## Alternative paradigms for sustainability: The Māori worldview

## Abstract

**Purpose:** Marketing’s current Western dominant social paradigm (DSP) is said to perpetuate ‘green’, yet unsustainable practices. The DSP does not support strictly pro-environmental practices and its proposed alternative, the New Environmental Paradigm (NEP), lacks in-depth conceptualisation, especially concerning business and marketing activities. However, the two paradigms contrast so much that a shift from one to the other is vehemently argued against and conceptually rife with problems. This article seeks to expand upon the merits of the NEP using Indigenous people’s environmental philosophies – specifically the Māori people of New Zealand – as examples of historically supported and successful sustainable philosophies. It conceptualises the Māori viewpoint to provide a more practical alternative to the DSP and includes propositions for marketing implementation of this perspective

**Design/methodology/approach:** This is a conceptual piece.

**Findings:** By explicating both the DSP and NEP and reflecting on each through an Indigenous Māori viewpoint, this article provides propositions for a broadened paradigm that support sustainability and its application for sustainable marketing.

**Originality/value:** This article is the first to explicate parts of the NEP and broaden its reach by integrating a Māori worldview as an alternative to drastically changing the current DSP. It does so by proposing that marketers embrace a middle ground that is influenced by Indigenous belief systems.
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## Introduction

Marketers have failed to adequately define the environmental problem (Kilbourne and Beckmann, 1998). This failure might be due to misunderstanding the relationship between humans, the economy and nature, attributable to a belief in the Dominant Social Paradigm (DSP) (Borland & Lindgreen, 2013; Marcus, Kurucz, & Colbert, 2010). However, with more recent research focusing on the limits of nature, sustainability issues have come to the fore— especially so with the increased frequency of natural disasters, economic instability (i.e. 2008 financial crisis) and social issues (i.e. rising inequality in developed countries).

Recent ‘sustainability’ efforts by marketers, such as the creation of ‘greener’ products and charitable donations, do not address the use of resources on our resource-limited planet nor do they address the social issues related to the production of these goods (Varey, 2011). To resolve ‘green’ yet unsustainable marketing practices, marketing sustainability and corporate social responsibility (CSR) practices must consider paradigms, worldviews, environmental values and ecological beliefs if they are to understand the implications of those underlying assumptions and values (Kilbourne, 1998; Kilbourne & Beckmann, 1998; Olsen, Lodwick, & Dunlap, 1992).

The DSP is defined as “the metaphysical, beliefs, institutions, habits, etcetera that collectively provide social lenses through which individuals and groups interpret their social world” (Milbrath, 1984, p. 7). In other words, it is the emphasis on the institutional structures, objectives, values and behaviours that govern worldviews and characterise a society. The current DSP espouses economic growth, laissez-faire economics, humans rule or dominate nature, individual property rights and technological solutions to environmental problems (Cotgrove, 1982; Dunlap, 2008). This dominant worldview is said to perpetuate current sustainability (environmental, social and economic) issues (Beddoe et al., 2009; Borland & Lindgreen, 2013; Matutinović, 2007). The DSP has pervaded since the mid-nineteenth century and the start of the Enlightenment. During the Enlightenment, thinkers began to confront the relationship between progress and the emergence of a free society (Bowles, 2014). Increased material wealth was considered a sign of such progress. The desire for increased material well-being tends to intensify consumption and promote materialism and consequently negatively affects environmental sustainability (Kilbourne et al., 2009; Kilbourne, McDonagh, & Prothero, 1997).

The current DSP does not acknowledge the limitations of continuous growth, the intimate connection between humans and nature, and the relationship of the economy to nature (Dunlap & Van Liere 1984; Marcus et al., 2010; Robertson, 1983). A fundamental paradigm shift is thus needed for marketing research and practice to develop a greater focus on sustainability (Kilbourne 1998). An alternative to the DSP has been posited to be the new environmental/ecological paradigm (NEP) (Bansal & Kilbourne, 2001; Dunlap & Van Liere, 1978, 1980, 1984; Dunlap, Van Liere, Mertig, & Jones, 2000; Kilbourne & Beckmann, 1998). With its basis in ecologism, the NEP could potentially drive the transformation of society rather than merely reforming it (Dobson, 1990). It could also increase the use of sustainable marketing, as a more ecocentric view of the world has been shown to protect the natural environment as well as support funding and regulations for the environment (Hawcroft & Milfont, 1010). However, marketing literature does not account for critiques of the NEP which fault its conceptualisation, issues of dimensionality of the scale itself (Amburgey & Thoman, 2012; Dunlap, 2008), and the lack of its translation into actionable business activities and goals.  For example, the NEP is considered an individual’s worldview, thus various studies examine environmentalists, business students, and working professionals as individuals (Hawcroft & Milfont, 2010). However the translation of the NEP is lacking in business philosophy and instead, business philosophy tends to borrow from related fields such as ecocentrism (e.g., Borland, Ambrosini, Lindgreen, & Vanhamme, 2016; Borland & Lindgreen, 2013).The DSP and NEP both conceptually and empirically negatively correlate (Dunlap, 2008; Shafer, 2006; Speth, 2010). The current Western DSP and NEP are incompatible as the DSP is based on anthropocentric beliefs that value nature because it maintains human life (Borland & Lindgreen, 2013; Kilbourne, 1998; Thompson and Barton, 1994), and the NEP on an ecocentric belief system that values nature because it has intrinsic worth and therefore deserves protection in its own right.

In summary, the DSP does not support strictly pro-environmental practices, and its alternative, the NEP, lacks in-depth conceptualisation, especially relative to business and marketing activities (e.g. Amburgey & Thoman, 2012; Dunlap, 2008). As such, this article sets out to conceptualise an alternative worldview, that of the Māori people of New Zealand. This approach provides a more practical alternative to the DSP by broadening the scope of the NEP and includes propositions for its marketing implementation. What follows is a brief overview of the embeddedness of the DSP in marketing. Next, is a discussion of the origins of sustainability in Indigenous worldviews, acknowledging the wealth of centuries-old knowledge passed down, and focus on a Māori worldview of sustainability. Comparing and contrasting the three paradigms transitions into the development of propositions and concludes with specific examples of how marketers might implement them. A discussion of how multiple contrasting paradigms might co-exist follows.

**Background**

The DSP paradigm significantly influences lives as it shapes not only value systems but also specific beliefs, attitudes, behavioural intentions and behaviours (Stern, Dietz, & Guagnano, 1995). It is the lens of interpretation, embedded, implicit and unthought-of (Mittelstaedt, Shultz II, Kilbourne, & Peterson, 2014). Paradigms shape how marketers perceive issues and their potential solutions (de Witt, de Boer, Hedlund, & Osseweijer, 2016). Individuals can hold their worldviews, but societies also tend to have dominant worldviews (paradigms) (van Egmond & de Vries, 2011).

The current state of sustainability research and marketer adoption is far behind expectations, given the age and maturity of the sustainability concept, with no real movement towards fostering environmental concern and behaviours (McDonagh & Prothero, 2014; Shove, 2010). Since the 1970s, Western consumption practices have links with the environmental problem (1973; Fisk, 1974). However, much of the subsequent “green” marketing research (and practice) has focused on traditional, managerial and micromarketing techniques that encourage continued consumption, but of a greener variety (Kilbourne & Beckmann, 1998). Tactics like these are not considered sustainable as they are viewed as “managerial strategies to increase sales” (Kilbourne, 1998: p.642) in the context of traditional profit-centric policies, and do not focus on the more prevalent issues (Kilbourne, 1998; Kilbourne et al., 2002). Subsequent research and practice have often focused on characteristics and measures of sustainability, with an emphasis on preservation of natural resources for future use, as opposed to the conservation of nature because it has inherent value beyond its utility for humans (Kilbourne, McDonagh, & Prothero, 1997). The research additionally spotlights the consumer behaviour of the so-called elusive ‘green consumer’ (Peattie, 2001; van Dam & Apeldoorn, 1996), emphasizing the ‘business case’ for sustainability (i.e. competitive advantage, cost savings) rather than moral, ethical and social responsibility (Allen, Cunliffe, & Easterby-Smith, 2017; Hahn, Preuss, Pinkse, & Figge, 2014; Tregidga, Milne, & Kearins). These findings echo the DSP as a paradigm that not only drives CSR but also informs research, shaping research goals, practices and worthiness (Buttle, 1994).

It is difficult for marketers to carry out ecological concerns with anthropocentric views that contradict them (Kilbourne et al. 1997). For instance, the DSP espies economic growth and technological optimism, so environmentalism reduces to policy issues and fixes rather than explorations of the causes of such issues (Rodman 1980). Reduce, reuse, recycle, and regulation practices, along with concepts of eco-efficiency, are grounded in an anthropocentric viewpoint (McDonough & Braungart, 2002; Young & Tilley, 2006). Kilbourne et al. (1997) discuss a need for development beyond the current Western DSP, which values increased economic growth over quality of life and the environment. The field of evolutionary psychology explains our struggle to become more sustainable. The evolutionary perspective argues, albeit controversially (Gannon, 2002), that our ancestors adapted in order to thrive in their harsh surroundings, but many of the tendencies we have inherited from them, such as our propensity for self-interest and valuing the present over the future, are detrimental and destructive to our environment (Griskevicius, Cantú, & Vugt, 2012). While concern for the environment already exists, awareness of the link between the current Western DSP in marketing, CSR and environmental degradation is essential.

 The Marketing Academy functions within the DSP, and centres on satisfying consumer needs and wants and driving an unsustainable consumer lifestyle by promoting continued consumption, with the ultimate goal of profit maximisation (Kilbourne et al., 1997). Such a view of the world, embedded within the current DSP, can be viewed as being at odds with the vision of consumption as something which must recognise the limits of nature and focus on sustainability (Robertson, 1983). What is therefore needed is a fundamental rethink of the materialistic agenda of the current consumer society. Society today seems to promote the belief that the hyper-consumption prevalent in many western industrialised societies can continue unabated, as long as it is the consumption of environmentally friendly products, with consumers not needing to examine their materialistic lifestyles (Kilbourne et al., 1997). Fisk (1973) argued that a new attitude toward the meaning of consumption and a new social order is needed. However, marketing philosophy based on ecocentrism may be challenging to implement, and transitioning from the DSP to the NEP unachievable, with marketers seemingly trapped in a capitalist society (Borland et al., 2016; Fitchett & McDonagh, 2000; Iyer, 1999; McDonagh, 1998; Shrivastava, 1995).

According to William Kilbourne, a prominent and key scholar on sustainability paradigms in marketing literature, what is now needed is a fundamental rethink of the materialistic agenda of current consumer society (Kilbourne et al., 1997). The attitudes and belief structures that govern the institutions of the DSP must be re-examined and reinvented for a successful shift to responsible marketing strategy to take place, and the transformation of the DSP towards the NEP promoted by Dunlap and van Liere to occur (1978; Kilbourne, 1998; Kilbourne & Beckmann, 1998; Kilbourne et al., 2002; Kilbourne et al., 1997). Kilbourne’s discussion of the philosophical differences between the DSP and the NEP relates to their economic, political, and technological dimensions, as well as the social facets of their structural, functional and human perspectives (e.g. Kilbourne, 1995). Because explication of the social elements of the NEP does not exist (i.e. responsibility to care for humans, equality), and is limited for its economic dimensions (i.e. limits to growth), further clarification and conceptualisation of the NEP is needed, especially in contrast to the DSP. In summary, previous research has touched upon an ecocentric organisational or marketing philosophy (e.g. Borland et al., 2016; Borland & Lindgreen, 2013; Gladwin, Kennelly, & Krause, 1995; Purser, Park, & Montuori, 1995) and the need to shift to the NEP (Bansal and Kilbourne, 2001), but does not acknowledge the weaknesses of the NEP. Consequently, asserting that a worldview inspired by Indigenous beliefs, specifically a Māori worldview (e.g. Spiller, Pio, Erakovic, & Henare, 2011; Tapsell & Woods, 2010), may further broaden the NEP and offer more specific marketing philosophies from which marketers can draw.

**Paradigms of Sustainability**

*Indigenous Views of Sustainability*

Indigenous views of sustainability differ substantially from Western perspectives relative to the responsibility of current generations to protect the environment. The drive towards obligatory behaviours in Māori as well as in other Indigenous or religious upbringings enforces strict and specific practices (such as Tikanga, or custom, and Rahui, or restriction to access) which have been tested and refined over thousands of years to ensure diverse and thriving ecosystems (Altman & Whitehead, 2003; Beckford, Jacobs, Williams, & Nahdee, 2010). This traditional ecological knowledge is the “*cumulative body of knowledge, practice and beliefs, evolving by adaptive processes and handed down through generations by cultural transmission about the relationship of living beings (including humans) with one another and the environment*” (Berkes, Colding, & Folke, 2000, p. 1252).

The Māori people of New Zealand have passed down Tikanga (right ways of doing things) for generations. This practice is associated with kaitiakitanga, or caring for the environment, guardianship and resource management (Marsden, 2003), and originated with Ranginui (the sky father) and Papa-tu-a-nuku (the earth mother) who are the primaeval parents of the earth. In the beginning, they were inseparable, and their children lived pressed between them in the dark. Wishing for independence, the children plotted successfully to separate them, and Ranginui formed the sky and Papa-tu-a-nuku the earth. Papa-tu-a-nuku nourished her children from the land, and Ranginui nourished the land from the tears he shed at their separation. This story and others provide a lineage for all natural entities of the earth (whether animate or inanimate) and tell of the Whakapapa (familial relationship) in all earthly matters, thus obliging the Māori to protect all things (e.g. kaitiakitanga). Whakapapa also provides the basis for the holistic system view of the Māori people of New Zealand, which is espoused by many Indigenous peoples around the world (Harmsworth & Awatere, 2013).

While the specific practices of Indigenous people likely defy generalisation, the beliefs and views of the world that enable their behaviour is of primary interest. For instance, the Māori definition of sustainability differs slightly from that of the Brundtland (1987) report, but with profound impact. *Intergenerational equity* is the Māori focus so that all parts of the ecosystem are passed on to the next generation in an *as good or better state as found*. Thus by expanding the current definition, it can be concluded that sustainability is not a process that “*meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs*” (Brundtland, 1987, p. 43). This statement implies that while a sufficing view is acceptable:

*Sustainability ensures that social and natural environments are protected or improved to provide intergenerational equity at the very least.*

Other Indigenous groups have similar beliefs and sustainability practices. For example, the Australian Aborigines hold plots of land that are usually owned by extended family and are not transferrable. The plots encompass sacred sites that have rules mitigating over-exploitation of the land. Each new generation inherits the knowledge and rules of these sites and thus becomes its guardians, specifically responsible because they are the only ones possessing this vital information. Plots are not completely self-sufficient but will produce enough surplus to share with other plots to gain missing resources. In the Aboriginal culture, the social ties that emerge from sharing, rather than withholding, material, spiritual and knowledge-based resources create value. Such reciprocity increases social status (Wills-Johnson, 2010). The focus is on utilising resources for subsistence rather than trade with a drive toward achieving wealth from intangibles like education, arts, entertainment and care of others (Sveiby, 2009). The First Nation of Walpole Island in Canada similarly understands their dependence on the environment. They practice responsible coexistence by harvesting only essentials, which respects and preserves the environment for future generations (Beckford et al., 2010).

Indigenous groups, such as Native Americans and Australian Aboriginals, and religions such as Buddhism and Taoism, hold similar holistic views of the world and environment (Berkes, Folke & Gadgil, 1994; Jenkins, 2002). More specifically, the nature-human connection commonly segments into Indigenous views and Western views (Johnson & Murton, 2007). Moreover, Indigenous knowledge is separated from scientific (Western) knowledge and is generalised across cultures in several ways:

It appears that Indigenous knowledge differs from scientific knowledge in being moral, ethically-based, spiritual, intuitive and holistic; it has a large social context. Social relations are not separate from relations between humans and non-human entities. The individual self-identity is not distinct from the surrounding world. There often is no separation of mind and matter. Traditional knowledge is an integrated system of knowledge, practice *and* beliefs (Berkes et al., 1994, p. 283).

The attention here is on the worldview of the Māori people of New Zealand. Thus, comparing different Indigenous views is beyond the scope of this paper. It is important to note, however, that while this paper specifically references the Māori culture, other Indigenous groups share some of its views (Berkes et al., 1994; Jenkins, 2002; Johnson & Murton, 2007).

Indigenous peoples have wrestled with sustaining their environments throughout history, and many have succeeded (Wills-Johnson, 2010). Their views of the world can provide lessons for such an endeavour by providing not only a paradigmatic path forward, thereby responding to critiques of the NEP, but also by providing clearer pathways for more ethnocentrically appropriate and sustainable behaviours for marketers taking a Māori point of view of sustainability. What follows is the explication of the DSP, NEP, and what is now labelled the Māori Paradigm.

*The Māori Paradigm for Sustainability*

The current conception of sustainability within the DSP shows sustainability as the intersection between the three rings of economy, society and environment, erroneously leading to the belief that each may function independently. Seeing economy, environment and society as separate leads to trade-offs between each and society, with the environment treated as a resource instead of equal and dependent (Daly & Townsend, 1993). If the weighting of the rings were acknowledged, one could see that governments within the DSP focus first on the economy and its development in the current neoliberal sense of growth in a capitalist economy, before shifting their focus to the other rings of society and the environment. A nested model of the three rings with the economy as the central ring surrounded by society and the environment may help to envisage the real interdependencies, with specific emphasis on environmental constraints on society and the economy due to its limits for dealing with growth.

[Insert figure 1 here]

An alternative conceptualisation of the sustainability diagram is the Māori view of the world (Morgan, 2003; Harmsworth & Awatere, 2013). Here, concentric circles depict the welfare of each aspect: Economic well-being, Social well-being, Cultural well-being, and Environmental well-being. Explained another way, they illustrate the Mauri, or life force/well-being, of the individual or immediate family, the community (the hapu), and environment.

[Insert figure 2 here]

Economic well-being refers to the well-being of the individual and close family. Having a view based on well-being does not concern material well-being, but rather an overall love and compassion achieved not through economic competition but by sharing and co-operation (Urlich, Cloher & Johnston, 1999). Social well-being refers to the well-being of the community and an individual’s feelings of belonging to that group, as well as access to the natural environment for recreation, growth and relaxation. Access to employment opportunities also works towards ensuring this form of social well-being (Morgan, 2003). Cultural well-being requires development and preservation of cultural values, ethics and related practices within the governing body. Last, environmental sustainability regards the well-being of the environment through its Mauri or healthy life force (Urlich, Cloher & Johnston, 1999).

The Māori paradigm weights environmental well-being as most important in decision making, with cultural and family well-being following, then social well-being being less so. Economic well-being is considered the least important in decision making. Thus, if a part of the natural environment is unwell, then its health is placed above cultural and community needs as well as the needs of the whanau (family) and business. However, the placement of the rings reveals their interactive nature, based on both Indigenous and Western views of the world. Understanding this weighting of decisions helps marketers to prioritise decision making.

*Contrasting Paradigms and their Co-Existence*

It is important to recognise that a paradigm becomes dominant, not just because a larger proportion of people accept it, but also because the influential groups in society champion it (Cotgrove, 1982). These groups hold dominant positions, which help prescribe presumed institutions that benefit the dominant group. This group also uses the DSP to justify, validate and maintain established standards and conventions within a society, such as political and social institutions, and therefore functions as a prevailing ideology (Cotgrove, 1982). Most importantly, while society embraces the DSP (Kilbourne, 1998), most individuals, whether conscious of it or not, reside firmly within the DSP, and possess attitudes towards the environment that little resemble ecological concern (Perlmutter & Trist, 1986). The embeddedness and institutionalisation of DSP principles mask its central importance to current governments, authorities and other institutions’ ethos.

Political and economic liberalism, technological optimism, anthropocentrism, competition and atomism (Mittelstaedt et al. 2014) characterise the Western DSP. More specifically, the DSP deems that (1) people are different from nature and dominant over it, (2) people create their future, (3) the world gives unlimited opportunities, and (4) human ingenuity maintains progress (Catton and Dunlap 1980). The DSP’s dominance, at least in Western society, is expressed in rationalist-humanist terms (van Egmond & de Vries, 2011). The most notable institutional representatives of this worldview are government organisations, corporations (Van Dijk, 1989; van Egmond & de Vries, 2011) and business studies (Hahn, Kolk & Winn, 2010; Springett, 2005, 2010). However, some scholars argue that society’s current scientific and technological successes, especially our consumerist and materialistic society adhering to the DSP, is the root of our current unsustainability (Beddoe et al., 2009; van Egmond & de Vries, 2011); meaning a paradigm change must take place for society to combat sustainability issues.

Marketers function within the DSP, emphasising the satisfaction of consumer needs and wants, and promoting continued consumption, with the ultimate goal of maximising profits (Kilbourne et al., 1997). These tactics are especially important to question, as research continues to show that materialism and excess consumption of goods does not increase happiness (Burroughs & Rindfleisch, 2002; Van Boven, 2005). The current rate of consumption in developed countries is unsustainable (McDonald, 2015) so the worldview embedded within the current DSP is at odds with the idea of consumption being something which must recognise the limits of nature (Robertson, 1983).

Favouring a “ ‘deep’ approach to greening”, Crane (2000, p.149) doubts the ability of the market to negate the damage already done to the environment. In addition, Buttle (1994) questions whether those who hold a traditional view of marketing are even aware of the questions that need to be asked to drive change; this is because marketing and CSR is framed within capitalism and favours liberal economics (the DSP) so is therefore incompatible with the NEP (Mittelstaedt et al., 2014; Prothero, McDonagh, & Dobscha, 2010). The solution then must be viewed in a separate context and researchers must begin to think differently and more innovatively, focusing on reflexivity, diversity and non-conformance (Buttle, 1994).

The NEP is based on ecosophy as elaborated by Naess (1973). Ecosophy is a philosophy of ecological harmony or equilibrium where humans are assumed to be equal with nature. Followers “aim to create social systems that are diverse, symbiotic, compatible with natural ecosystems and diversity of living beings, and that support social justice and peace” (Drengson, 2011, p. 10). In Dunlap and Van Liere’s (1978) original conceptualisations of the NEP, they state five base assumptions:

 i. Existence of ecological limits to growth

 ii. Importance of maintaining the balance of nature

 iii. Rejection of the anthropocentric notion that nature exists primarily for human use

 iv. Rejection of exemptionalism

 v. Belief in the likelihood of an eco-crisis

In contrast, endorsement of the Western DSP has led to an acceptance of behaviours that causes environmental degradation and lack of support for policies that protect the environment (Pirages, 1977). Consequently, adopting an ecocentric view allows for the development of new approaches to sustainability in marketing (Borland & Lindgreen, 2013) and marketing strategy (Borland, Ambrosini, Lindgreen, & Vanhamme, 2016). The study of the NEP can help researchers become aware of its underlying beliefs (Kilbourne et al., 1997).

In the case of the DSP and NEP and the proposed Māori worldview, the means and ends of the paradigms can overlap but may also contradict each other. For example, the DSP stipulates the ‘ends’ of business is profit maximisation, which does not necessarily contradict the Māori worldview of profit earning but instead the ‘means’ change, whereby business practices business change. More obviously some elements of the NEP and Māori worldviews overlap as their ‘means’ (achieve a sustainable, equitable, fair, collaborative society) are similar; however, the Māori worldview provides explicit ‘ends’ to achieve these ‘means’ which the conceptualisations of the NEP have failed to do.

What follows is a discussion contrasting the DSP, NEP, and the view of the Indigenous people of New Zealand, the Māori people. The discussion continues with proposed implications for sustainable business and marketing practices by adopting the Māori approach to sustainability based on the six paradigmatic dimensions identified in the marketing literature by Kilbourne for the DSP and NEP: Political, Economic, Technological, Structural, Functional and Human Position dimensions (Kilbourne, 1995). These propositions were developed through deductive and logical reasoning using literature around Kaitiakitanga, the DSP and NEP in new ways (MacInnis, 2011; Cornelissen, 2017).

**Propositions for a Māori Approach to Marketing Sustainability**

*Proposition 1*

 Three primary tenets exemplify the Political institutions of present-day Western societies: possessive individualism, private property and limited government. Possessive individualism refers to the fact that people are in “possession of themselves and their abilities” (Kilbourne et al., 2009, p. 263), which means they are free from the will of others, voluntarily engage in shared bonds and relationships and are in singular possession of their competencies and products of their labour (Cotgrove, 1982). Early history taught that accepting individuals as the sole owners of the results of their labour consequently led to the justification for the ownership of private property, one of the many outputs of a person’s efforts (Locke, 1963). Limited Government was then instituted to protect people’s lives, freedom and property. This type of leadership is now viewed as essential to protecting individuals and their rights to own property (Kilbourne et al., 2002).

While a complete debate on the political ideology surrounding the NEP is beyond the scope of this article, a brief explanation is helpful (for an in-depth discussion, please see Eckersley, 1992). It is agreed that the political dimension of the NEP takes an ecocentric approach that is decentralised and non-hierarchical (Bansal & Kilbourne, 2001; Eckersley, 1992; Gladwin et al., 1995), which limits property rights as the silent voice of non-humans is also represented (Eckersley, 1992). Dobson et al. (2009) believe that ecologism is one political theory that abides in these beliefs and may be used as its basis, though other political theories exist (Eckersley 1992).

In contrast, the Māori view of political philosophy advocates empowering dialogic communication and governance through a flat, decentralised and participatory structure. This approach, in part, regards group property ownership as not bound by time (Kennedy & Laczniak, 2014). Thus, the whole tribe or community owns property in perpetuity and each person in the community participates in its possession because he or she has a role in safeguarding the knowledge necessary to successfully manage the environment for future generations (Sveiby, 2009). While co-existence and compassion (Tapsell et al., 2011) are born from a belief in whakapapa, they are related and interlinked (Marsden, 2003), thereby leading to the first proposition:

*Proposition 1: An organisation that follows a Māori view of the world would function using a flat, decentralised and participatory governance structure, including the environment as a stakeholder.*

This proposition relates to sustainability, as it addresses the negative impacts of individual ownership and profit from a liberal political structure. It also allows for the environment to have a voice within the governance (Starik, 1995). Last, it affords improved stakeholder well-being within a participatory structure.

Organisations that use decentralised power and authority to build a consensus relate intimately to the concepts of Māori wealth and social capital, “creating value for the entire network of stakeholders through co-operation” (Phillips, Woods, & Lythberg, 2016, p. 248). Governance utilises collective decision making, and business failure is usually attributed to weak governance (Phillips et al., 2016). A business model that emphasises flat, decentralised and participatory governance structure is the co-operative, though other models might also illustrate this type of structure.

Capital owners, not business investors, control co-operatives. Capital owners may be controlled by those who sell to the co-op, who buy from it or who work there (Hill, 2000). Several principles govern co-ops, including ideologies that resonate with Māori principles, for example, democratic member control (“one-member, one-vote”), co-operation among co-ops, concern for sustainable development, and a fair share of economic returns (Hill, 2000). Co-ops may develop “institutions and practices of employment, finance and governance” which lead to greater employee participation in decision making, thus exhibiting participatory governance (Moye, 1993, p. 273). For example, Tui Balms, creator of soothing and healing skin care balms, is a worker co-operative that aims to create a sustainable co-created business model, which has minimal management hierarchies and a flat wage structure. Tui Balms’ additionally donates profits that are not used to develop the business (stipulated as at least 5% of all sales) to New Zealand registered charitable trusts.

Ngai Tahu Pounamu, a Ngai Tahu tribal economic initiative in New Zealand, is another company utilising a decentralised approach to governance that is an example of customary Māori economic structures (Barr & Reid, 2014) not based on a co-operative model (Reid, Rout, & Anderson, 2016). Ngai Tahu Pounamu sets clear divisions of responsibility, with the iwi investing in the marketing processes for Ngai Tahu pounamu jewellery, and the hapū Ngati Waewae leading the harvesting and manufacturing processes and working with an array of individual and family pounamu carvers (Barr & Reid 2014). Both hapū and individual carvers invest a portion of their income back into the tribe to benefit the community, which is seen as a contemporary form of reciprocal obligation (Reid et al., 2016). These activities occur within the resource management rules, and customs enforced by the hapū, and have been successful overall, with distribution increasing from one to fifty outlets within two years (Reid et al., 2016).

A flat organisational structure enables a company to promote increased employee involvement in decision making and marketing strategy. Inclusive practices afford employees opportunities to have a voice in decision making, thereby increasing morale and utilisation of employee knowledge and skills. A decentralised structure also allows continuous organisational learning, flexibility, and time efficiency in dealing with unexpected problems and market conditions (Zammuto & O'Connor, 1992). One example of this type of decentralised organisation is Patagonia, which famously rejected Black Friday in 2016, and donated 100% of its sales to environmental organisations. The idea to do so came from Taylor Cox, a Junior Graphic designer, ten days before Black Friday. Patagonia’s flat structure enabled the organisation to act quickly on this marketing idea and implement it within a short timeframe (Patagonia, 2018). The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO, 2002) actively encourages this type of decentralised system to allow for decision making at the local government and community levels, which aids in environmental protection.

*Proposition 2*

The DSP designates that society organises its economic activity via an institution of market exchange. Because society is a social construct, market exchange is dependent upon and formed by a variety of other social actions. The essential requirement of market exchange is unrestrained competition, which predictably translates to economic growth (Hirschman, 1977; Polonsky et al., 2014), an essential aspect of capitalism. Capitalism, which is a relatively recent form of economic exchange, dominates market exchange activity within modern Western societies (Bansal & Kilbourne, 2001).

Three main conditions constitute the Economic dimension of the DSP:

1. Individuals are free to pursue their interests.
2. An increase in production defines progress.
3. Wealth unevenly distributed is still justified by the criterion expressed under ‘Pareto Optimality’, or, the gains received by one individual may not come at the expense of another (Friedman, 1962; Kilbourne, 1998; Heilbroner, 1985)

Aspects of the NEP acknowledge limits to growth and a shifting toward balance and sufficiency (Bansal & Kilbourne, 2001). Steady-state economies posit that sustainable growth and development need to be “within the regenerative and assimilative capacities of the ecosystem” (Daly & Townsend, 1993, p. 268). Thus, resource value shapes economics rather than market-determined prices (Devall & Sessions, 1985), where local production serves local needs, and the community takes precedence, exchanging only genuine surplus (Gladwin et al., 1995). The aim is for healthy growth, not stagnancy, the goal being to reach an equilibrium of steady-state economics, which prefers sustainable activities (Robertson, 1983; Dunlap &Van Liere, 1978). Such ‘economies of permanence’ shift the priority to human needs, social justice and ecological sustainability (Schumacher, 1973, p. 36). While an in-depth discussion of economics is beyond the scope of this paper, please seek further details in Robertson’s book (1983).

The Māori view focuses on community and family subsistence to protect its resources (Harmsworth & Awatere, 2013). To reiterate, as group ownership versus individual ownership exists, the well-being of the group comes before the individual. ‘Value’ is defined as that which is useful and has historical, commemorative, cultural, social, or aesthetic meaning (Marsden, 2003). In other words, instead of measuring economic success by monetary growth, it is measured by the health of the Mauri, or life force, of the immediate family and its ability to service the broader community in environmental, social, spiritual and social well-being goals (Durie, 2001, 2003). This “economy of affection”, or Arohatanga in exchange, places sharing, compassion and love before profit (Harmsworth & Awatere, 2013). The next proposition elaborates on this:

*Proposition 2: A Māori view of the world moves beyond profit as the primary motive of firms and advocates a drive towards goals which attain environmental, spiritual and social well-being.*

The provision of solutions to environmental, social, and spiritual well-being needs is the priority in marketing decisions, especially concerning product and service development. Marketing and business processes that do not harm the environment, society and people during the development of the product or service meet this objective. Specifically, scholars have promulgated a move from products to services (e.g. Charter, Peattie, Ottman, & Polonsky, 2002; Murphy, 2005), thereby shifting the focus to need satisfaction by employing renting, sharing and collaborative consumption (Peattie, 2001). Examples of organisations which envision this approach are Patagonia and Eco Store (in New Zealand).

Another example is Kākano, a local organisation in New Zealand, which places healthy food and healthy food education/training at its core. The organisation seeks to empower whanau (families) and the community to create and eat healthy, sustainable meals. Behind this philosophy is the sourcing of sustainable and ethically grown, fed and produced products (Kākano, 2017). Social enterprises and entrepreneurship are especially relevant to this philosophy, and establishing organisations based on solving social issues and adding social value to the community are straight forward implementations of this approach to doing business (Grant, 2008; Tapsell & Woods, 2010). Another example is VisionWest. Its mission is to reduce poverty and homelessness and support the young, elderly, and infirm. VisionWest provides numerous services that address their mission vis a vis homecare and community housing, training and education, counselling, social work support, chaplaincy, financial literacy and budgeting support, and community banks (including food and school uniform support) (VisionWest, 2017).

Returning to the Patagonia example, it is apparent how operating under such a world view has made it an exceptional organisation. The company prides itself on its environmental conscience and the social well-being of its employees, and actively resists the trappings of capitalism. By staying true to its mission to “build the best product, cause no unnecessary harm, use business to inspire and implement solutions to the environmental crisis” and placing sustainability and its workers ahead of profit, economic growth is not the sole measure of success (Patagonia, 2018). That said, utilisation of CSR still has financial benefits in the form of increased profits (Torugsa, O’Donohue & Hecker, 2012). Further, employees want to work in socially responsible organisations. (Peters, 2019).

*Proposition 3*

In keeping with an underpinning commitment to economic growth, the DSP considers the economic goals of society as bound to the advancement of technology (Bansal & Kilbourne 2001). Optimism surrounds technology as a means of growth. Seeking technological remedies for the environmental degradation brought on by such growth (Feenberg, 1991; Polonsky et al., 2014) also affords further control over the natural environment (Kilbourne, 1998; Winner, 1986).

Alternatively, if relationships rather than material well-being are the primary concern of the NEP, technology should be used for personal growth, belongingness, love, esteem, quality of life, and cooperation (Bansal & Kilbourne, 2001). Such social ends mean that technology needs to mediate between people and the environment only when strictly necessary as relationships are valued more (Winner, 1986). This is the humane view of technology where “…it will be good to work with, and under people’s control, it will produce a good end product from which most people can benefit, (not just the privileged minority), and it will be sparing in its use of resources and kind to the environment” (Robertson, 1983, p.42; Gladwin et al., 1995). Similarly, in the Māori view, man-made and natural capital are complementary but not substitutable (Neumayer, 1999; O’Riordan & Cameron, 1994; Sveiby, 2009). Technology acknowledges processes for undertaking actions but does not in itself provide an understanding of why those processes and actions occur (Marsden, 2003). Again, placing the well-being of people and the environment first through non-material benefits such as spiritual and cognitive enrichment is preferred (Harmsworth & Awatere, 2013), thereby echoing the NEP view. Thus:

*Proposition 3:* *A Māori view of technology places value on technology’s ability to complement but not replace the natural environment, advocating for technology that enables personal growth and cooperation.*

While technology is used to provide services and goods for society, it should not replace the natural environment. For instance, accepting that businesses will pollute waterways and result in the development of technological alternatives to those waterways is unacceptable. However, the development of technology to replace pollutants and to clean waterways comes within the remit of this approach, as long as it is developed and implemented in tandem. If technology only ‘fixed’ waterways but did not address the unsustainable causes of what polluted them, the current DSP would agree. Further, recent legislation in New Zealand requires farmers to protect their waterways by fencing all streams and rivers on their land. Utilising fence technology to protect the waterways from nutrient runoff from fertilisers and effluent does not deal with the underlying issue. Instead, technology and science that captures and re-uses the nutrients in the runoff that is beneficial to the soil but harmful to waterways are being developed (NIWA, 2014).

*Proposition 4*

If one agrees that liberalism is at the heart of the DSP, then ecocentrism is at the heart of the NEP. To explain, while the Western DSP links back to political and economic theory, the NEP links back to ecosophy with ecocentrism at its heart. Ecocentrism assumes that humans and non-humans are equal and both have inherent value (Cotgrove, 1982; Naess, 1973; Purser, Park and Montouri, 1995) regardless of their usefulness (Merchant, 1980). Neither is more worthy than the other; they each have different attributes (Eckersley, 1992). While two views of ecocentrism exist, human welfare ecology is rejected here, identified as unsustainable and a form of anthropocentrism because it places the human before nature (O’Riordan, 1976). Instead, this article accepts Eckersley’s (1992) view, as stated above.

The current DSP however, promotes an anthropocentric view of man’s relationship to nature (Dunlap & Van Liere 1984). This perspective puts humans at the centre of human-nature dualism (Purser et al., 1995) and has its basis in the principle that nonhuman nature exists to serve humankind (Kilbourne & Polonsky, 2005). Nature is, in this way exploited, particularly in the pursuit of technological progress, as humans see themselves as separate from nature (Borland & Lindgreen, 2013, Hawcroft & Milfont 2010).

In keeping with an ecocentric belief, the Māori view maintains that the environment embeds human beings; therefore, the voice of the environment is as much a part of them as it is apart from them. Humans are recipients of the gifts that Papa-tu-a-nuku provides. They do not own these gifts and thus have no right to control or exploit them (Marsden, 2003). This ideology differs slightly from the NEP’s view of ecocentrism; instead of believing that humans and non-humans are equal, the view holds that humans and non-humans are one, which comes from the whakapapa lesson that the lineages of animate and inanimate objects come from one another and are related. Kaitiakitanga, or the stewardship of the environment and its guardianship over it, is doubly important, as intergenerational equity not only applies to humans but non-humans as well because all things are one with the environment, related to it and a part of it (Challenger, 2013). This bond implies:

*Proposition 4: A Māori view of the world sees intergenerational equity as applying to both humans and non-humans in tandem with the natural environment; as such, this view includes the natural environment as an equal stakeholder in decision-making and behaviour.*

This view champions the idea that an organisation’s products reflect upon the environment and the rest of society. A cradle-to-cradle model, for example, ensures all materials and goods are produced and consumed in a circular system. This model offers two distinct metabolisms: biological metabolism and technical metabolism (Braungart, McDonagh, & Bollinger, 2007). Biological nutrients are nutrients designed for living systems that the natural environment can re-assimilate after use (e.g. biodegradable packaging). Technical nutrients are material, usually synthetic or mineral, that can remain in a closed-loop system of manufacture, recovery, and reuse (e.g. reusing the parts of a fridge for new models or other innovations) (Braungart et al., 2007). Utilising both biological and technical nutrients ultimately results in a waste-free production and consumption system, that emphasises the limits to growth (economic, production, consumption) society faces and elevates the natural environment as a key and central stakeholder.

Moreover, multiple disciplines, from environmental management to philosophy to futures research, have explored issues of intergenerational equity. Past research suggests several decision-making frameworks for meeting obligations to future generations (Tonn, 2018). Other research explores how to incorporate the voice of nature, in which a “holistic, value-oriented, focused, and strategic approach to stakeholder management” is advocated (Starik, 1995, p. 207).

*Proposition 5*

It follows from the above discussion on ecocentrism that NEP supporters reject the atomistic viewpoint of the Western DSP in favour of a holistic view. The DSP views nature mechanically and sees it as made up of parts that require separation so they can be understood and manipulated (Capra, 1982). Individuals, too, are not seen as related and so function apart from one another, thus emphasising individualism. NEP followers feel that humans are a single strand in the web of life, which is organic, whole and interrelated. Internal relatedness stipulates that our interactions and relations create a dynamic web of the world in which we cannot indeed be separated from one another (Gladwin et al., 1995; Kilbourne & Polonsky, 2005). An extension of this thinking accepts that a series of events and interactions, not objects, constitutes the world, thereby opposing atomism, as no real dividing line between humans and non-humans exists, thus nor does superiority (Birch & Cobb, 1981). The whole system, including the ecosystem, must be considered (Borland & Lindgreen, 2013; Ulrich, 1993). As everything integrates into a dynamic set of structures, it is important to maintain equilibrium (Callicott, 1999). Holism then considers the entire ecosystem as having equal importance and sees value as emanating from itself, not just from the parts that are useful to humans (Borland & Lindgreen, 2013). While the ecosystem is needed for human to exist, tampering with or destroying it bears significant consequences.

A Māori view also espouses a holistic view of the world because of the relationship between humans and the earth, and humans are obliged to take an inclusive, systemic approach to decision making and behaviour (Marsden, 2003). This view stems from their belief in Whakapapa (lineage between the environment and humans), Mauri (the life force that flows through all objects), Kiutakitai (holistic, system-wide resource protection and management) and Mana (the authority to provide stewardship of natural resources) (Harmsworth and Awatere, 2013), and assumes that society, culture and institutions be considered together (Marsden, 2003) before making any permanent change. As such, the following proposes:

*Proposition 5: A Māori view of the world takes a holistic and systemic approach to decision making and behaviour which seeks to reconcile complex multi-layered contexts.*

Moreover, systems thinking provides a methodology that helps analyse situations by creating an ongoing learning system that stakeholders can then receive (Checkland, 2000). In trying to understand how a system (social or organisational) might operate more smoothly, all stakeholders in the system should participate. This thinking enables a better understanding of the worldview, opinions and suggested solutions, which also lends itself to action research (Kirk, 1995) for use in marketing problem solving and CSR interventions. Patagonia takes a similar approach to organisational decision making in that its social and environmental mission is at the core of its business practices; it understands the imperative that as an organisation they have a responsibility to take a holistic approach to decision making while being mindful of natural resources and humankind (Patagonia, 2018).

*Proposition 6*

The DSP believes competition is necessary for the society to advance and for a liberal economy to flourish. Market-based economies are founded on competition as people continuously compete for scarce resources to enable economic growth. However, the NEP believes that co-operation is key to a functioning society (Kilbourne & Polonsky, 2005), which includes co-operation between people and organisations (Borland & Lindgreen, 2013; Pinkse & Kolk, 2012). This thinking emanates from ecocentrism and holism as it seeks non-hierarchical relationships created from shared goals instead of from control or dominance (Bookchin, 1996). Organisations need to network to best implement resource efficiency, not independently, but with broader co-operation between industries (Bansal & Kilbourne, 2001).

A Māori view endorses the concepts of Whanaungatanga (relationships and connections), Kotahitanga (creating alliances and unity), and Hapai (uplifting others). Traditionally, decisions and social and political goals were made and set through people meeting and discussing these items at length until reaching a consensus (Marsden, 2003). These meetings are called Hui and are inclusive and participatory. Thus, while members possessing expert knowledge in the areas discussed are present, co-operation, alliances and unity are vital in reaching an eventual consensus, leading to the following:

*Proposition 6:* *A Māori view of the world supposes that the achievement of political, technological, economic, social and environmental goals be through co-operation, alliances and unity.*

Strategic alliances are voluntary, usually non-binding and self-governed, inter-firm cooperative agreements (Parkhe, 1993). The motive for entering into a cooperative agreement varies, but a business that prescribes to a Māori Paradigm seeks alliances and co-operation to offer better products and share knowledge about sustainable innovations and processes, on the premise that pooled knowledge creates a broader knowledge base than research or implementation conducted alone. The core values of a Māori economy are connectedness and Māori wisdom (Phillips et al., 2016). The principles of unity and harmony between humans and nature drive the thinking in numerous cultures; however, including Chinese traditional culture (Pan, Valerdi, & Kang, 2013). Governmental and non-governmental organisations or not-for-profit organisations can also create alliances like these. The outdoor clothing industry is an example, where a group of manufacturers and retailers have created the Outdoor Industry Association’s sustainability workgroup to share and collaborate sustainable marketing practices and innovations.

As an active, engaged and ethical member of society, the Māori organisation takes its social contract with society seriously and contributes its fair share of taxes, community involvement and other social obligations, i.e. fair working conditions and wages. Most importantly, the Māori view of the world seeks the best for all stakeholders, i.e. they do not lobby for favourable tax cuts or subsidies that only benefit organisational profit or advocate policy and initiatives that only benefit their organisation. This same concept drives Patagonia. Its flat organisational structure ensures that it hears the voices of its employees. In addition to promoting environmental activism and minimising their environmental impact, they actively pursue alliances that ensure they are a socially responsible organisation for which to work (Patagonia, 2018).

This paper has briefly discussed co-operatives in the context of governance, but by their nature, they embody co-operation, alliance and unity values. Mondragon exemplifies a thriving co-operative, consisting of 261 organisations in the fields of technology, manufacturing, retail, education and R&D, and employing more than 74,000 employees. Co-operatives may prefer to work alongside other like-minded companies, however, and create networks and alliances. Expressions of this type of co-operative ideology include organisational alliances that combat environmental and social issues, as well as innovation-driven collaborative networks like public-private partnerships (Reypens, Lievens & Blazevic, 2016). Corporate mission and culture may impact competition and partnership strategy; for example, Patagonia sharing its innovative practices, processes and products with its competitors (i.e. Paid Leave Project) (Patagonia, 2017). Even traditional companies like Nike embrace elements of co-operation, such as having 400 of their utility patents listed under a Creative Commons license to enable other companies to leverage them for sustainable innovation (Nike, 2016).

In summary, the Western DSP champions two key areas, liberalism and anthropocentrism. Conversely, the NEP is ecocentric and strives for decentralised politics, steady-state economics, humane technology, holism and co-operation. Each of the three paradigms is outlined here, conceptualising for the first time the differences between characteristics of the DSP and the NEP. As readers will see, the NEP and Māori Paradigm share many traits, but the Māori Paradigm offers more concrete suggestions for marketers by particularly expanding the philosophies behind its political and economic elements.

**A Way Forward: Proposition Implementation**

An understanding of the Māori view is now used to set forth propositions and their applications to marketing, CSR, and business decision-making (please note: the following is not an exhaustive review of potential applications of these propositions). Specific areas of marketing implementation include products (new product development (NPD), supply chains, resource procurement, manufacturing, and waste), distribution, pricing, promotion, and overall marketing strategy.

*Marketing Strategy*

In marketing strategy, holistic decision-making is enabled by systems thinking and mapping; thus, they look at the complete product system life cycle. In a Māori view of marketing and the world, soft (interpretive) systems thinking and mapping (P5) spur decision-making and its consequences. Systems thinking applies systems theory to complex situations through modelling, simulation and problem-solving. More specifically, a systems approach to decision-making perceives the whole picture from top-to-bottom and considers the ends (outcome) as well as the means (actions). It is a process-oriented approach based on holism, learning, and participation (Pan et al., 2013). This big-picture thinking balances short and long-term interests (Anderson & Johnson, 1997). As such, overall marketing key performance indicators (KPIs) must base success and thus decision-making on intergenerational equity (P4), social and environmental well-being before profit (P2), genuine stakeholder representation (P1) and human centred technology production and use (P3), through co-operation, alliances and partnerships (P6). Because soft systems thinking aims to solve unstructured problems in social and organisational systems, many methodologies or methods, exist including Interactive Planning Methodology, Social Systems Design, Soft Systems Methodology, and Strategic Assumption Surfacing and Testing (Pan et al., 2013).

Since Māori Paradigm organisations understand that humans are one with nature and with each other, they must undertake a fundamental rethink about an organisation’s relationship to nature. This reconsideration includes the relationship and obligations the organisation has with its employees, which must reflect on the ability of employees to live a comfortable life through areas like living wages and shares of ownership, as well as its obligations to the broader community. For example, in Ngai Tahu Pounamu, hapū and individual carvers contribute a portion of their earnings to the tribe to benefit the community (Reid et al., 2016)(P4).

KPIs must measure their success in terms of intergenerational equity that focuses on longer-term consequences than usual, perhaps as much as 60-100 years in advance, and internalises the interests of all stakeholder groups (P4) and the well-being of society and the environment (P3) (Peterson, 2013). A stakeholder approach to decision-making views the environment as equal to all other partners (community, industry etcetera) (Starik, 1995). An example of this stakeholder approach is board representation for the environment, which is separate from marketing connections; these spokespeople may come from governmental or non-governmental agencies or community groups that are connected and knowledgeable about the environment and represent the voice of nature (P1, P4).

As technology enhances and protects the environment, and aids in personal growth, it should also be used to create belongingness, love, esteem, quality of life and co-operation. For instance, technology can help facilitate community involvement and help organisations engage with their stakeholders. Communication technologies like apps, instant messaging services and web 2.0 platforms allow marketers to connect and interact with stakeholders in real time. Such direct communication vehicles can also aid in transparency and co-operation between organisations (P6). Other technologies like virtual assistants, teachers and webinars that allow comprehensive access to content can be used to drive personal growth and learning. This proposition supports any technology that can be used to create belongingness, esteem and co-operation, which postulates goals for both new product development and stakeholder engagement (P3).

*Product Decisions*

The system perspective specifies that product decisions start with a more significant decision making boundary than usual and should consider environmental and social impact over the entire product system life cycle (Fuller, 1999) (P5). Undertaking a product system lifecycle (PSLC) assessment on all current products and services, as well as during new product development, is essential for identifying waste and pollution impact by the complete supply chain, as well as its social impact (P2). For instance, waste and pollution from resource procurement and transport, manufacturing, distribution, use and divestment can be identified and minimised through strategic alliances, partnerships and co-operation (P6). Ensuring a greater emphasis on durable and long lasting products rather than planned obsolescence also assists in marketing implementation. Patagonia’s partnership with the Swiss company Bluesign highlights technology and its usefulness in undertaking this type of process. Bluesign works to decrease waste and pollution at each step of the supply chain and ensures that Patagonia’s suppliers take a collaborative approach to technologically advanced interventions (Patagonia, 2018) (P3, P6). It is imperative, then, that product, supplier, resource and new product development decisions need to place social, environmental and spiritual well-being before profit (P2) through the complete product lifecycle. Reverse logistics is another practical marketing strategy attained through strategic alliances and partnerships that implements the type of thinking that leads to intergenerational equity (P4, P6). Marketing strategy grounded in this approach ensures that each company take full responsibility for the long-term impacts of their decisions.

New product development criteria must include implications for environmental harm, namely the design for environmental thinking (Fuller, 1999), and social well-being (P2). This criteria includes eliminating investment in or utilising technology that causes people separation from personal growth or relationships (with production processes as well as consumption of products or services, e.g. robotics in manufacturing). Marketers use of technology should always consider people before profit. Therefore, developing AI that replaces employees without providing them with subsequent new careers is unacceptable. Organisations like fashion brand People Tree, epitomise this view by hiring skilled embroiders in developing nations to hand embroider their garments instead of using machines to do the work (People Tree, 2017). Similarly, companies that use AI in tandem with humans for menial, repetitive tasks can decrease the incidence of repetitive stress syndrome and allow workers to develop higher-level skills (P3).

Including employees in new product development and manufacturing epitomises a flat, decentralised structure (P1). For instance, New Belgium Brewery practices open bookkeeping then provides its employees with training on how to understand their financial reports (Choi & Gray, 2010). These initiatives and their ‘open to suggestions’ philosophy have saved both water and methane waste and use by employing a closed-loop production process with more than $60,000 in savings a year (New Belgium, 2010; Peterson, 2013).

*Distribution, Pricing and Promotion Decisions*

Distribution decisions made by companies operating under the Māori Paradigm are obliged to take social, spiritual and environmental well-being into account before profit (P2). This perspective does not mean that profit is unimportant; it is simply viewed less importantly than the other three areas. For instance, when looking at the distribution of goods and services, removing access to goods or services should not disadvantage the local community. Limiting access to healthy food, postal services or public transportation due to unprofitable routes, is seen as unacceptable where other geographical locations might be used to subsidise those with less profit potential. This approach requires more collaboration and alliance-building between entities than a traditional business view employs (P6).

Similarly, pricing of products and services should not disadvantage any one group in society and limit their access to essential goods and services. Price gouging and predatory pricing are already seen as unethical (Brenkert, 2008), though this view also sees potentially low pricing as inappropriate. For instance, pricing products or services at meagre prices to encourage consumerism, which is shown to decrease happiness and thus, social and spiritual well-being is not acceptable (Murphy, Laczniak, Bowie, & Klein, 2005). Further, low prices that do not consider the environmental impact of the product or service require the attention of marketers (Fuller, 1999) making environmental accounting necessary (P2) over the complete PSLC to ensure intergenerational equity (P4). An area for consideration is then the appropriateness of premium green pricing, given the other stakeholders in the marketing decision making.

Marketing communications and CSR can benefit from the positive pro-social and environmental initiatives the organisation is undertaking. That said, authentic and transparent communications are necessary for the impact of decisions and intergenerational equity to be understood (P1, P6). For instance, the annual environmental report should include intergeneration equity along with social and spiritual well-being, as these items are significant beyond the straightforward report on environmental impact (P2). Linking technology to human development and personal growth initiatives in the report also not only benefits the organisation but epitomises the point of view (P3). Partnering with environmental and social advocacy groups and becoming members of environmentally/socially focused alliances, while practising CSR (Fuller, 1999), also reflects the Māori worldview. Including both direct and indirect long-term ecological, and functional and emotional benefits of products and services in marketing communications (Fuller, 1999) supports the view as well. Educating consumers to help them make ecologically sound purchases and use and divestment decisions (Fuller, 1999) is a facet of marketing communications. Overall, the promotion of ‘green’ and conventional products or promotions that encourage consumerism needs addressing (P2), which may include efforts in demarketing.

 [Insert Table 1 about here]

Overall, there are many benefits to implementing the Māori Paradigm through the propositions suggested here (See table 1 and above discussion). As summarised above and in table 1 though, there are also barriers to their implementation and adoption within organisations. Impediments include a need for a change in organisational member’s ideologies and orientations. Specifically a shift away from individualism, profit-dominant orientations, and technology centric views toward co-operative, collective, and personal growth orientations. Also a focus beyond short term profits and consequences to long term consequences, intergenerational equity, and systems thinking. Lastly focusing on prevention of environmental issues through treatment of the environment as a stakeholder presents ever more cognitive hurdles for organisations to grapple with.

## A Way Forward: Institutional Change

While we have discussed how companies can implement the Maori worldview, we also need to draw on institutional theory to better understand how companies can integrate this ethos into their core values and objectives. The NEP and DSP offer unique yet competing perspectives on sustainability as both are dependent on two different logics: sustainable and market. The meta-theory of institutional logics provides assumptions and descriptions about how institutions shape heterogeneity, stability and change in both individuals and organisations (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008). Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury (2012, p. 2) define institutional logics as “socially constructed, historical patterns of cultural symbols and material practices...by which individuals and organisations provide meaning to their daily activity”. Higher order societal institutions, such as capitalism and democracy, shape an organisation’s vision of the social world (Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005), influencing organisational philosophy and goals. Thus, institutional logics, like institutions, operate at the individual, organisational and societal levels (Friedland & Alford, 1991).

The DSP reveals that market logic is mainly present in corporations (Pache & Santos, 2013), universities (Doherty, Meehan, & Richards, 2015), and the higher education publishing industry (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999). However, the emerging and pressing environmental, social and economic issues affecting individuals, organisations and society have caused the emergence of sustainability logic (Kok, de Bakker, & Groenewegen, 2017).

The institutional logics of market and sustainability offer different realities, assumptions and objectives of the world and business, which may make these two logics incompatible or competing (Besharov & Smith, 2014). Thus, by reflecting on how organizations embed new values and beliefs into their practices, one can draw on hybrid (the combination of two or more logics, where one usually remains dominant) or paradox theory. Hybrid logics involve the integration of two competing logics, which lends new perspectives to hybrid organisations such as social enterprises (Pache & Santos, 2013). For example, Yan, Ferraro and Almandoz (2018) examined both the financial and socially responsible investing (SRI) logics and proposed that the ‘means’ (expertise and practices) of financial logic in some circumstances, particularly when the ‘means’ of the logic are more weakly held, complemented the newly emerging ‘ends’ (motivations, values and goals) of the SRI logic. The paradoxical perspective acknowledges the tensions between worldviews (i.e., sustainability and corporate social responsibility) (Carollo & Guerci, 2017; Hahn, Figge, Pinkse, & Preuss, 2017; Hahn et al., 2014; Ioannou & Serafeim, 2015), allowing organisations and individuals to work through and achieve simultaneously competing objectives (Hahn et al., 2017). Thus, the paradoxical perspective and hybrid logics demonstrate the ability of paradigms to co-exist and even complement one another. For instance, an organisation that champions a Maori worldview (inconsistent with the DSP) draws upon the growing sustainable logic while also adhering to the market logic, thereby allowing the organization to remain legitimate and economically viable. Organisations like All Birds, Ben & Jerry’s, Patagonia, and Tony’s Chocolonely are successful examples of this type of integration and are specific to organisational structures like social enterprises and B Corps, demonstrating that companies practising integration can compete in the marketplace and remain competitive.

Any introduction of a new paradigm, or logic, requires the destabilisation of the dominant logic (market or DSP) and institutional work to create and institutionalise the new logic (Māori worldview). While options and avenues for paradigm change are beyond the scope of this paper, institutional theory sheds light on how logics can be created, maintained or shifted. New institutional theory reinforces the potential for resistance in institutions in the form of institutional work and institutional entrepreneurs. Institutional work is the purposive action of individuals and organisations involving a broader range of actors that goes beyond individual roles. This takes place in the form of institutional entrepreneurship through the mobilisation of resources (DiMaggio, 1988; Riaz et al., 2011), which can be in the form of academics and universities changing marketing education content and conducting research on sustainability as well as sustainable companies introducing ‘new’ (sustainable) ways of conducting business in the form of individual plights (i.e., single academics, university or business – institutional entrepreneurship), a group of motivated academics (i.e., research group), universities (i.e., alliance of universities) or businesses (i.e., associations) (institutional work). However, self-enlightenment is a prerequisite to any institutional work or entrepreneurship, and motivation for change remains a key, yet unanswered question.

## Conclusion

Few papers have set out to explore marketing and management aspects from an ecocentric perspective (Borland et al., 2016). More importantly, research has failed to fully conceptualise the NEP, specifically concerning political and economic philosophies, and specifically relating to business and marketing activities. This paper offers further clarification and conceptualisation of the NEP, especially as a contrast to the DSP, and offers The Māori Paradigm to broaden and address criticism of the NEP, enabling more specific and realistic propositions for marketers.

This article set out to examine how the Māori Paradigm could broaden the NEP, emphasising its flat, decentralised and participatory governance structure and drive towards goals that place environmental, social, and spiritual well-being ahead of profit, and value on technology’s ability to complement and not replace the natural environment. The Māori Paradigm takes a holistic and systematic approach to decision making and behaviour and views the natural environment as an equal stakeholder in each. It is a marketing model that values co-operation, alliances and unity. An overview of how the Māori Paradigm relates and compares to the DSP and NEP demonstrates a fundamental change in marketers thinking; the Māori paradigm provides a more agreeable set of propositions for marketers to follow.

The propositions of Māori Paradigm defined herein are meant to motivate marketer acceptance and future research in the area. The propositions should be examined, expanded and adjusted to aid in understanding the possibilities for individual and government implementation. Pursuing empirical testing of the Māori paradigm and developing scales for measuring its success would be of value. Case studies performed by organisations that adopt a Māori paradigm might elaborate on different marketing and CSR conditions and applications. Surveys of marketers and their CSR and sustainability practices and a comparison with their paradigms (DSP, NEP and Māori) would provide further guidance and insight. Many avenues for future qualitative and quantitative research in Maori and Indigenous worldviews are still unexplored. These would allow businesses and society to become sustainable, reconnect with nature, challenge our relationships with each other (as individuals, competitors, customers, etcetera), and become a genuine bridging paradigm.

A paradigm shift from the current Western DSP towards more ecocentric principles is paramount to addressing the planet’s limits to growth and the crisis that DSP has caused. Research into the sustainability or practicality of such a paradigm shift has either not been conducted or has not been as influential as it could have been due to society’s attachment to the Western DSP. Alternatively, conducting research based on the view that all of humanity is part of an interconnected web with nature and strives for personal growth and fulfilment speaks to the sustainability agenda and the need for such an undertaking. By putting forth the principles of the Māori worldview, this paper seeks to inspire further research and to provide marketers with a more flexible, practical and palatable shift in paradigms.
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