their new surroundings. Following Bourdieu’s notion of capital (Bourdieu, 1986), I was interested to observe how these musicians used their talents to integrate into New Zealand society and exchange their skills for social and economic capital. I spent time with the Burundian Drummers, a group of musicians who rehearse each Saturday afternoon in the back yard of a state housing area on Auckland’s North Shore.

Important events within this community, most notably the Burundian National Day, are marked with lively drumming and dancing. What surprised me about this group is that they do not use their musical skills as a means of employment or of assisting them to become Kiwis. Rather, they use their drumming as a way of preserving their culture and of inducting their New Zealand-born children into the Burundian way. Here a marginal group chooses to remain at the margin, for it is in this marginality that their unique identity is preserved.

Furthermore, it was in the cause of the preservation of their uniqueness that the leader of the Burundian community in Auckland declared to assembled audience at their National Day Celebrations in July 2004, after a stunning performance of drumming and dance, ‘Don’t you wish you were Burundian?’ This leader invited us to the margins, for here is where uniqueness and difference is really experienced and it is here that new identities are formed.

*Making some sense of our ‘dance’ around the edges*

The music at work project, aside from the empirical projects themselves, can be read as an attempt by the researchers, each in sometimes different ways, to address the problem of responding to centre-periphery relations. While in some respects the overall project and each case study itself could be read as a search for the margin or entertains the sensibilities of the margin, each project is also an attempt to produce a
locale. We start in each case with our own experience and concerns — subjective experiences, embodied experiences, emotionality, our self-reflexive relation with others’ experience, and in community relations, in whatever forms these take. As such the projects are all inevitably located within a critical interpretivist tradition (one begins with people and their understanding and experiences). But beyond this none is tied to or attempting to flatter particular ‘NATO’ research problems or questions. Rather each is involved in what we might call the ‘barbed-wire’ activity of attempting to cobble together and move between sets of conceptual resources that in terms of the particular location seem to make sense.

Of course at the same time we are not unconcerned about the problematics of getting some attention for such work from ‘there’ (‘there’ being the place that seems to anoint us with credibility as far as the PBRF is concerned). But rather than attempt a ‘franchise’ or ‘margin’ response, our work points toward the attempt to constitute a locale. A locale, in research terms, is a space that begins with the local and non-local resources and attempts to fashion something distinctive from both. This might seem, to some, to be, at times haphazard and to even violate the coherency and consistency of some ideas, concepts and frameworks. This is inevitable: turning a location into a locale involves altering the meaning and purpose to some degree of the resources and material used to construct that position. Improvising involves putting something to work in ways that were not intended by the original authors. Thus constructing a locale is not without its disappointments and challenges in relating to those original authors and the traditions that support them7. This is not to dismiss NATO debates and theoretical frameworks and methodological traditions but rather to beg, borrow and steal from them in ways that turn location into a locale, a space from which to address both local issues and concerns and to speak ‘back’ to the ‘centre’. Of course as members of a community engaged in a competitive PBRF system we are caught between a rock and a hard place. We have little option but to participate and compete. If we want to continue to work in this critically inclined management community then we need to find ways that speak critically about management in ways that can be recognized in Europe and the US. And yet this ought to be done, in our view, in ways that draw on strong, evocative empirical materials that are distinctive of this place, that develop and use concepts that are distinctive and resonate with ‘this’ place, and to improvise with imported frameworks and concepts. Of course the research audit processes will continue to use terms like ‘internationally competitive’ and ‘world-class’. The task then is not to see this as the inevitable necessity of ‘franchise’ research but as an invitation to appropriate and fashion our own and the centre’s terms and practices into those that make sense in this place. Surely this is what is ‘really’ meant by ‘internationally competitive’ or ‘world-class’?

References

7 If we were looking for a metaphor for such work we might see this mode of engagement is akin to the barbecue or beach fire traditions of the antipodes.
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The Open Polytechnic of New Zealand
New Zealand has often been called Arcadia, a “land of milk and honey”, or “Godzone”. Many tourists who have visited our country will reflect that it is populated with irrepressibly optimistic, friendly, happy and creative individuals (Florida, 2004). This paper will utilise recent critical social research to show that through a collective drive for social and economic progress, New Zealanders have had a long-standing motivation for the realisation of individual, business and social utopias. These utopian aspirations have a corollary to theories of the knowledge age today. For one contemporary Management Theorist, Peter Drucker saw a bright future for all workers in the later decades of the 20th century with the aid of computers. But, contrary to Drucker’s predicted ideal, American-led globalized capitalism has in recent years served to indenture cohorts of knowledge workers, rather than liberate them from their electronic chains. For many critics, the outsourcing of ICT work to India (for example) makes this specialised labour analogous to the historical blue-collar work of textile mills (Witkowski, 2003). The ability of the current knowledge age to transform Western societies into individualised utopias, in Drucker’s particular interpretation at least, has been made wanting. Domestically, local journalists are increasingly claiming fashion incubators, ad agencies and start-up creative business clusters as vanguard knowledge age New Zealand industries (Perrott, 2005, pp19-20; Moore, 2004, pp.18-20; Gray, 2002, pp19-21). Stories such as these draw upon a now familiar stock of promised benefits for our economy and society. In partnership with local and central government, within a favourable policy environment, and due in no small part to the creative enterprise and hard work of individual visionaries, the promise of the knowledge age may be moving from beyond the boundary of imagination to now perhaps be within the reach of those who seek it. This paper returns attention to the question of worldwide homogenization of local cultures that are a purported consequence of Globalization. We will argue that a hitherto under recognised set of local conditions must be considered in any discussion of the net effects of Globalization upon New Zealand.

Our future potential successes in Knowledge Age enterprise stands upon several constituent cultural values that are commonplace among New Zealanders. In terms of our production and consumption of globalized culture, manufactured commodities and services these are values that underpin our engagement with others within a globalized setting. We have for more than a century been – and today remain – a nation of shopkeepers; a nation of pragmatic creative thinkers, and one also that has a particular resonance with its unique landform. Recast in more contemporary language, New Zealanders are a breed of grounded, entrepreneurial, creative, globally oriented people. These statements are not intended to be taken as astute patriotism. If the hegemony of globalised capitalism today makes widespread the modernity of an American Empire, New Zealand is a model alternative modernity within that paradigm. But we can make no claim to exceptionality in this matter, as claims to alternative modernity can be easily made by other nations also: India, Australia, Singapore, Japan and South Korea in the very least today.

It is not overstatement to suggest that New Zealand society has always been reconciled to an Imperial yoke. In our foundation years, the global hegemon was, of course, Great Britain. And within a paradigm of British Imperial modernity, New Zealand barely figured. William Pember Reeves, the founding author of 20th century New Zealand history, has succinctly depicted our place in the British Imperial
hierarchy (1898, p.2): ‘Taken possession of by an English navigator, whose action, at first adopted, was afterwards reversed by his country's rulers, [New Zealand] was only annexed at length by the English Government which did not want it, to keep it from the French who did’. If the colony did not at first figure on a global scale, its role as a social laboratory would soon have visiting scholars make pronouncements for the ‘New Zealandisation’ of the world (Demarest Lloyd, 1903). The radical political reforms of the social laboratory generated social values that have underpinned New Zealand social life for nearly a century: the principle of fair pay for a fair job, universal franchise, superannuation, principled land policies that maintain no single group should control access to what are otherwise ‘public’ lands, and an ethos that communities would look after those who cannot look after themselves. As the historian Keith Sinclair has recalled (1963, p.1), the Liberal government that implemented these policies ‘aimed at greatness in a moral sense’,

They wanted a society which cared for all of its members, including the young and the old, the neglected child, and the female factory worker. In 1900 New Zealand, with a population of less than 800,000, was nevertheless a great country. With some of the Australian colonies, it stood for something of central importance to humanity, as was widely recognized. It was studied and visited by many of the most distinguished reformers, political thinkers, and leaders in the European world.

As a member of that colonial Liberal government, William Pember Reeves was a significant architect of these policies. He was an engaged intellectual whose drive arose from a private passion for state socialism. By way of a small insight into his weltanschauung, he often gave expression to this passion through poetry, for example in this New Zealand-centred alternative for the then national anthem God Save the Queen:

New Zealand

GOD girt her about with the surges
And winds of the masterless deep,
Whose tumult uprouses and urges
Quick billows to sparkle and leap;
He filled from the life of their motion
Her nostrils with breath of the sea,
And gave her afar in the ocean
A citadel free.
Her never the fever-mist shrouding,
Nor drought of the desert may blight,
Nor pall of dun smoke overclouding
Vast cities of clamorous night,
But the voice of abundance of waters,
Cold rivers that stay not or sleep,
Greets children, the sons and the daughters
Of light and the deep.
Lo! here where each league hath its fountains
In isles of deep fern and tall pine,
And breezes snow-cooled on the mountains,
Or keen from the limitless brine,
See men to the battlefield pressing
To conquer one toe—the stern soil,
Their kingship in labour expressing,
Their lordship in toil.
Though young they are heirs of the ages,
Though few they are freemen and peers,
Plain workers—yet sure of the wages
Slow Destiny pays with the years.
Though least they and latest their nation,
Yet this they have won without sword—
That Woman with Man shall have station,
And Labour be lord.
The winds of the sea and high heaven
Speed pure to her kissed by the foam;
The steeds of her ocean undriven,
Unbitted and riderless roam,
And clear from her lamp newly lighted
Shall stream o'er the billows upcurled
A light as of wrongs at length righted,
Of hope to the world.

William Pember Reeves (2004, p.1)

In politics, Reeves’ aim was to set in place a policy framework that would enable not simply economic wealth or social favour, but social harmony:

In a debate, in 1888, on a tariff Bill, [Reeves] quoted Goldsmith:

… ye statesmen who survey
The rich man's joys increase, the poor's decay,
'Tis yours to say how wide the limits stand
Between a splendid and a happy land.

He made it clear that, if he had to choose, he would prefer that New Zealand should be a happy land rather than a splendid one. He was in some ways unsympathetic to economic growth, which he thought likely to produce a depressed industrial proletariat, and frankly preferred to see the country inhabited by a million people 'happy, prosperous and satisfied' than twice as many living in dreary poverty. (Sinclair, 1963, p.1)

In many respects, Reeves’ policy vision was for a meritocracy among colonists and their descendants. He wanted to preclude the ‘Old World evil’ of class conflict from taking root on New Zealand soil. Here, the desire was for the social structure of the New Zealand colony to have a high floor and a low ceiling (Oliver, 1969). As a suite of legislation, the Liberal’s policies created favourable conditions for social mobility that would enable personal advancement hitherto unseen in Britain or her colonies. Those ideally utopian social conditions for labour have implications for current critical thought and praxis. As we will see the very notion of constructed democratic social conditions that would enable social mobility is one point today where much of the knowledge age and knowledge management theory diverts and reverts to the status quo.

For Peter Drucker the present knowledge age was about blue-collar workers being elevated and becoming self managers through the utility of computers (Drucker, 1993). He envisioned a process of change to model of Western societies from an agricultural age, through an industrial age to what would become a knowledge age. Factory work would end as the ideas in people’s heads would come to have more value than their physical labour. Education would be key to developing knowledge
workers, that although knowledge work often involved manual work, it was the mental skills that were needed to escalate this societal development (Drucker, 1994; 1999).

For Drucker, these new ‘knowledge’ workers’ ability to self manage not only their work activities but an entire career would ultimately bind them to a reformed sense of humanism:

In a few hundred years, when the history of our time will be written from a long-term perspective, it is likely that the most important event historians will see is not technology, not the Internet, not e-commerce. It is an unprecedented change in the human condition. For the first time -- literally -- substantial and rapidly growing numbers of people have choices. For the first time, they will have to manage themselves…Throughout history, practically nobody had choices. Until about 1900, even in the most highly developed countries, the overwhelming majority followed their father’s line of work -- if they were lucky. If your father was a peasant farmer, you were a peasant farmer. If he was a craftsman, you were a craftsman. There was only downward mobility; there was no upward mobility. (Drucker, 1994, p.1)

Here, new age management of human resource would become a liberal art. It would understand work as a human activity rather than exploitation merely for profits and would manage labour in such a light. At the centre of what has been called Drucker ‘genius’, he understood that workers actively hated to be managed, and so rightly resisted the traditional command and control style of management passed down from the Victorian servitude to the measurement of time and motion in discrete units of Taylorism, to circumstances today where labour is outsourced or off-shored for increased shareholder value (Drucker, 1999). Drucker argues that the knowledge age has become ideologically swept up and adapted by numerous management gurus, who tussle in their books and consultancy firms; who want to sell their courses, services and technical products. Knowledge management turned in recent decades from a means elevate workers’ value to a brand for making money (Prusak, 1999; Mentzas, Apostolou, Young, & Abecker, 2001). Further, much like other Western centres, New Zealand society today is one where paid white- and blue-collar labour works more than a forty-hour week; has diminished work conditions and experiences employment uncertainty. As Manual Castells has shown, rather than the globalized knowledge age emancipating workers through the utility of self-management, the possibility of social mobility is instead increasingly reduced (Castells, 2000a, 2000b). The gap between rich and poor continues to widen. The prospect of achieving an individualised utopia remains possible within popular imagination, but remains beyond the possibility of realisation for the average salary and wage earner.

Conclusion
Although we have shown that the origins of New Zealand’s social life are unique and were significantly shaped by the vision of a poet, our critical reflection upon local cultural identifiers does not assess New Zealand cultural nationalism, past or present, in ‘post-modern’ terms. When examining our historical or contemporary fields of study, we must be careful to not effect a cringe upon their substance. We must instead consider these phenomena on the bases of their own times and places. By understanding some of the unique features of our history, we may be able to reclaim some of Reeves’ original dreams and use them to reform New Zealand in ways that will perpetuate a society built on intellectual equality for all New Zealand rather than a knowledge age built to serve Global capitalism. Much like the British imperial network during Reeves’ time, New Zealand is today a node within a global network,
wherein ideas, ideologies and identities move across space and time. Geographically and intellectually, our society is a modernity alternative to the global hegemon of an age. At a local level this is recognisable in the experiences of vanguard small business owners, today regarded oftentimes as knowledge age entrepreneurs. In its social conditions, this alternative modernity provides the both employed labour and the enterprising small business man or –woman motivation to realise his/her economic emancipation. These conditions similarly advance efforts to realise social utopias, whether in efforts to realise rangatiratanga/autonomy; in the ability to explore one’s creativity, knowing that the state welfare system will support you if necessary; or in the realisation of personal spirituality; or in the overused notion of quality of life. Call it what you may, the values of New Zealand’s social heritage enable self realisation, within certain limits and ultimately supported by the State through regulation (and since 1935 - welfare), and it is from the common stock of these now long-standing conditions that the knowledge age grows.
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One of the key challenges in organisational studies is how to provide a coherent and comprehensive account of economic, cultural and social diversity. It is from within this context that we engage with the question - What is Critical Management Studies in Aotearoa/New Zealand? While, we acknowledge there are many factors that are ‘critical about’ management studies in New Zealand, our aim in this forum is to contribute to the discussion on the development and use of innovative methodologies in organisational studies, particularly in relation to research on Indigenous Maori organisations. This inevitably draws our attention to Kaupapa Maori Research as a critical system of thought available to critical management studies in New Zealand that gives primacy to an Indigenous Maori paradigm.

Our contribution to this conference is derived from our own experiences as Indigenous Maori researchers undertaking research in Indigenous Maori organisations. We have found that despite mainstream organisational research’s best intentions and increasing use of more interpretive methodologies (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Seale, Gobo, Gubrium, & Silverman, 2004; Steier, 1991), its application to the research questions that arise out of Indigenous organizations inevitably result in a pale reflection of contemporary Indigenous business practice. We suggest that this is a consequence of organisational research and practice that typically reinforces a view of the world consistent with underlying Western oriented assumptions (Henry & Pene, 1999).

To undertake organisational research in an Indigenous Maori context, it is necessary to do so from an alternate philosophic orientation to that which is currently endorsed by mainstream Western research theory and practice. This brings to the forefront two caveats that we argue are important to consider with respect to critical management studies in New Zealand.
Zealand. The first is the censure of a monocultural approach to knowledge and lack of recognition provided to distinctions between different cultural groups (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Said, 1993). The second caveat is the importance of critically challenging the status quo, typified in mainstream Western based organizational theories where positivist intellectual traditions have been inherited and in some cases embedded (Henry & Pene, 1999; Smith, 1997; Smith, 1999).

At this point it is important to reflect on our use of ‘Indigenous’ and ‘Western’ worldviews. We acknowledge that the use of the terms ‘mainstream Western’ and ‘Indigenous’ are problematic because these terms conceal a great deal of heterogeneity. They are both terms that collectivise many distinct populations providing an umbrella term for different communities around the world. The terminology is, however useful in making explicit distinctive ‘worldviews’ as domains of practice and inquiry with their own discourse, sets of assumptions, language, culture and identity. The notion of worldview captures the embeddedness of distinct cultural values and underscores the relationship between cultural integrity and practice as explained by Marsden:

“Cultures pattern perceptions of reality into conceptualisations of what they perceive reality to be; of what it is to be regarded as actual, probable, possible or impossible. These conceptualisations form what is termed the ‘worldview’ of a culture. The worldview is the central systemisation of conceptions of reality to which members of its culture assent and from which stems their value system. The worldview lies at the very heart of the culture, touching, interacting with and strongly influencing every aspect of the culture” (Marsden, 2003: 56).

Alfonso Ortiz (cited in Beck, Walters, & Faransisco, 1990) suggested that the term ‘world-view’ denotes a distinctive vision of reality, which not only interprets and orders the places and events in the experience of a people, but lends form, direction and continuity to life (Henare, 2001). A worldview, therefore encapsulates the way in which people perceive and understand the world. Understandings, which Markus and Kitayama (1991) describe are themselves constrained by the patterns of social interactions characteristic of a given culture. Indigenous peoples have different ways of ‘viewing’ the world and this then shapes their societal assumptions and knowledge about the world (Bishop, 1996; Mauss, 1970; Sahlins, 1999; Said, 1993; Smith, Carroll, & Ashford, 1995).

The notion of Indigenous defines the cultural identity of first nation(s) peoples in specific geographic landscapes; wherein we apply the term Western as a descriptor for the industrialised Western nations, which are dominated by Anglo-American culture, thought and practice. In using the term ‘Indigenous’ we wish to acknowledge the experiences many Indigenous communities share. For example, the effect of colonisation, new technologies,
globalisation and racism, which have influenced the worldviews and identities of Indigenous peoples (Sahlins, 1999; Said, 1993; Smith, 1999; Stillitoe, 1998). However, while each Indigenous community may share similar cultural characteristics in their worldviews, we have positioned our discussion from the perspective of an Indigenous Maori worldview whereby the term ‘Maori’ denotes the Indigenous peoples of New Zealand, and carries with it distinct notions of a cultural identity and knowledge that informs practice.

Maori identity is born of a history and geography that has produced positions from which they have enunciated their own narratives and cultural practices, that continues to support the continued development of their cultural distinctiveness in their worldview (d'Hauteserre, 2005). For Maori, identity is further delineated on the basis of a collective identity, characterized by shared perspectives of the world, sets of values and belief systems through links to distinct territories and hierarchically based tribal configurations providing inter-action of different degrees between whanau (family), hapu (tribe), and iwi (confederation of tribes) (Petrie, 2002). Although each iwi has its own historical experiences, dialects, customs and practices, they share common cultural and genealogical connections to knowledge creation and transmission.

According to Henare (2001) a Maori worldview is a traditionalist religious worldview in which the spiritual dimension is pre-eminent in Maori social order. A theory of vitalism that includes a philosophy of tapu, mana, mauri, hau and wairua informs and upholds a worldview where the natural, spiritual and social worlds are interrelated and interconnected. This conception of the Maori worldview embraces the principles of totality and complexity of the connections and relationships that exist within the field (Bishop, 1996; Royal, 2002). It captures a sense of unity between the physical, spiritual and philosophical as represented by the ‘Baskets of Knowledge’ as recounted by Marsden (2003), which are central to the Maori worldview, each basket representing a constituent element of the Maori worldview and source of Maori knowledge (Figure One).

![Figure One]

Exploring worldviews therefore is an essential precursor to understanding an Indigenous paradigm as an alternate philosophical orientation for scholarly engagement in organisational theory. In our experience, accepting the existence of other worldviews offers

---

8 Tapu (being with potentiality for power), Mana (religious power, authority and ancestral efficacy), Mauri (unique power, a life essence, a life force, a vital principle, Wairua,( a spirit akin to a soul and all things in creation have one), Hau (a complex totalising system of gift exchange beginning with the gods, creation and into social relationships)
distinctive insight into the critical analysis of organisations in contemporary conditions, requiring researchers to free themselves from established research paradigms and embrace innovative and new experiences in research (Casey, 2002; Seale et al., 2004). This is a direct response to the increasing debate regarding the consequences of blindly applying formalistic, rational, positivist models of enquiry and practice in mainstream business education (Ghoshal 2005; Grey, 2004; Liang & Wang, 2004; Reynolds, 1998).

Much of organisational research to date has prevailed with the dominant principles of logic or reason, Cartesian thinking derived from Descartes’ premise cogito ergo sum and interrelated ideological movements including individualism, scientific positivism, utilitarianism and behaviourism (Pethrick & Quinn, 1997). As a consequence much of the conceptualisation of business organisation that has emerged are those that conform to hierarchical, formal, systematic, rationalist and compartmentalised models (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Brown, 1989). For Indigenous peoples, this mode of thinking has, through such a rigid system of representation, allowed for the comparison and evaluation of societies that ignores the multiple traditions of knowledge systems embedded in the distinctive values and behaviour of Indigenous peoples and their organisations (Smith, 1999). The result of which is that much of contemporary theory and practice grounded in Western science and knowledge is depicted as being more rational and therefore stronger in theory and practice to Indigenous forms of organisation (Petrie, 2002; Prasad, 2003; Sahlins, 1999; Said, 1993). Indigenous business practices, as a consequence are pigeon-holed in an epistemological void, which at best propagates Indigenous practice as a romanticised and idealistic vision of Indigenous peoples and their organisations.

Our intention at this forum is to add constructive discussion to the various philosophical, theoretical and practical issues involved in current debates on methodological approaches in organisational studies (Brocklesby, 2005). We draw attention to fact that constructive criticism of mainstream organisational research and practice is not unique to Indigenous concerns. Indeed there has been a great deal of debate from within the Academy itself offering alternative insights to the field of organisational research (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Grey, 2004; Liang & Wang, 2004; Prasad, 2003; Reynolds, 1998).

We also acknowledge that there has been increased interest in research methods that are more conducive to research in Indigenous contexts, particularly in qualitative research, supporting an interpretive focus with the goal of generating holistic and realistic descriptions and/or explanations (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Gummesson, 1991), which coincide with the Indigenous epistemological importance of relationships and connectivity. For example, the use of focus groups, story telling, narrative inquiry and participatory action research, (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000; Ashar & Lane-Maher, 2004; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Seale et al., 2004; Steier, 1991). However as Henry and Pene (1999)
note these approaches have not necessarily been derived from Indigenous historical, cultural or spiritual foundations. Therefore, to understand and develop processes of engaging with contemporary Maori organisations, that reflects the reality of Maori cultural particularities and challenges the status quo of the dominant approaches to organisational research, we argue that it is necessary to act from a research design and methodology that will reflect an Indigenous Maori worldview – Kaupapa Maori Research.

Kaupapa literally translates to mean ‘guiding principle’ (Marsden, 2003). Thus taking into account the epistemological, ontological and methodological distinctions and complementarities between Maori and Western thought regarding the world (Penetito, 2002), which are relevant to how research is conducted in a Maori organisational context. Kaupapa Maori Research is a transformative research approach that provides for culturally informed theory building and practice addressing the complexities of research in Indigenous organisations. As a research strategy it embodies the philosophical orientation that expresses a Maori worldview and is defined by Smith (1999) as localised critical theory that shares the particular notions of critique, resistance, struggle and emancipation as espoused informed theorists such as Gramsci and Friere. A Kaupapa Maori Research approach accords full recognition of Maori cultural norms, value systems and practices, providing cultural legitimation of both the process and outcomes of research (Bishop, 1996; Smith, 1999). To that end we suggest that Kaupapa Maori Research as a culturally attuned instrument for organisational research is a critical system of thought that can contribute to critical management studies in New Zealand.
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Figure One – The Baskets of Knowledge (Marsden, 2003)

Tua-uri
*Beyond on the world of darkness*

Where cosmic processes originate and operate as a continual interacting rhythmic pattern of energy that sustains and replenishes the life of the natural world. This basket contains the source of Maori philosophical lore that guides Maori perspectives of ‘being’.

Aro-nui
*That before us*

The natural world that is comprehensible to human senses through observation and whakapapa (genealogical recitation). Beyond the general wisdoms passed down through each generation, this basket provides for genealogical connection to the natural world.

Te Ao Ta-atea
*Beyond space & time*

Where space and time are conjoined and relative to one another. This represents the eternal world of life, mind and spirit as infinite.
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Examining power relations between sport organisations in Aotearoa/NZ

Since its inception in 2002, Sport and Recreation New Zealand (SPARC), the government funding body for sport, has actively encouraged the development of formally organised, rationalised, structured management in sport organisations from club to National Sport Organisation (NSO) level. This is a new phenomena for many sport organisations, given their historic reliance on relatively ad hoc management style organised by parents, volunteer coaches, administrators, and in rural areas, multiple clubs that reflect the diverse and isolated nature of many communities. The pressure exerted by SPARC to adopt new management techniques has given rise to some interesting and complex questions regarding the nature of management in sport organisations in Aotearoa/NZ. In particular, and the focus for this paper, the relationship between SPARC and NSOs is characterised by multiple, arguably problematic power relations. The following short description of my recent attendance at the “Business of Sport Summit” in October 2005 indicates some of these issues. I then outline how the relationship between SPARC and NSOs might be examined, thus offering a topic for analysis of interest to this conference.

Although not the sole funder of the Summit, SPARC provided the dominant themes and impetus for it. This was evident through SPARC’s prominent logo in conference material, and the opening address by the CEO of SPARC. Throughout the Summit, the promotion of the “businessification” of sport organisations was a
dominant feature, particularly through the principles of a specific form of rational management. These principles were articulated through keynote speakers and breakout sessions. For example, three of the seven keynote speakers were from Australia, where the management of sport organisations has been aggressively commercialised and rationalised over the past twenty years. The other keynote speakers followed the tone of promoting rational management, encouraging the participants to focus on “improving the management capacity and capability of sporting organisations … driving improved accountability and transparency of operations” (Keynote speaker, 21st October, 2005).

The delegates, most of whom represented National Sport Organisations (NSOs) listened dutifully, took notes, and asked questions about how they could make their organizations more effective, efficient, and rational. Most dutifully wore black (good Kiwi sport organisation colours) and checked their cell phones at regular, but appropriate intervals. It was overhearing a cell phone conversation that highlighted and reinforced my disquiet at the dominant messages being promoted at the summit. A man barked to his colleague on the phone “well I don’t know where the bloody folder is, ask Mary, she’ll know”. He added “here’s my [computer] password so that you can get into my email and find out those details”.

This comment seemed somewhat at odds with the “improved management capacity” and other dominant messages promoted at the Summit. It also highlighted a potential discrepancy between the well-oiled machinery expected by SPARC and the more ad hoc versions of management utilised within many NSOs. This perceived discrepancy at the Summit also reflected broader relations between SPARC and the NSOs. SPARC is seemingly able to provide policy and governance recommendations that, if not followed by NSOs, will result in reduced funding and support from
SPARC (SPARC, 2005a). These recommendations follow overseas models without prior critique of these models in any way, and without examining any potential local differences with the NZ context. While SPARC’s actions have faced some critique from the academic sector (e.g. Sam & Jackson, 2004), there is no evidence of SPARC addressing this critique. Further, given its reliance for funding, the sport sector is currently largely powerless to resist SPARC’s actions.

The relationship between SPARC and the NSOs offers a number of key questions that can be asked within the confines of this conference. In the interests of space, I outline two: the first is one element of the multiple power relations between SPARC and NSOs; and the second is the question SPARC’s positioning of NSOs’ within NZ/Aoteroa and internationally, which is an issue of location.

Turning first to an element of the power relations between SPARC and the NSOs. Following Bauman (2001), SPARC is intrinsically tied up in creating a powerful truths regarding specific rational management discourses, which have been identified as central to improving management capacity (SPARC, 2005b). These truths are bound by a form of modernity, that is “subject to ever-growing efficiency and based on a detailed division of labour and increasing expertise” (Blackshaw, 2005, p. 41). If NSOs do not embrace the systems associated with rational management such as audit, competitive funding, and strategic management, SPARC claims that NSOs will be lost in the international wilderness, consigning NZ to the “also ran” list of countries in the international sport fraternity (SPARC, 2005a).

This subtle influence on the NSOs is backed up by more deliberate threats and rewards. Within a long list of conditions for receiving funding, NSOs are clearly instructed that “failure to accept NZAS (New Zealand Academy of Sport, the regional representation of SPARC) assistance may result in the withdrawal of SPARC high
performance investment support from an NSO” (SPARC, 2005a, p. 11). NSOs are left in no doubt that they are to pursue high performance (for example Olympic or World champion status) and to do so by using SPARC’s management formula. As such, SPARC is clearly creating its own limited version of expertise and governance through tightly defined, rationalist discourses.

The intricacies of location also play a key role in the relationship between SPARC and the NSOs. In this instance, location may be understood as the space, or sector, in which an organisation operates (Burnley, Matthews & McKenzie, 2005). At an organisational level, the location of NSOs in a particular sector, traditionally nonprofit, is questioned or threatened by SPARC’s demands on the NSOs. As with nonprofit organisations outside the realm of sport, NSOs are being required to adopt the accountability and transparency that is mythically associated with the commercial sector. The difficulties associated with such demands are well documented (e.g. Adcroft & Willis, 2005). Some of these difficulties were outlined in the cell phone conversation that was described above. The re-positioning of nonprofit organisations into another sector can also lead to a loss of focus on core mission and operating difficulties (Burnley et al., 2005), and this may well be the case for NSOs.

More broadly, the focus that SPARC has placed on the international location of NZ/Aotearoa NSOs may be questioned. Constant benchmarking against the performance of other countries, articulated through an unquestioned desire to “leapfrog countries that finished above us [in the Athens Olympic Games]” (SPARC, 2005a, p. 2) and increase “New Zealand’s medal tally at future Olympics” (SPARC, 2005a, p. 5) reinforces the implicit “wilderness” threats by encouraging NSOs to constantly look over their shoulders and compare themselves to other, much larger, and often much better funded countries. This discursive rhetoric is tightly bound up in
questionable concepts of national identity, creating the impression that doing “well” at the Commonwealth and Olympic Games is, in some way, the NSOs’ national duty. Such benchmarking, articulated through the production of guidelines and policies, and the reinforcement of notions of often vague and conflicting notions of national identity, has enabled SPARC to reinforce its position as an indispensable entity. SPARC employees have promoted themselves as experts in an organisation that will take the NSOs into the 21st century to become effective, efficient, rational organisations (Johnson, 1993). As the medical and judicial professions made themselves indispensable to society in the 18th and 19th centuries, so SPARC is an example of modern organisational expertise has been able to “reconstitute networks of expert/official discourse, creating new institutional forms such as ... audit and ... appraisal” (Johnson, 1993, p. 146). As Shaw and Chisholm (2004) discussed, there is a burgeoning industry of audit within Aotearoa/NZ that has a vested interest in recreating and protecting itself. The circular nature of power (Foucault, 1980) ensures that those who present themselves as experts, and set up systems by which their expertise is valued, are quickly and powerfully considered key to any decisions made within the sector. It is also fair to say that, in this discursive relationship, the organisation which is most often in a dominant position is quick, and able, to dismiss “other” forms of knowledge, which in SPARC’s case may include NSOs’ own views, and critical comment from academics.

In this brief discussion, I have argued that the relationship between SPARC and NSOs in NZ/Aotearoa is a worthy topic for analysis. This analysis cannot be confined only to academic discussion, however, because that discussion has proven to be easy for SPARC to ignore. It is a discussion that, in keeping with the “locality and location” elements of this conference must take place with not on NSOs and SPARC.
This approach may also provide room for discursive resistance, located within power relations, to be articulated (Foucault, 1979). Working with sport organisations may also provide an area in which CMS can reflect back on itself: how and in what ways can CMS be a research framework that can encourage reflexivity and constructive change within NSOs and other organisations? I have offered one of multiple areas in which sport management in NZ/Aotearoa can be analysed. There are many others, and many other ways to analyse the relationships at work within and between these organisations. I hope this paper may prompt some discussion that will elucidate them further.
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This submission explores the desirability and possibility of developing a more explicit critical, regional consciousness in Aotearoa / New Zealand in order to collaboratively develop and utilize organizational knowledge between the dominant culture and a marginalized group of Pacific Islanders, the tribe local comic, Te Radar, has referred to as Ngati Pakeha.

This is not a joke. In Kiwi management education and practice, the “dominant culture” is not that of European Kiwis, but of the internationally dominant culture of management centred on OECD business practices and led by the American knowledge production industry. In contrast, the culture dominant within Aotearoa / New Zealand consists of a mere three million white Pacific Islanders whose domestic and imported knowledge practices often emphasize a discourse of “free trade”, “global competitiveness”, or “productivity”, discursive formations which contribute to marginalizing indigenous knowledge practices in favour of the (presumably) superior practices of the global empires.

In seeking a perspective from which to question this marginalisation, one might draw a useful analogy to global movements aimed at preserving and validating indigenous knowledge practices. Among these are Liberation Theology, Afrocentric Theory, Postcolonial Theory, Feminist Theories and, more regionally, Kaupapa Maori methodology. These movements share three moments of resistance: (1) consciousness of one’s marginalization as marginalization, (2) critical valorisation of one’s heritage as both a source of contemporary problems and contemporary strengths, (3) negotiation of hybrid knowledge practices which optimize the never-unproblematic between the indigenous tradition and the presently-dominant culture.

Consciousness

One issue of consciousness to explore is that of demystifying colonial consciousness. In this respect, Pakeha consciousness is unusual, possibly unique, in that it has been more positive about colonization than the colonizer itself has been. This is an interesting twist, but a postcolonial country still suggests the need to develop a decolonized mind. One element of this mentality which could be explored and questioned, for instance, is the lingering power of British education as an influence on tertiary education despite the failure of the UK to couple education to commerce in the 20th century (as, for instance, Braverman discusses in Labor & Monopoly Capital).

Other issues which suggest the need to develop a local consciousness include, for instance, uncritical openness to foreign influences. This includes what Winston Peters regularly refers to as “selling the family silver” – the sale of state assets to foreign investors. It includes openness to American fast food chains, and the transformation in business practices they bring. It includes arguing for “free trade” as if the country were one of the global empires rather than a potential competitor with...
Myanmar as a supplier of cheap labour. It includes the steady but stealthy transformation of the national university system from a public trust into a foreign exporter selling education overseas, primarily to China. None of these practices is per se wrong, but they are all examples of phenomena bringing a complex mix of good and bad influences, which are accepted relatively passively rather than based upon assessment stemming from a critical consciousness of what Pakeha New Zealand wants and needs.

Critical Valorisation

Study of the appearance of Kiwi cultural icons in the media and in casual conversation shows two contradictory movements. On the one hand, Pakeha have “Kiwi ingenuity” and “punch above our weight.” On the other hand, a look at the business press regularly shows “experts” (most often American or English) chastising the “she’ll be right” or the “bach, boat and BMW” mentality. Critical valorisation of these qualities would engender simultaneous discussion of the positive and negative consequences of these core cultural values, of their historical and cultural significance and of their ongoing relevance. For instance, a “#8 baling wire” mentality can reflect both an ability to adapt to a wide range of unexpected situations and an attitude of getting it “good enough” rather than right.

Hybridity

One of the central constructs of postcolonial theory is that of hybridity (see, for instance, A. Prasad’s Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis). This concept is broadly applicable to the present context at multiple levels. Clearly, the world of Maori rangitiritanga in Aotearoa has been subsumed by the sovereignty of the kuini in New Zealand. But that world is being subsumed by a world of colonization by the “knowledge economy” and “global competitiveness.” In seeking an appropriate response to this situation, all that is clear is that both extremes are untenable. The country can neither shut out nor disappear into the world economy. In the middle ground, how will a future be negotiated? One way to understand this future is as one of hybridity.

Conclusion

This submission seeks to make two points. The first is to raise consideration of Pakeha New Zealand as a marginalized culture. This is not to in any way undermine the legitimacy of Maori and other minority cultures to represent their position as marginal relative to Pakeha culture. However, to see Pakeha culture as only dominant is to miss critical dynamics positioning New Zealand in the global economy. The second point is to analogize theoretically to other movements by marginalized constituencies, especially the local knowledge of kaupapa Maori. The insights from this theorizing can both usefully inform the indigenizing of Pakeha knowledge and position the locally dominant Pakeha culture to more successfully engage in a hybridized future with the locally marginal and globally dominant constituencies interpenetrating the country’s organizational environment.
PART II EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST (EoI)
In considering the organization, identity and locality of CMS, it might be worthwhile to think about the positioning of CMS in relation to constituencies outside the academy and in particular, the desirability and possibility of a ‘public role’ for critical scholars. This term incorporates activities such as engagements with practitioners, membership of committees or advisory groups related to public policy, involvement with think-tanks and political parties, and appearances in the media. For analytical purposes, this definition excludes interactions with other academics and with students (at undergraduate, postgraduate or ‘executive’ level).

In terms of its political orientation, CMS appears to provide an ideal foundation for developing a critical public role, by placing critique at the heart of its agenda. Despite this, ‘critters’ are routinely and vigorously criticised for their efforts in the public arena, often by those sympathetic to CMS. Mir and Mir (2002) argue that academic credibility has become an end in itself and that ‘critical scholars in the academy write for the academy and speak to the academy’ (p.119). They lay the blame largely with the academics themselves for being unable or unwilling to venture outside the academy more often. Parker (2002) also believes CMS has little influence on the world outside the academy, stating it has ‘strengthened the popular diagnosis of academics as people who argue about things that nobody else understands or particularly cares about’ (p.116).

In defence of critical scholars, one must not forget the impact of research assessment systems (such as the RAE in the UK and, more recently, NZ’s PBRF) that have attributed greater importance to publication in academic journals. A second defence might be that ‘critters’ do not need a public role in order to provide a critique of established management practice and to promote more inclusive, just and sustainable organisations. Teaching provides opportunities to shape the managers of the future and if students leave university more ethical and critically aware, perhaps that is all that needs to be done? Certainly, the classroom is one location where ‘critters’ can have impact, but I suggest we can do more.

Grey and Willmott (2002, p.417) have recently placed an expansion of the public role on the CMS agenda:

The aim of transforming management practice, although partly about B-schools, especially in terms of education, is one that can only be achieved in concert with other political movements and through non-academic media. This is a possibility that CMS has
only just begun to explore but that we believe needs to be encouraged and developed.

It might be worthwhile, therefore, to consider the implications for the New Zealand context of CMS. Do we see the public role as an important part of CMS? What are the sorts of activities that are on-going? What opportunities are there for developing a more active public role and what are the threats?

References:


Transformational Potential of Critical Theory

Maria Humphries & Dale Fitzgibbons

Authors
Maria Humphries
Waikato University
Hamilton
New Zealand

Dale Fitzgibbons
Illinois State University
Normal
Illinois
USA

Title
Transformational Potential of Critical Theory

Introduction
We are interested in responding to each of the questions in the conference call.

What critical systems of thought are available for CMS?
Habermas and those who engage his ideas in organisational studies offers the potential to move from analysis/diagnosis to transformational/emancipatory action. We have used the work of Habermas in a number of projects in both manufacturing and social service organisations and in our teaching (Humphries and Twiname 200#; Paine and Humphries 200#). In this ‘system of thought’ the advocated movement from instrumental to communicative action - even if not achievable in its ideal form – is argued to have transformational possibilities.

What might be the key topics of organisational analysis for CMS in this country?
We are interested in transforming the ‘domesticating effects of the template’. Examples of ‘templates’ may be seen in the increasing ‘panoptic’ processes engaged by corporations, governments, and community organisations in the form of compliance mechanisms. Many of these are now ‘on-line’ ‘pull down menus’ – intensifying ‘managing from a distance’ and amplifying control.

How can issues of locality and location be approached from critical perspectives?
In each of the projects, location and locality have significant implications. Meaning making is always contextualised. The possibilities and the boundaries of what can be said, known, done is at least geographically, historically, culturally and politically inscribed. In our work with manufacturing and service delivery organisations, the lexicon of efficiency circumscribes all discussion. In our work with Maori, western lexicons require radical revisiting, involvement of western practitioners, the uptake or imposition of supposedly neutral templates for action (quality assurance, risk management and so on) the contemporary gospel of colonisation (Ellis and Humphries under preparation).

How central to CMS are issues of power relations?
The marginal movement of power/domination observed in our various projects provides an opportunity to consider that these apparent shifts in power are illusions (co-options of discourses to safeguard the larger project of exploitation or colonisation) or that the transformational potential through increased exercise of communicative action is delusional. However, we are also of the view that there is no better aspiration than to advocate for such processes of mutuality through which to address the many life threatening and dignity defiling conditions of human and environmental existence. In keeping with the transformational aspirations of critical theory, our belief that imbalances of power provide opportunity for exploitation and injustice, we are interested in any theories that generate a desire not only to resist such opportunities but to generate processes of mutuality and respect. To that extent, we support the formulation of a relational ethic and to facilitate an increasing interest in communicative action in all spheres of human endeavours (Humphries and Grant, 2005; Humphries and Martin 2005). Another way of expressing this may be to argue that we hope for a world in which the ethical impulses that support the Life World are the impulses that generate our economic activity as well as our social activity (Dees, 2005)
Activism

Where I come from (Trondheim, Norway) the difference between being ‘a studying subject’ (studerende) and being a student, (student) is made explicit to prospective students from day one. You can be a studerende without being a student. The university makes you a studerende; i.e. you read your books, go to lectures, pass your exams etc, whilst the Student Union (Samfundet) makes you a student. To be a student entails to be a studerende and more. It entails organising, mobilising, stirring up some dust, engaging with students from other disciplines, it entails failing a paper if you are organising for something that you believe in and strongly identify with. And the beauty is that you probably still get a job because the people that will be hiring you are likely to have been students too and prefer to have students rather than studerende in their workforce.

I identify myself with being a student and – if not everything – then at least much of what that entails where I come from. I say ‘where I come from’ because I find location (geographical location) to be important here. In my current location I do not always identify this way though through my decisions and actions. What I wish to do is to challenge that and embody my identification with ‘being a student’ the way I understand it from my previous location to my current location as a student-to-be in Palmerston North and as an academic that identifies with CMS and I would like to explore ways of doing that with you at the OIL II conference. I write about Fair Trade in my PhD, but when I consider engaging with local community groups that promote Fair Trade something makes me hesitate. That ‘something’ is most often a concern that it might have a negative impact on my research. Perhaps this is not the case, but this ‘something’ nevertheless makes me hesitate.

I would like to discuss this ‘something’ whatever it is or could be, and the written and the unwritten rules of community engagement, or activism, in CMS and CMS in New Zealand. And before we leave the conference venue perhaps we can un-write and write some?
Dale Pfeifer
Organization, Identity and Locality (II)
Expression of Interest

I have recently completed my master’s thesis comparing Maori and Pakeha New Zealanders perceptions of outstanding leadership behaviour. To do this I used the GLOBE (Global Leadership and Organizational Effectiveness) Research Program’s method.

The GLOBE is a multiphase, multi-method approach to examining the interrelationships between societal culture, organisational culture and practices, and organisational leadership. It aims to develop a truly international leadership theory which describes, understands, and predicts the cultural impact on leadership, organisational processes, and the effectiveness of those processes (House 2004).

The GLOBE explores culturally-endorsed implicit theories of leadership (CLTs), and in doing so measures followers’ perceptions of culture and leadership, and considers the relationship between them. It measures leadership along six global dimensions comprising 21 sub-scales (as seen in the diagram below). By examining the relationship between cultural dimensions and leadership scales for both Maori and Pakeha New Zealanders, the GLOBE research claims that a picture of each culture’s leadership behaviour can be deduced.

*The GLOBE leadership model*

In line with its objective is to generate a truly international leadership theory, the GLOBE aims to avoid ethnocentrism, a common flaw of cross-leadership studies. In
response to this, the GLOBE was developed by a core of researchers from 22 cultures, and the final questionnaire was tested and validated in all 62 participating cultures.

New Zealand was sampled in the original GLOBE study, but New Zealand’s within-country sub-cultures were not recognised. Although no ethnicity data were available for the New Zealand GLOBE sample, a series of emails with the New Zealand chief GLOBE investigator suggests that few, if any, Maori or participants from other New Zealand cultures took part. This study begins to address this shortfall by collecting a Maori sample and giving Maori a voice in this international research project. So as while the GLOBE investigators intended this project to remove locality and location from leadership theory, my aim was to use it for the opposite effect, to emphasis the importance of the locality of New Zealand distinct sub-cultures, and in doing so, to raise the international consciousness of leadership research in this location.

This research was carried out with close guidance and on-going and support for Maori academics including: Matene Love, Dr Ngatata Love, Mana Cracknell, Hawira Hape, Tyron Love, and Shane Jones.

In-line with cross-cultural leadership theory, the results of this study suggests similarities and some differences in outstanding Maori and Pakeha leadership behaviour. In fact, significant differences were found along 13 out of 19 sub-scales. Very briefly, the biggest differences were along the modesty and integrity sub-scales. The most similar results were recorded along the inspirational and participative sub-scales.

However, what I would like to discuss at this conference is the difficulties I encountered when using the GLOBE, and as a result of this, the questions that arose relating to locality and identity.

Feedback from my advisors and people who completed the questionnaire suggests that the GLOBE does not consider important behavioural attributes deemed crucial for outstanding Maori leadership. According to this, the GLOBE model does provide an complete picture of outstanding Maori leadership behaviour.

Additionally, I was advised that if I did not adapt the GLOBE questionnaire, I would have problems getting people to participate. The issue was not only with its length (over 300 items!) but also with the language it uses. It contained many words which that my advisor felt it would be unclear for many Maori due to the existence of multiple literacies and low English literacy levels. In response to this, some scales were removed from the questionnaire and problematic item were rewritten.

In light of this, the question must be asked, does the GLOBE model give an accurate picture of leadership internationally? And if not, how global are international leadership theories (even the ones that do their utmost to be inclusive)? Are they really just national theories posing as international theories? If so, how accurately do they represent leadership in this locality (the New Zealand context)? Also, how important is locality in shaping a leaders perceived identity?
I am keen to participate in discussions on the meanings of critical/organisation studies in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Critical management (organisation) studies are framed by an analysis of power relations and a focus on the interaction between the individual actor, the organisational and the wider environment. I have a number of priorities I believe are important to contextualise and localise our scholarship: collectivism, gender roles, post colonial impacts, geographic location. These aspects are inter-connected although I will note them singly.

(i) A localised CMS would investigate the impacts of collectivism on organisational forms and managerial processes. This is a local priority as demographic show that 22% of the population has, traditionally, a collective basis to their identity. Current management and organisational endeavours focus on the individual. The exaggeration of individuality, devoid of connectiveness, serves to exclude non-dominant world views and ways of organising. Extending our knowledge base beyond individualism has wide ramifications for organisation studies and management processes; for example, human resource management, organisational structures, leadership, careers (plus learning and pedagogy). Serious consideration of the collective bases of identity would downplay the efficacy of individual agency.

(ii) Gender constructs shape our aspirations, interactions and influence organisational activities. The gender analyses of organisations are locally nuanced. Dichotomised gender roles are constructed differently from the British origins partly, due to the recency of colonising processes. A Pakeha feminine gender(s) is still rooted in domestic ‘helpmate’ roles but also coupled with an independent pragmatism. Pakeha masculine gender(s) is still characterised by individualism (the man alone), self reliance and emotional muteness. Constructions of gender - intertwined with ethnicity – influence how power is actioned within organisations.

(iii) Interactions are all framed and influenced by ongoing ‘post’-colonial struggles and the dynamic re-positioning of Pakeha and Tangata Whenua. The power relations between the two dominant groups are in active negotiation. A complex nexus of reasons have led to a separate development of Maori organisations and management functioning; within this trend is an exciting evolution of indigenous organisation studies mixing precolonial with contemporary perspectives. The bipartite struggles for power, influence and continuity of culture are contested by recent migrant groups with coalitions shifting and changing. These struggles to acquire and establish places in the mosaic of organisational power relations needs to be part of CMS scholarship.

(iv) The geographic isolation of Aotearoa/New Zealand has deep influences on the individual psyche, societal character and how organisations develop. The focus on self-reliance, making do with less, coupled with a confidence to perform on a global stage. The extended development brought about through the ‘overseas experience’ is just one result of geographic distance that has important positive spin offs for individuals and organisations.
Critical public relations and non-corporate organisations
As a prospective PhD student in Critical Management Studies I am about to embark on research on Critical Public Relations.

My interest lies in how post-structuralist theories can both theorise how public relations is practised in organisations and possibly encourage new ways of working. I am interested in how ‘traditional’ public relations practice is used by non-corporate organisations and the creative ways they have developed public relations to serve their needs. The tensions between the organisation’s objectives and their representations in the media and wider public discourses is of interest in my research.

As I am at the beginning of my post-graduate studies I am interested in examining the various threads of post-structuralist theories and the possibilities of using them eclectically to suit the needs of specific projects. I am specifically interested in how Maori and Pakeha post-structuralist feminism can influence CMS.

You are what you say you are
The identity of organisations is at the centre of public relations activities. When the discourses surrounding the identity of a non-corporate, community, activist or grass-roots organisation meet with the media, what discursive creations are formed? Do these discourses around the identity of the organisation change? If so, does that have any bearing on the discourses surrounding identity within the organisation? What about the identities of the people involved? How do they then talk about themselves and the organisation? Can theories of hegemony be of value here? Are internal public relations influenced by the discourses about the organisation in the media and wider public? In conclusion, what role does public relations have in the creation of identity of non-corporate organisations?

How are public relations practices executed in non-corporate organisations? Who does it? What bearing does this have for CMS? Can CMS learn from how community, activist and grassroots organisations work?

Although I have provided more questions and answers, this submission reflects where I am in my research – keen to meet and talk with people and look forward to ways of working in CMS. (Fiona Shearer Email: fionamshearer@yahoo.co.nz)
Producing descriptions of Aotearoa/New Zealand workplace practices

Description is enough: Doing “hey look at this”
That description is an adequate aim for research projects is argued by conversation analysis (CA) founder Harvey Sacks when he said that his task was “to sell what I can do, and the interestingness of my findings” (Sacks 1992, Lecture 1 Fall 1968). To produce descriptions is how I have used actor-network theory (ANT) - taking some small piece of something and saying hey look at this (see for example, Law 2004 p. 26).

Accepting partial descriptions re-opens fieldwork as an option
It is not necessary to spend years in the field and claim the label “ethnography” to use observation techniques. Taking up the stance that it is neither possible nor necessary to tell whole stories opens up the possibility of doing observation research rather than closing off doing something like ethnography. This is in keeping with anthropologist Marilyn Strathern’s concept of partial and highlights practices of choosing:
“Thus one might imagine choosing two or three elements of initiation practices for theoretical consideration, knowing that for no single case had one grasped the natural character of the entire phenomenon. Other perspectives remain” (Strathern 1991 p. xiv).

Hold firm to looking first
It has been useful for me to be aware of the effects of the timing of research moves (see Silverman 1999). Rejecting telling the whole story does not mean rejecting all practices used by ethnographers. For instance, taking a look early on in research helps avoid making priori assumptions and is valuable for holding off making early replies to broad questions. Taking an ethnomethodological approach and inquiring into members methods is useful in producing descriptions of practices (attempts and achievements of ordering).

Focusing on practices of making
In the meetings that were the site of my fieldwork, workers gathered and used resources, which included forms of competence. Worlds are made, or built (Latour 1999 p. 20) by gathering many things, including what became the focus of my project, the phrase “out there”. As Latour and Woolgar said many years ago: “We do not wish to say that facts do not exist nor that there is no such thing as reality… Our point is that ‘out-there-ness’ is the consequence of scientific work rather than its cause” (1979). Law and Urry have made a more recent statement of middle ground, saying
there are places between romantic (reality is unknowable) and scientific (an ultimate truths unreachable by social science) outlooks: “while the ‘real’ is indeed ‘real’, it is also made, and that it is made within relations” (2004 p. 395). These real worlds are constantly in the making, and they are multiple:

“At such moments doubt is smothered and certainty is being manufactured. ‘But surely we are all fighting the same disease? We share a goal, don’t we?’ ‘But listen, people die, people suffer. There is a real disease out there.’ As if the certainty of death and misery necessarily brought with it the singularity of the real. So in the hospital there are, at least, these two repertoires” (Mol 2002 p. 163-4).

The ANT research practice of following the action is not restricted to watching real-time events and interaction
Because we leave traces, it is possible to follow the action using documents (see Latour 1996). This means libraries are potential research sites for producing descriptions of Aotearoa/New Zealand workplaces.
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Expression of Interest from Ralph Stablein
r.stablein@massey.ac.nz

As a participant in the first Organization, identity and locality gathering in Palmerston North, I am very interested in continuing involvement in this group. My interest in the development of a critical management studies goes back to my doctoral study days in organization behavior at Northwestern University. I moved to New Zealand in 1988 to the University of Otago. Over the years I become more acutely aware of the importance of location in the reception and development of organization studies in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

My awareness has grown due to my own experience as an immigrant, interaction with my students, and in response to intellectual currents within the international community of organization studies. I left the United States for Canada and the University of British Columbia in the Reagan years, then shifted to New Zealand, subsequently marrying a Māori woman. At a phenomenal level, the variety of perspectives on republic, commonwealth, language, race, economic, political and social ideologies, and culture have demanded reflection and ongoing sensemaking. Teaching has provided an empirical test of sorts as students of various nationalities have reacted with varying levels of understanding or incomprehension.

The shift to poststructuralism with its focus on historically situated knowledges has provided some tools for sharpening my awareness. More recently my engagement with postcolonial theory seems to be particularly helpful.

I would like to bring this individual experience and reflection to the meeting as a discussant. I think that some reading that I have been doing recently is particularly relevant to the occasion. Smith (2005) and Bishop (2005) have written for the international community on Kaupapa Māori methodology. Denzin (2005) as reflected on a range of indigenous research epistemologies.

In addition, I propose to discuss the relevance of ideas from a recent book of chapters edited by Barber Czarniawska & Guje Sevon (2005). Their examples of translation and inquiry into its mechanisms may provide a vocabulary for linking our own concerns in Aotearoa/New Zealand with the larger community of organization studies.
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