AERU
Agribusiness
and Economics
Research Unit
A Lincoln University Research Centre.
New Zealand's specialist land-based university.

Unlocking Export Prosperity: The Distinctive Cultural Attributes of Food

Matthew Rout
John Reid

Research Report No. 350
January 2019

Lincoln
University
Te Whare Wānaka o Aoraki
CHRISTCHURCH • NEW ZEALAND

***Research to improve decisions and outcomes in business, resource and environmental issues*.**

The Agribusiness and Economics Research Unit (AERU) operates at Lincoln University, providing research expertise for a wide range of international, national and local organisations. AERU research focuses on business, resource and environmental issues.

The Agribusiness and Economics Research Unit (AERU) has four main areas of focus. These areas are: wellbeing economics; trade and the environment; economic development; and non-market valuations.

Research clients include Government agencies, both within New Zealand and from other countries, other international agencies, New Zealand enterprises in the private sector, and community groups.

AERU MISSION
To exercise leadership in research for sustainable well-being.

AERU VISION
The AERU is a cheerful and vibrant workplace where senior and emerging researchers are working together to produce and deliver new knowledge that promotes sustainable well-being.

AERU STRATEGIC AIMS

- To be recognised by our peers and end-users as research leaders for sustainable well-being;
- To mentor emerging researchers and provide advanced education to postgraduate students;
- To maintain strong networks to guide AERU research efforts and to help disseminate its research findings; and
- To contribute to the University's financial targets as agreed in the AERU business model.

DISCLAIMER
While every effort has been made to ensure that the information herein is accurate, the AERU does not accept any liability for error of fact or opinion which may be present, nor for the consequences of any decision based on this information.

Summaries of AERU Research Reports beginning with #235, are available at www.lincoln.ac.nz/aeru. Printed copies of AERU Research Reports can be requested from the AERU Administrator.

© Agribusiness and Economics Research Unit. Lincoln University, New Zealand, 2019.

This work is licenced under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 New Zealand licence.

Suggested citation for this report:

Rout, Matthew and John Reid (2019). *Unlocking Export Prosperity: The Distinctive Cultural Attributes of Food.* AERU Research Report No. 350, prepared for the Unlocking Export Prosperity Research Programme. Lincoln University: Agribusiness and Economics Research Unit.

Unlocking Export Prosperity: The Distinctive Cultural Attributes of Food

Matthew Rout
John Reid

Research Report No. 350

January 2019

Agribusiness and Economics Research Unit
P O Box 85084
Lincoln University
Lincoln 7647
Canterbury
New Zealand

Ph: (64) (3) 423 0372
http://www.lincoln.ac.nz/AERU/

ISSN 1170-7682 (Print)
ISSN 2230-3197 (Online)
ISBN978-1-877519-64-2 (Print)
ISBN 978-1-877519-65-9 (Online)

Abstract

On 12 September 2017, the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment announced that a research programme entitled Unlocking Export Prosperity from the Agri-food Values of Aotearoa New Zealand had been selected for funding from the Endeavour Fund. The programme has been launched with four reviews written for a general audience on relevant existing knowledge, including this report on distinctive cultural attributes of New Zealand agri-food exports. It focuses on how New Zealand producers can use cultural attributes as a means of 'maximising export returns.' There are two key components that are addressed: first, what is meant by 'cultural attributes of food' and, second, what are the means by which these can help increase export earnings? Different chapters in the report then focus on Māori cultural attributes, and New Zealand Pākehā cultural attributes.

Keywords

Value Chains; Cultural Attributes; Māori Cultural Attributes; Farming Culture.

ANZSRC Fields of Research

Pricing (incl. Consumer Value Estimation) (150507); Rural Sociology (160804); Studies of Māori Society (169904).

Acknowledgements

This Client Report has been prepared as part of the research programme Unlocking Export Prosperity, funded by the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (LINX1701).

Contents

ABSTRACT v

KEYWORDS v

ANZSRC FIELDS OF RESEARCH v

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS v

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER 2 DISTINCTIVE CULTURAL ATTRIBUTES OF FOOD 3

2.1 Culture 3

2.2 Food 3

2.3 Identity 4

2.4 Summary 4

CHAPTER 3 MAXIMISING EXPORT RETURNS 5

3.1 Supply and value chains 5

3.2 Provenance, authenticity and traceability 6

3.3 Branding and marketing 7

3.4 Summary 8

CHAPTER 4 THE TIME IS RIGHT 9

CHAPTER 5 MĀORI CULTURAL ATTRIBUTES 11

5.1 Māori beliefs 11

5.2 Māori values 11

5.3 Māori behaviours 12

5.4 Māori supply and value chains 12

5.5 Māori provenance, authentication and traceability 13

5.6 Māori branding and marketing 14

CHAPTER 6 NEW ZEALAND/PĀKEHĀ CULTURAL ATTRIBUTES 17

6.1 New Zealand farming culture 17

6.2 Pākehā/New Zealand values 18

6.3 New Zealand/Pākehā behaviours 19
6.4 New Zealand/Pākehā supply and value chain 19
6.5 New Zealand/Pākehā provenance, authentication and traceability 22
6.6 New Zealand/Pākehā branding and marketing 23

CHAPTER 7 CONCLUSION 27

REFERENCES 29

Chapter 1
Introduction

Many experts have noted that the New Zealand primary sector has a ‘volume mentality’ despite producing some of the highest quality food products in the world (Brakenridge, 2016; Saunders *et al*, 2016). This volume mentality sees milk produced in conditions and locations that would gain a premium in virtually any country in the world turned into a powder that is then traded as a commodity, indistinguishable from milk produced in far less appealing circumstances. As Brakenridge (2016, emphasis in original) notes, “New Zealand must challenge the status quo, blow apart the traditional price-taker mentality and move to a market-shaping model, one where we forgo a volume mentality for a value mindset… we need to transform not what we’re selling, but the way we’re selling it”. He makes an important point; New Zealand needs to focus on adding value rather than volume.

The ‘conditions’ and ‘locations’ of New Zealand primary production are crucial to gaining a premium, the free-ranging sheep roaming the picturesque landscape is certainly a powerful means of adding value. However, there is more to the story than the ethical and locational, there is more to New Zealand’s story than just ‘beautiful scenery.’ A big part of the story is who we are and what we represent to the world. And it is this part of the story that is focused upon in this report. As Belich and Wevers (2008, p. 1) state, “If one could place a value on [New Zealand-ness], even in solely economic terms, it would be in the tens of billions. Cultural identity ranks right up there with grass as New Zealand’s chief asset”. Building on this, Hilton Collier argues, “As a country we know we can feed 30 million people. We know we want to feed the richest people. This gives us a consumer base of approximately one billion people. This number exceeds our entire food supply; we should therefore visualise and position ourselves as the world’s delicatessen” (Collier, 2015, p.2, cited by Thomson, 2015, p. 20).

Specifically, this report will examine the ‘distinctive cultural attributes of food’ with a particular interest in how New Zealand producers can use these as a means of ‘maximising export returns.’ There are two key components here that need to be addressed: first, what is meant by ‘cultural attributes of food’ and, second, what are the means by which these can help increase export earnings? In the following sections, each question is answered.

Chapter 2
Distinctive Cultural Attributes of Food

2.1 Culture

The term 'culture' is used in a general sense to refer to the 'beliefs,' 'values' and 'behaviours' of a specific group of people, or society (Barker, 2004). While beliefs, values, and behaviours are distinct, there is also a hierarchy, with the flow of influence running from beliefs through to behaviours. In a way, culture can be understood as the collective set of rules, understandings, and practices that help a group of people live as a society, though even within a society culture can vary. Therefore, the cultural attributes of food can be understood as a society's particular beliefs, values, and behaviours regarding the production, preparation, and consumption of food – though in this report the focus is mainly on production.

One way of looking at this is that a culture's beliefs, values, and behaviours about food are a subset of their broader culture (Kittler *et al*, 2011). The values they hold regarding how their society should be organised or their religious beliefs will impact the way they produce, prepare and consume food. Food can be understood as a manifestation and representation of a culture.

Another way of looking at it is that food encapsulates a society's culture, providing a powerful lens through which the culture can be viewed (Montanari 2006). For example, taking part in a Japanese tea ceremony involves far more than merely drinking tea but offers a compelling insight into a wide range of Japanese beliefs, values and behaviours. It is a window into their culture. This view is summed up by the title of culinary historian Massimo Montanari's (2006) book *Food is Culture*.

Both ways of understanding culture's relationship with food are correct and both help in the analysis to come. Food is a subset of a society's culture, and food encapsulates and embodies culture. This suggests that the word 'food' has a far more complex meaning than the simple dictionary definition of "any substance that provides the nutrients necessary to maintain life and growth when ingested" (Kittler *et al*, 2011, p. 1).

2.2 Food

Food is not the same as sustenance, as Kittler *et al*. (2011, p. 1) explain, "When most animals feed, they repeatedly consume those foods necessary for their well-being, and they do so in a similar manner at each feeding. Humans, however, do not feed. They eat". In other words, rather than merely ingesting the essential nutrients needed to sustain life and well-being; humans make a wide range of choices and decisions far beyond those needed for 'fuelling the machine' – this is 'eating'.

"Eating," as Kittler *et al*. (2011, p. 2) note, "is distinguished from feeding by the ways humans use food." Expanding on this, Montanari (2006, p. xi) explains that "We only too readily associate the idea of food with the idea of nature. That linkage is, however, ambiguous and fundamentally inaccurate. The dominant values of the food system in human experience are, to be precise, not defined regarding 'naturalness,' but result from and represent cultural processes dependent upon the taming, transformation, and reinterpretation of Nature". Put simply, when we use the term 'food' we are already inescapably referring to culture. The two are intrinsically entwined. However, because food is such a fundamental component of culture this connection is often overlooked. It is often when you experience another culture and their food habits that you realise how culturally embedded your understanding of food is and how much this can vary around the world.

2.3 Identity

Culture is a crucial source of identity (Tajfel, 1981). In other words, people understand who they are through the culture they belong to, and this sense of belonging is critical to self-esteem and general wellbeing (Tajfel 1981). In turn, this means that food, then, is "central to our sense of identity" (Fischler, 1988, p. 275) and our self-esteem and wellbeing. As well as providing the physical sustenance we need to survive, food is also vital in providing what might be understood as psychological sustenance.

Food helps us to feel good about ourselves, and it helps us feel like we belong to our social group. This is seen in terms like 'comfort food' and 'soul food,' in traditions like 'Sunday family roasts' and 'neighbourhood BBQs' and concepts like 'national dishes' and 'local cuisines.' Food is so fundamental to identity that people are both judged by what they eat – e.g. Americans see vegetarians as 'pacifists' and fast food consumers as conservatives – and use food analogies to define who they are – e.g. 'I am a meat and potatoes kind of guy' to mean they are someone with basic needs (Bisogni *et al*, 2001; Kittler et al. 2011). Food has an emotional component as well as being a core aspect of identity.

2.4 Summary

The distinct cultural attributes of food are the beliefs, values, and behaviours society has regarding the production, preparation, and consumption of food. Each society has their own 'food culture,' which can be understood as both a reflection of their wider culture and as a core component of their culture. These distinct cultural attributes of food are central to the very nature of what 'food' is because food is far more than just the necessary nutrients that keep us alive, food is fundamental to the way people think about themselves and their sense of belonging. Taken at its broadest the distinct cultural attributes food can refer to all attributes of food as the very concept of food is culturally determined and defined. In other words, even referring to 'physical attributes' has a cultural component. However, we do need to refine this for the following analysis. Here we are interested in the beliefs, values, and behaviours of 'food cultures' as understood through the insights regarding identity, belonging and emotion.

Chapter 3

Maximising Export Returns

There are many intersecting areas of study that can inform how cultural attributes can maximise export returns, including supply and value chains; provenance, authenticity and traceability; and branding and marketing. These are all concepts that are used extensively in the literature focused on improving profitability and while there is a high degree of overlap between these different areas each brings a particular framing or focus to how the topic. Before continuing, the primary focus here is on how 'culture' can be used to maximise export returns by adding value in the consumer's eyes. However, where relevant it is mentioned that culture can also help improve operational efficiency which indirectly maximises returns.

3.1 Supply and value chains

The 'supply chain' describes all the activities, functions, roles and organisations involved in the production, delivery and consumption of products from raw materials to final consumption (Saunders *et al*, 2016). Here it is most useful to think of it in a practical, physical sense, and with specific reference to primary production. For example, a basic primary production supply chain might consist of, running chronologically: the materials needed for farming, such as fertilizer, stock, machinery; the farming process itself; the processor; the exporter/importer, if different to the processor; the marketing of the product; and the final link is sales and after-sales support (Simchi-Levi, 1999). The entire supply chain, as Saunders *et al*. (2016, p. 6) note, is colloquially referred to using phrases like 'farm gate to plate' and 'beef to burger'.

The purpose of conceptualising production in this way is it provides a framework for understanding how to increase the revenue – this is the 'value chain', by looking at the entire supply chain and seeing how they can coordinate and integrate it in ways that add value. As Saunders *et al*. (2016, p. 6) note, "the final customer is the arbiter of value, everything done by firms along a value chain should add value to the consumer's experience". Analysis of value chains seeks to determine the "value-adding and value-destroying activities that align with customer value and preferences". Furthermore, as they explain (ibid), "value is subjectively perceived by the customer". There are four primary sources of value:

Product value – the product attributes themselves and the price/quality relationship for foods and commodities.

Process value – the processes and practices used within the value chain to produce the product or food.

Location value – the setting and atmosphere of where a product is purchased or consumed.

Emotional value – both the emotive response of consumption (pleasure, satisfaction, utility, etc.) and the emotive response to the 'story' associated with the product.

Here we can see how the value chain concept can help with cultural attributes. A consumer's product, process, location and emotional values are mainly based on their food culture. Take product value, which some may argue has nothing to do with culture. It includes sensory properties like taste, texture and flavour (Saunders *et al*, 2016). This is no more evident than with cultural differences in palettes, where for example many Asian people are averse to the flavour and texture of cheese, while many New Zealanders are similarly averse to the 'fishy' flavours found within some Asian dishes.

Value chain analysis examines all of the links in the chain to see how and where there are ways to give the product greater value in the eyes of the consumer. When the entire value chain is focused on this goal, it is referred to as a 'market-oriented value chain' (Grunert *et al*, 2005). While companies have been working on 'market orientation' for a long time, this was traditionally a binary relationship between a single company and their customers (idem). Value chain analysis widens the scope, arguing that the producer, the processor and the exporter/importer should work together to ensure the consumer sees their product as valuable.

A culturally-focused value chain analysis would seek to understand the consumer's food culture with the aim of determining what their product, process, location and emotional values are. It would then look at the producer's food culture, seeking to understand which of the producer's distinctive cultural attributes of food would appeal to the consumer's values and how the chain can be oriented so that this is communicated to the consumer. One way of doing this could be to 'collapse' the chain by selling and communicating directly to consumers, often referred to as the 'value net' rather than a chain because it is more networked, creating flexibility and enabling a better consumer focus (Bovet and Martha, 2000). While other links in the supply chain can communicate this to the producer, a direct, or less indirect, connection ensures that the information flow regarding something as particular as cultural attributes is better understood. This is particularly true when the links in the chain have different cultures.

3.2 Provenance, authenticity and traceability

Together, provenance, authenticity and traceability are often one of the drivers and benefits of an integrated value chain – though they are not the only purpose or outcome. The following analysis will separate these, but the connections between the value chain and provenance, authenticity and traceability will be illustrated where possible. The term 'provenance' is often associated with the area or region where the food has come from, food provenance has three key areas of interest: where the food is from (the spatial dimension), how the food was produced (the social dimension) and the perceived qualities and reputation of the food (the cultural dimension) (Reid and Rout, 2016). At its most basic, provenance is interested in the history of the product. The "utility of provenance comes when the consumer is made aware of a correspondence between their values and the food's provenance as mediated by marketing" (Reid and Rout, 2016, p. 431). Provenance, then, is the use of food's spatial, social and/or cultural components as a means of marketing to consumers through the alignment of values.

Put simply, authenticity is when a product is viewed as 'authentic' by the consumer. Therefore, authenticity can come when the provenance of the food is believed to be credible. However, there are many different ways of being perceived as authentic, including brand longevity, stylistic consistency, quality commitments etc. (Beverland, 2006; Starr and Brodie, 2016). Here we will focus on the subfield of cultural authenticity. As Casey (2014) outlines, cultural authenticity can come from one of three key categories: authentic location, authentic technique or authentic producer. Cultural authenticity can be achieved from the effective emphasis of one or more of these categories. As with provenance, cultural authenticity is a marketing tool that emphasizes 'authentic' location, technique and/or producer to add a premium to a product.

The key, though not only, means of communicating both provenance and authenticity is traceability, which is the ability for the consumer to trace a product through the entire chain with a high degree of trust (Moe, 1998). The perceived transparency of traceability comes from having a third party involved in the process (Hatanaka, Bain and Busch, 2005). Generally speaking food traceability is focused on improving efficiency and ensuring safety, but over time as consumer interest in provenance and authenticity has grown traceability has expanded to be able to deliver more than just critical data about herds, batches and logistics (Moe, 1998). The problem is that many companies have cynically used the consumer desire for provenance and authenticity, creating false branding and marketing that manipulates these desires, and as a result many consumers are themselves cynical about these claims (Reid and Rout, 2016). Traceability gives provenance and authenticity its heft by helping the consumer verify the claims.

Again there is a clear usefulness in these concepts with regarding to using culturally distinct attributes of food as a means of maximising export returns. Both provenance and authenticity focus on the emphasis of one or more characteristics as a means of adding value. With provenance the most obvious characteristic is the cultural dimension though as the cultural nature of the term 'food' and the authenticity categories suggest, both the spatial/location and means of production/technique categories have cultural attributes as well. Here the focus will be on how producers or other actors in the chain have used traceability to deliver cultural provenance and authenticity.

3.3 Branding and marketing

Branding and marketing are interdependent but distinct disciplines. Simply delineated, branding is the why and marketing is the how. The "original purpose of branding was to associate a product or offering with its producer or owner" (Roper and Parker 2006, p. 57). Branding has evolved and is now focused on creating an identity for a company, of understanding the culture, values and mission of the business, and using the resultant 'brand' as a way to differentiate the company and its product from the competition and, ultimately, to enhance the perception of the company and its product (Balmer, 2001). As Roper and Parker (2006, p. 66) outline, a brand has three functions: "brand as identifier, brand as differentiator and brand as asset". Branding is typically associated with a name, a logo or a slogan, but it is also the overarching identity (or narrative) that ties all of these, plus the culture, values and mission of the business, together (Denning, 2006).

Marketing is the means through which the brand is communicated to customers. Gummerus (2015, p. 19) explains that "Generating superior customer value continues to be one of the primary goals of marketing and the means of attaining competitive edge". Attitudinal loyalty and repurchase behaviour are usually how customer value is measured (idem). From a management perspective, then, marketing is a "process that seeks to maximise returns to shareholders by developing relationships with valued customers and creating a competitive advantage" (Paliwoda and Ryans, 2008, p. 25). The means by which relationships are created and by which these relationships generate 'customer value' are diverse but often focus on the brand/product being perceived as either useful or pleasing by the customer (Gummerus, 2015). In other words, marketing uses either function or emotion as a way of communicating value to customers.

Just as with other concepts, the way in which branding and marketing can help maximise export returns is clear. While branding is usually focused on the company's culture, values and mission here it can be expanded to include the broader culture in which the company operates. In other words, for a primary producer in New Zealand branding would incorporate cultural attributes as a means of differentiating and enhancing customer value. Likewise, marketing with a focus on cultural attributes would utilise the emotional power of culture to create a relationship with customers.

3.4 Summary

Taken together, these concepts suggest that the best way to maximise export returns is:

- Understand both the societal culture and 'food culture' of the producer and the consumers.
- Outline the company's own culture, values and mission with a focus on those which match the producer society's culture.
- Develop a brand that embodies both the company and societal cultures, but also has flexibility in how it can be emphasised in different consumer cultures.
- Understand the cultural attributes, the values, beliefs, behaviours, emotional connections and associations, the consumers have with food with a particular focus on the importance of location, production technique and the similarities between consumer and producer regarding these attributes.
- Create a marketing strategy that can effectively emphasise the authenticity of essential cultural attributes and the provenance of the product. Ensure that the entire value chain embodies and communicates these values.
- Collapse the value chain into a net to better focus on the consumer.
- Provide some form of traceability that validates the authenticity and provenance of the cultural attributes.

Chapter 4
The Time is Right

Fortunately, the time is right for precisely this kind of approach. The global agri-food industry has long focused on selling placeless and faceless products (Goodman, 2009). This is because the production of food has become increasingly industrialised and monopolised by global corporations. Telling the consumer the where, how and who of their food is not only an added expense but can also compromise that aim as people often will not like what they are told. Consequently, the provenance of modern food has been intentionally and incidentally obscured, hidden from consumers (Brand, 2010; Cook and Crang, 1996; Goodman, DuPuis and Goodman, 2014). It has become 'food from nowhere and food from no-one' (Friedmann and McMichael, 1989). Often modern food is then given a fake provenance that is used as a marketing tool. Brands are used to imply that a product comes from a specific place or has been produced by a specific person or entity. The 'Kiwi' brand of bacon suggests a New Zealand provenance but has been warned for its confusing labelling of foreign meat while the brand 'Pams' implies there is an original Pam involved when the company is owned by Foodstuffs (Chan, 2005; MacDonald, 2015). However, food scares such as Mad Cow Disease, worries over genetic modification, growing concerns about the ethical and environmental issues of agricultural and horticultural production and changing 'food cultures' such as the organics and paleo movements around the world have seen a blowback against placeless and faceless food (Friedberg, 2004). As a former director for Beef+Lamb NZ explains, there has been a "backlash to large-scale industrialised meat production". Many people feel ''increasingly alienated from the way their food is grown and processed" and want to know where it has come from, how it was grown and who was involved (Duffy *et al*, 2005, pp. 17-18).

There has been a wide array of different responses that range from the return of farmers' markets in countries where they had largely disappeared to the development of highly sophisticated authentications schemes run by the very agri-food giants whose actions had precipitated the crisis. It is no exaggeration to say that in the last few decades the global food system has experienced as significant a change as during the 'Green Revolution' of the 1930s to 1960s. However, while there has been much work reasserting the 'place' food comes from there has not been as much looking into the 'face' that produces it. As Tellström *et al*. (2006, 132) note "All these (food provenance) studies skirt round an information 'black hole' concerning the use of market research in choosing a food culture expression to ensure the best chance of economic success". This is probably due to several factors. The first is that the connection between food and region is more straightforward to make and is less contentious than the connections between food and the people and techniques used. The second one is that even in the most developed regions of the world, particularly Europe, geographical food provenance was never as obscured as social and cultural provenance (though these are related). This is obvious even in the terms we use for specific products, such as Parmesan cheese or Champagne and the reason for this continuity is evident in the passion held for regional foods in Europe.

As the discussion above should indicate, both the ‘face’ of food and the ‘place’ of food are closely interrelated. New Zealand needs to utilise its food culture/s to put both ‘place’ and ‘face’ on its foods as a means of adding value because it is unable to compete in scale.

Chapter 5
Māori Cultural Attributes

5.1 Māori beliefs

Māori beliefs provide the best place to begin to outline 'cultural attributes'. They can best be understood by examining the Māori worldview. This is the fundamental way in which society views reality, life and their existence (Reid and Rout, 2016). The Māori worldview may be contrasted with the Western worldview, which might be best characterised as 'modernist' (Reid and Rout 2016). While there are many ways of explaining these, the latter is premised on beliefs in the importance of rationality, progress, universality and the individual while the former believes in the importance of emotion, relationships, localism and the collective. These are exaggerated caricatures, but they help differentiate these worldviews.

The West has long been founded on the distinct separation between human culture and non-human nature (Panelli and Tipa, 2009). Like other indigenous people, Māori believe that people, animals and the broader environment are all mutually dependent on one another, existing in a relationship with all others they, directly and indirectly, interact with (Reid and Rout, 2016). Māori believe that they are related to the natural world, seeing animals and plants as family members (idem). As Wolfgramm (2007, p. 80) explains, Māori "use whakapapa [genealogies] to actively interpret relationships to bring the sacred to the centre of being. This is a relational view of the world, where we are called into being through our relationships, through the interaction with kin, genealogies, and events". This "perspective closely aligns with discoveries within the field of biology that reinforce the relational qualities of all life" (Reid and Rout, 2016, p. 430).

As Panelli and Tipa (2009, p. 457) note, food provides "an iconic example of how people and other phenomena are linked in processes that blur culture/nature, material/metaphysical and human/non-human classifications". In practice, the "relationships between people, the land, the water, and flora and fauna contained therein… mean the food and fibre hunted, harvested, gathered and produced by Māori are fundamental manifestations of who Māori are as a people" (Saunders *et al*, 2016, p. ix). This also connects back to the understanding that even the term 'food' is cultural. While it is generally sourced from 'nature' during this process, it becomes cultural as well as remaining 'natural'. Rather than crossing some imagined border, it instead has cultural interpretations overlaid onto its ongoing 'naturalness'. This suggests that there is an 'authenticity' to Māori food culture that has been lost in the contemporary industrialised food sector.

5.2 Māori values

The core Māori values can be seen as emerging from this worldview, and the way they are interpreted and implemented is guided by this relational way of viewing existence as well. As Spiller *et al*. (2010) explain, Māori values are primarily relationship- and reciprocity-centric, that is they are premised on the collective and ways in which collective well-being can be raised and maintained. They are focused on increasing the collective mauri (wellbeing/vitality) and mana (prestige/power) of people and place (Reid *et al*, 2013). The consequence of this understanding is that the food that is hunted, harvested, gathered and produced by Maori is a manifestation and representation of who they are as a people (Harvey, 2005; Willerslev, 2007). The identity of the supplier and their location is crucial as this is part of their mauri and mana. Likewise, the wellbeing of the recipient of the food is critical as it has an impact on the mauri and mana of the supplier. Spiller *et al*. (2010) list four important Māori values that best show the influence of this relational understanding of the world:

- Kaitiakitanga - to steward, guard and protect;
- Kotahitanga - respect for the individual in combination with consensual decision-making;
- Manaakitanga - the obligations of hospitality and care; and,
- Whanaungatanga - the acknowledgement of the bonds of kinship.

These values have clear outcomes concerning this report as they are all 'cultural attributes' that have a direct connection with the core issues consumers have with modern food, particularly the environmental and ethical components. These values demand that Māori respect the environment and are ethical in the way they operate. Again the way 'culture' impacts all of the significant factors of food is clear.

5.3 Māori behaviours

The behaviours that come from these beliefs and values shape how Māori produce, prepare and consume food. There are several important ways of understanding this, the first of which is tikanga – rules and customs, or 'the Māori way of doing things' (Mead, 2006). "Tikanga", as Forster (2013, p. 14) explains, "regulated access and use of natural resources in a manner that protected the mauri of an ecosystem to ensure sufficient supply of resources for survival of the tribe". For example, a core tikanga is rāhui, which is the variable regulation of access to a resource to conserve its mauri (Forster, 2013). Another tikanga is that seeds belong to specific tribes and should only be grown within territorial boundaries of the tribe claiming ownership (Hutchings *et al*, 2012). While the explanation given for this is because of the life force of the seed (idem) it is easy to see that this could have practical ramifications such as selective breeding for traits that suit a location. This is explained by Hildreth (quoted in Hutchings *et al*, 2012, p. 136): "Knowing about where the seed comes from so that it has some integrity in ensuring that they are safe seeds and that they're easily dependable and you know that the seeds are going to grow again … it's about integrity and dependability in terms of sustainability".

5.4 Māori supply and value chains

Integrating the chain is not a new idea for Māori, as Biasiny-Tule (2014) notes, "180 years ago Māori once were integrated supply chain specialists, owning land, crops, flour mills and the ships that distributed their product internationally". An example of the integrated chain based on Māori cultural attributes in action is Miraka, the predominantly Māori-owned dairy processing company which sources most of its milk from Māori-owned farms. As they note on their website, Miraka "recognises excellence through the Miraka supply chain – from the farm to the consumer. It is our way of acknowledging our team and suppliers when excellence is attained or exceeded in the manufacture of our products… Our suppliers are all part of the Miraka whānau (family)". Chairman Kingi Smiler explains that Miraka "is fundamentally driven by the vision and strategy of participating in the value chain in a direct sense and having more control over a niche opportunity". Specifically, Miraka has "created incentive schemes for farmers to add value to their milk-based around strong environmental credentials" and focuses on "having more direct contact with customers over the long term" through strong connections with their international distributors. Māori beliefs regarding the wider environment sees Miraka use its position in the supply chain to see its farmers go above and beyond regulatory requirements for animal welfare. Miraka adds value by emphasising the core Māori beliefs and values by looking after their stock, the environment and treating their suppliers like family, ensuring that the entire value chain embodies these values.

The idea of 'adding value by emphasising the core Māori values' invokes both key definitions of the word 'value' – that is 'worth' and 'principle'. This duality is very telling for this project. As AgResearch explains, "whakapapa, values and ownership structures propel Māori businesses towards something different – a supply chain (including the farm and the consumer) that is based on shared-principles… Whakapapa, Rangatiratanga, Kaitiakitanga, Whanaungatanga and Manaakitanga". These principles can add worth. Thomson (2015) notes that the producer needs to work with the marketer/exporter/importer to ensure that Māori cultural attributes are effectively communicated along the value chain. He offers a case study of how manaakitanga can directly help with the integration of the chain. Tohu Winery "host international manuhiri (clients, guests) they are given a formal pōwhiri [welcome] and the opportunity to meet with kaumatua [tribal elders]. During the pōwhiri the manuhiri have someone explaining what the speaker is saying during his korero [talk]. The speaker will also translate into English. They are also given a booklet translating the four values allowing them to become familiar with what Kono [owners of Tohu] stands for and also the chance to connect with the culture" (Thomson, 2015, p. 9). He then notes that "Asian markets like China tend to respond very well to the Maori culture. They too, also have strong values around hierarchy, respecting elders, hospitality and a long-term intergenerational philosophy… This in itself ties in with the story the customer [importer] can tell their consumers in China. The Chinese buyer has been to the winery, knows the winemaker, and can share the story of Kono" (ibid). This emphasises the importance of outlining the company's own culture, values and mission and the importance of understanding how this resonates with the consumer society's culture shown here by shared values between Māori and Chinese culture.

5.5 Māori provenance, authentication and traceability

Provenance, authentication and traceability are not just used as a means of increasing export returns but are of fundamental importance for Māori as food is an embodiment of people and place (Reid and Rout, 2016). Miraka's integrated value chain provides a stable base for them to communicate the cultural provenance and assert the authenticity of their products; however, while they are implementing a traceability scheme, this is focused on reassuring consumers of product safety. As the general manager explains, traceability is essential "If you are going to make some claims you need to be able to back it up, particularly in places like China or Southeast Asia where they are not as trusting as some western consumers". While consumers are more interested in the authenticity of any environmental, ethical and, in particular, safety claims, at the premium end even the cultural attributes should be backed up by some form of trust enhancing mechanism. Cultural authenticity can reinforce these types of claims as they encapsulate beliefs, values and behaviours toward land, animals, employees and consumers. The traceability of crucial information like farm and processor identity and technique of production also provide the critical cultural attributes meaning adding this provenance and authenticity is a matter of framing the information to emphasise culture rather than requiring extra information.

Traceability is an issue for Hua Parakore, a food authentication system developed by the National Māori Organics Authority of Aotearoa and informed by the International Social and Environmental Accreditation and Labelling Alliance (ISEAL) (Hutchings *et al*, 2012). The system makes sure all "production and cultural practices are free from genetic modification (GM), nanotechnology, chemicals and pesticides and ensure[s] product purity and integrity that is congruent with Māori cultural practices". However, it does not even have a website, and all online references are either media or academic related. These schemes require underlying processes such as third-party verification made public to generate trust through traceability (Reid and Rout, 2016). Unfortunately, a label is not enough to convince all consumers.

An example of a Māori scheme with traceability is the Ahika Kai project run by Ngāi Tahu. Ahika Kai provides consumers with an understanding of the people, techniques and place behind their food (Reid and Rout, 2016). The Ahika Kai website enables consumers to trace their food using a unique code. It provides a "forum where consumers can come to know and connect with the producers and can gain an understanding of the provenance of the food, in all three dimensions, as well as the relationship between the producer and the food. (Reid and Rout, 2016, p. 432). The scheme is guided by five key Māori values, which producers must embody to be accepted into the scheme (idem). The scheme "'involves producers in the process of continually evolving, refining, and adopting best-practice through co-learning" and provides a means for consumers to sell and communicate with producers directly, reinforcing the core Māori belief of coevolving and mutually beneficial relationships (Reid and Rout 2016, 433). By 'condensing' the chain, the producers can add more value, selling directly to the consumer and they can find out more about what the consumer values. The scheme is not only important for Ngāi Tahu producers as a means of adding value but also, as one of the founders explains, because "traceability and verification are the main issue for [Ngāi Tahu because the]… cultural authenticity of both provides a link to the people'' (Reid and Rout, 2016, p. 433). Ahika Kai provides a means for producers to directly learn what their consumers want in a way that reflects core Māori beliefs and values.

5.6 Māori branding and marketing

Branding, at least the core principle of it, has a deep resonance with Māori just as it does for any 'traditional culture'. As Harmsworth and Tahi (2008, p. 3) explain, "Māori branding has always been an integral part of Māori culture". Māori already have 'strong brands' as traditional "Māori cultural elements such as imagery, language, symbols, colours, designs" are the core of contemporary branding initiatives (Harmsworth and Tahi, 2008, p. 1). It is not as simple as just using traditional cultural attributes though, Māori branding does add value "but it doesn't happen easily, and there are many other aspects that need to be in line as well. A brand won’t sell a product, it will tell a story that will help the product sell itself” (Thomson, 2015, p. 2).

Tohu Wines branding and marketing also embodies Māori cultural attributes. The word Tohu means ‘signature’ and their “branding includes a number of elements that pay tribute to our culture and what we treasure as a Māori organisation. These include traditional Māori art forms, genealogy and our land”. Visually, their branding includes a koru, a silhouette of their whenua (land) and font designed to look like rauponga (a carved surface pattern). Extending this cultural branding, their reserve wines are labelled as ‘kaumātua’. As their marketing explains: “A kaumātua is the name given to a respected elder of a Māori whānau or family in recognition of the significant contribution they have made to their community. Our Reserve wines are each named in honour of a kaumātua of the Māori owners of Tohu Wines”. Their branding brings together many critical cultural attributes with an unusually emotional heft from love for the land through to respect for elders. They are providing a story of who they are that builds relationships between the producer and consumer.

Ngata (quoted in Thomson, 2016, p. 13) explains, “Brands are living things, not just logos. Brands tell a story, they should represent people, place and product”. Examining how these ‘3 Ps’ have been put into use, Thomson (2016, pp. 13-14) describes Ngāti Porou’s premium smoked fish product called Ahia, explaining that the “Ahia website tells the story of the people of Ngāti Porou, the descendants of Maui, the greatest fisherman of them all who fished up Aotearoa. It tells of their people, their passion and the lifestyle and culture of the rohe (area). The Ahia website is a complete package. It describes the “art of smoking” and the health benefits of eating fish. It tells the story behind the brand, while giving the perception of being a quality product of value and captures the reader into wanting to see, taste, feel the product and most importantly to buy it. It successfully includes the three P’s people, place and product”. The Ahia website goes into great detail explaining their logo, breaking down the six key components and explaining how they are essential to Ngāti Porou. Some of these explanations are themselves broken down into many points of explanation. Again this is providing a story of who they are as a means of connecting with the consumer.

Chapter 6
New Zealand/Pākehā Cultural Attributes

In this section we will look a 'Pākehā' or New Zealand cultural attributes, with a particular focus on New Zealand farming culture.

6.1 New Zealand farming culture

New Zealand farming culture is guided by core beliefs about the importance of rationality, progress, universality and the individual common across the West. As Parker (2001, p. 9) writes, a "great strength of New Zealand farming has been a pioneering spirit through rugged individualism, hard work, determination and personal rewards". These beliefs are not fixed nor are they dominant. For example, while New Zealand farmers do show a remarkable individualism, this probably has as much to do with the rugged and isolated nature of farming, particularly in the early colonial days. Furthermore, while New Zealand farmers are individualists, they also show a collective spirit, with farmers' cooperatives a common part of the agricultural sector. Moreover, New Zealand farmers' 'individualism' was, and to a decreasing degree is, not so much centred on the lone person but rather an individual family, which further blurs these lines (Johnsen, 2004). Still understanding the underlying beliefs is useful as a rough guide.

One particular belief that has had a powerful influence on the way New Zealand is that of progress. From the advent of frozen exports in the 1880s until the 1970s New Zealand had what is described as 'productivist agriculture' which was focused on producing as much food to sell to the guaranteed UK market (Rosin, 2008). The aim was to progressively produce more with little focus on premium quality or production differentiation. This changed when the UK entered the Common Market of the then European Economic Union and New Zealand lost its market access, forcing New Zealand farmers to adapt and innovate. While this drive for progress remains a key part of the farming culture, it has been modified. The New Zealand farming sector has experienced a significant shift in the past three to four decades, the "loss of free access to Britain, together with the neo-liberal reform of New Zealand's agricultural economy in the 1980s, initiated a sense of crisis in the sector" (idem, p. 49).

One point of interest is that the difference between Māori and Pākehā/New Zealand beliefs regarding food production techniques was at its high point in the 1950s to 1970s when the global industrial food industry marketed productivist food as being 'scientifically produced' and terms like 'natural' and 'organic' carried none of the marketing power they do currently (Campbell, 2015). We are now in a period when wider Western beliefs about food production are closer to indigenous beliefs than they have been in decades, which is a powerful insight for Māori and New Zealand in general as individually and collectively we have food places, faces and techniques that align with the increasingly common beliefs around the world.

While the Western worldview remains powerful in New Zealand Māori beliefs have had an increasing influence in the broader culture. This can be seen in various ways including their inclusion in legislation such as the Resource Management Act of 1991. Of course, it would be wrong to portray beliefs such as the intrinsic value of the environment as being solely Māori or indigenous. However, it is also important to acknowledge that for New Zealand and Western society these beliefs have conflicted with others such as progress. Revealingly, Belich and Wevers (2008, p. 7) write, "Pākehā New Zealanders tend to have a strong, if mythic, connection to a rural society or imagined versions of it, and (perhaps contradictorily) to an unspoilt landscape". What is important here though is the understanding that Māori beliefs are having a wider impact and that this has many critical outcomes for the use of cultural attributes as a means of maximising export outcomes.

6.2 Pākehā/New Zealand values

Many values are particularly crucial to Pākehā culture. Probably the most important are those of fairness, equality and honesty (Fischer, 2012). Other vital values are ingenuity, independence, hard work and 'mateship' (Sibley *et al*, 2011). New Zealand farmers not only share these values but can be seen as one of the primary sources of them, with the 'number eight wire' mentality embodying many of these and displaying its obvious agricultural origins. Stone (referred to in Johnsen, 2004, p. 428) refers to "a 'creed', or special ideological status accorded to farmers in Australia, USA, Canada, and New Zealand, wherein farmers see themselves, and are considered by others, to be 'uniquely worthy' because of their hard work producing essential food and resources to aid the growth of the nation". They are "held in high esteem because of the way they have 'tamed the land'… by the 'sweat of their brow and ingenuity'" (Stone, cited in Johnsen, 2004, p. 428). New Zealand farming culture is responsible for shaping New Zealand's broader cultural values, with the hard-working, ingenious and independent farmer embodying many of the country's core values. Fairweather and Keating (1999) argue that there are three critical managerial types of farmers in New Zealand: the dedicated producer, the flexible strategist and the environmentalist. These provide some insight into values and beliefs, the first is focused on hard work as a means of progress, the second as someone who uses rationality and ingenuity to gain independence and the third as someone who has a relational 'mateship' with the land and wants equality of outcome between themselves and the environment. These can be seen as insightful rather than prescriptive.

It would be wrong to associate the environmentalist managerial type of farmer with Pākehā rather than New Zealand culture as this has been a common trend around the world. However, strong resonances are developing between Māori values and these environmentally focused farmers across not just kaitiakitanga but also family and community-oriented aspects as well. Just as Māori beliefs have been incorporated into keystone pieces of New Zealand legislation, Māori values have also been adopted by national and local government institutions – though admittedly with mixed application and results (Harris *et al*, 2016). While this was initially driven by Māori agitation and legal precedents set by the Waitangi Tribunal in recent years, there has been growing understanding that these values provide a useful means of running a bicultural nation. While progress towards a shared set of Pākehā-Māori values is uneven values such as kaitiakitanga, kotahitanga, manaakitanga and whanaungatanga are increasingly common in government documentation. Furthermore, they are spreading beyond the legally-mandated areas. For example, Air New Zealand has gone from appropriating the koru since the 1960s (Shand, 2002) – discussed below – to integrating Māori values into their corporate social responsibility strategies (Rigby *et al*, 2011).

6.3 New Zealand/Pākehā behaviours

While the beliefs and values that underpin New Zealand farming have remained fairly similar, at least in the farms that remain in family ownership, farming behaviours in New Zealand have changed dramatically in the past few decades. Rosin (2008, p. 52) concludes that the change from simply producing as much food as possible has seen an "alteration in the underlying valuations of good agricultural practice" because of the "greater voice to consumers regarding both tangible and intangible qualities of agri-food products". This connects with the three different managerial types outlined above, New Zealand farming culture has split into a variety of different practices. While some are still focused on the productivist practices, others have adopted different behaviours, which is often connected to an awareness of different cultures. These behavioural changes have been driven by the external pressures of market access.

With regard to Pākehā behaviours, the influence is not as well sign-posted as values where the Māori words are becoming increasingly common in wider New Zealand discourse. However, again there seems to be a slight and subtle influence. For example, rāhui has been included in legislation though in practice the traditional concept and the legislative version are different (Wheen and Ruru, 2011). While in practice, not all New Zealanders respect rāhui, many do, and this change of behaviour is gradual but undeniable.[1] While the adoption of overtly Māori behaviours by Pākehā farmers would be minimal at present, the title of one of the Pākehā Nuffield farming scholarship winner's report was 'Defining our Kaupapa: New Zealand's role in the future of global agriculture'. The Māori term Kaupapa means, as (Bensemann, 2016, p. iv) defines it: "the principles and ideas which act as a base or foundation for action". In other words, principle-guided behaviours. While her findings are not Māori-oriented, even her use of the term is telling.

6.4 New Zealand/Pākehā supply and value chain

There has been an increasing focus on the integration of New Zealand supply chains to add value. Local academics Le Heron *et al*. (2013) try to shift the conception of the chain from the linear cause and effect view to a more dynamic and interrelated network of actors and actions. In their exploration of the wine industry, they show how problems are solved through informal networks of friends and associates, discussing how "cultural practices and social dynamics" aid problem solving (Le Heron *et al*, 2013, p. 228). Here they begin to explore how 'culture' can streamline operations. They also argue that the value chain is part of "an integral part of an emergent relationality" which is about being "in conversation with those with whom we wish to engage" (idem, p. 231).

The conception of how culture can improve the way the supply chain can work together is insightful. Whether this plays out in practice across major agricultural sectors is another matter. Nuffield scholar Parson (2008, p. 9) argues the "greatest barrier to a New Zealand meat and wool industry transformation is the fierce culture of independence, poor communication and mistrust endemic in the industry… This behaviour is not because industry members are morally deficient, but rather symptomatic of the complex and dysfunctional supply chain structures they are in". He identifies the independence of New Zealand farming culture as a stumbling block to integration. This is also something that Woodford indicates when discussing the need to integrate all of New Zealand food production into a single chain if we wish to add value in China, stating that "It seems that 'everyone working together' is not the way we usually do things in New Zealand".[2]

---

[1] https://www.wildernessmag.co.nz/clubs-respect-rahui/; https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=11978208

However, this does not mean that New Zealand farming culture is only a hinderance to adding value to the chain. In their paper on value chains, Saunders *et al*. (2016, p. ix) refer to 'cultural authenticity' and then note that "Although New Zealand may not have a strong internationally-recognized cuisine culture, its conservation culture does generate associations between food products and environmental cleanliness". New Zealand farming culture may not be well-known internationally but it is certainly well-defined, and if communicated effectively through the chain it could generate strong emotional responses from consumers. Considering the widespread backlash to large-scale industrial farming the notion of small, family owned and run farms would appeal to international consumers (Adams and Salois, 2010). This is where the consumer-focused research into preferences would help align the value chain. Conveniently, these have been conducted by academics around the world and finding out which markets this farming culture would appeal to most would not be difficult. Take the US: "Pens of bare earth in serried rows, stretching across fields as barren as an urban car park, packed with cattle being intensively fed – this is the vision we have of the over-industrialised, disease-prone, polluting and crueller side of American feedlot beef production".[3] The most infamous of these US feedlots, between San Francisco and Los Angeles, has up to 100,000 cattle squeezed into a square mile, is referred to as 'Cowschwitz' by its critics.[4]

While the anger directed at these operations is prompted by the living conditions of the cattle, there is also a deeper understanding that this emerges because of the ownership structure (Adams and Salois 2010). This provides New Zealand farmers with a powerful opportunity to connect their grazing style to their ownership structures. With regard to value chains, this means that the value of small, family owned and run farms needs to be communicated both to the consumer and to the farmer. The recent trend in New Zealand has been towards farm consolidation and, admittedly to a lesser degree, feedlot style agriculture (White et al. 2010).[5] As Brakenridge (2016) and many others have argued, New Zealand cannot and should not compete on scale, and these trends reduce New Zealand farming culture – not to mention the environment – and its value internationally. This means that ensuring the chain is valuable means making sure that New Zealand still retains its farming culture of small, family owned and run farms.

---

[2] https://www.stuff.co.nz/business/farming/opinion/73312711/climbing-the-agrifood-value-chain

[3] https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/may/31/beef-production-britain-farming

[4] https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2011/12/feedlots-vs-pastures-two-very-different-ways-to-fatten-beef-cattle/250543/

[5] https://www.stuff.co.nz/business/farming/76715640/sheep-farmers-look-for-answers-to-slow-the-decline;

Another overlooked area of New Zealand farming culture is its innovative nature (Rosin 2008). While the number eight wire mentality goes back a long way, the latest driver of innovation has been deregulation and the loss of subsidies (Rosin, 2008). This has forced New Zealand farmers to operate far more efficiently, and it has also seen them develop one of the most enquiring and forward-focused farming cultures in the world.[6] Because they have had to improve their production techniques, New Zealand farmers have developed a new culture that overcomes the individuality of the past, sharing information through their networks (Sligo and Massey, 2007; Wood *et al*, 2014). This networking is being facilitated by the chain, in particular, the processers who understand that one of the best ways of adding value is by enhancing information sharing (Sligo and Massey, 2007). In turn, this is helping to create a new innovative farming culture that, used in conjunction with the small, family owned and run farms, could serve as a powerful marketing tool. This highlights something important to remember, culture is not fixed but rather fluid, and New Zealand can use this to its advantage, particularly as its 'young' culture makes it even more fluid than others.

There is no available research into or evidence of Pākehā farmers or organisations overtly using Māori beliefs, values or behaviours as a way of adding value to their supply chain. That said, the major issue of New Zealanders not 'working together' can be overcome by embracing these beliefs, values or behaviours. Furthermore, many of the emerging trends have a strong resonance with these beliefs, values or behaviours, meaning that there are wider lessons to be learnt. For example, the largest Chinese importer of New Zealand lamb, "Grand Farm recently ran a competition sponsoring winners to visit New Zealand, allowing them to trace the meats they bought in China back to the farm it was grown on to enhance their understanding of the food production and safety process".[7] Conversely, New Zealand sheep farmers and organisations are increasingly visiting their foreign importers.[8] While these can be seen as 'practical' visits that are focused as on logistics, marketing etc. they also have an inescapably social element to them, one that can be easily understood through the framework of Māori values. Rather than assuming the social component is an 'add-on' to the trip, it may help if participants in the value chain are more focused on the importance of this relationship building. As a farming couple who went on an industry-backed trip to Asia state, "In China the Smiths noted the importance of strong relationships with resellers of New Zealand products".[9] Likewise, the most positive impact of the five listed for the Callaghan Innovation-led trip to North America's largest dairy technology event was "new or stronger international relationships thanks to being part of the delegation" as opposed to acquisition of new technology.[10] As one delegate explained, "We aim to do more of our in-market work in the USA as a result of relationships (formed) and the attitude of the people we meet through this delegation".[11]

---

[6] https://theeconreview.com/2017/02/22/new-zealand-the-model-for-farms-of-the-future/

[7] http://www.stuff.co.nz/business/farming/agribusiness/9463889/Putting-New-Zealand-meat-on-Chinese-tables

[8] https://newhavenperendales.co.nz/red-meat-study-tour-of-asia

[9] https://newhavenperendales.co.nz/red-meat-study-tour-of-asia

[10] https://callaghaninnovation.govt.nz/blog/blog-vocabulary/45%26category%3DAgTech

[11] https://callaghaninnovation.govt.nz/blog/blog-vocabulary/45%26category%3DAgTech

6.5 New Zealand/Pākehā provenance, authentication and traceability

While there are food provenance and authentication traceability programmes running in New Zealand, they do not focus on cultural attributes but rather on environmental, ethical and, in particular, food safety.[12] This fits with New Zealand's current 'volume mentality'. For example, Fonterra has an authentication scheme, but it is solely aimed at the tracing a specific item back through the supply chain.[13] Fonterra's 'cow-to-cup' traceability has been driven by food safety concerns and while the "ultimate vision would be for consumers to be able to trace product back to the farm, but the realities of tankers collecting milk daily from multiple farms meant it was extremely difficult to achieve".[14] That said, the agri-food industry recognises that traceability needs to beyond this narrow focus. As the Sustainable Business Network outlines, "Traceability is more than being able to successfully pull off a product recall, essentially it is about an open and honest story of food that highlights best practice and therefore pressures companies who don't perform well across their supply chain to alter their habits".[15]

While not an agri-food example, one scheme in New Zealand that used farming culture in an overt manner was Icebreaker's Baacode, which "allow[ed] people to trace the merino wool in their garment back through the supply chain to the farms in New Zealand's Southern Alps where it was grown".[16] Icebreaker encouraged consumers to 'meet the growers', naming the farms the merino was sourced from and naming the farmers, providing a statement from the farmer about themselves and a video with them talking about their farming life. This provided an emotional connection between the producer and consumer and carried with it underlying statements about New Zealand farming culture, from talk of the 'rugged' nature of the life and work there to how long their family has owned their farm.

Just as with supply and value chains, there are no explicit uses of Māori culture as a means of tracing provenance and authenticity, but similarly, there are lessons that can be learnt from Māori beliefs about the importance of these (Reid and Rout 2016). In particular is the understanding that splitting up the different 'attributes' and only tracing one is problematic as they all relate to one another. Certainly when there are technical issues such as Fonterra's the focus should be on food safety, but these tracing systems provide them with the information and technology to easily emphasise 'cultural' provenance and authenticity, even if it only focuses on the regional group of farmers and their culture rather than a specific farmer. While food safety is paramount, knowing the farming culture that is guaranteeing this safety adds to the perception that the hygiene and quality control standards are high.

---

[12] http://foodsafety.govt.nz/elibrary/industry/dairy-traceability-working-group-report/index.htm; https://sustainable.org.nz/sustainable-business-news/where-has-your-food-been/

[13] https://www.ruralnewsgroup.co.nz/rural-news/rural-general-news/fonterra-seeks-cow-to-cup-traceability

[14] https://www.stuff.co.nz/business/farming/agribusiness/91228403/fonterra-introduces-traceability-technology-to-fakeproof-its-infant-formula-brand

[15] https://sustainable.org.nz/sustainable-business-news/where-has-your-food-been/

[16] https://gearjunkie.com/icebreaker-s-baacode

Rather than focusing on one aspect, the Māori way of viewing these would see them combined and considered together.

6.6 New Zealand/Pākehā branding and marketing

'Brand New Zealand' is viewed as having a powerful impact on agricultural export and tourist import, leveraging the 'pure' scenery to sell both beef and boarding passes. That said, in their comprehensive survey Lees and Saunders (2015, p. viii) conclude that "a large percentage of New Zealand food exports arrived at the consumer unbranded and not identified with their New Zealand origin, so they did not have New Zealand-specific credence attributes associated with them". There is much that needs to be done in this area as New Zealand has done some work toward branding and marketing its agricultural exports using provenance of place, say through 'country of origin labels', there is even less focus on using New Zealand 'farming culture'.

While Campelo *et al*. (2011, p. 9) claim that "100% Pure New Zealand [branding] seems to be no longer limited to a clean and green image but more concerned with presenting the notion of a pure New Zealand culture", this has barely transferred to agricultural branding and marketing. The New Zealand Meat rosette was first introduced way back in 1923 to identify New Zealand meat products though up until the UK entered the common market this did not have the same importance as it does now (Clemens and Babcock, 2004). The New Zealand lamb brand is widely recognised around the world, though generally speaking 'Brand New Zealand' attributes are: free-range animals; good animal welfare practices; no use of growth-promoting hormones, steroids, or other chemicals; good processing quality; leanness that will contribute to a healthy, nutritious diet; and standard and custom-made cuts (idem). Traditionally, New Zealand farming culture has not been used to add value – it remains hidden behind the imagery of sheep on green hills.

There are new initiatives, however, to use New Zealand farming culture as a means of branding and marketing. Beef+Lamb New Zealand (B+LNZ) has just developed a new marketing strategy that seeks to "tell the story about the farmers behind the product, as well as the quality, nutritional value and food safety that underpins our red meat industry"[17] The Chairman of B+LNZ outlines the "development of a red meat sector story, which captures the culture, values and integrity that's long been associated with New Zealand sheep and beef farmers, will be an angle we aim to exploit in differentiating this country from its competitors in the international marketplace Their campaign is based on market research".[18] As B+LNZ explains, "We need to understand the values, needs and motivations of these consumers, what is making them tick, what's important to them, and what type of experience they expect when they purchase premium food products".[19] B+LNZ's campaign is based on insights into their markets' food cultures.[20] That said, the key focus of the overarching strategy is dominated by place rather than farming culture – the brand is called 'Pure Nature' and the marketing campaign is called 'Taste Pure Nature' and refers to New Zealand's 'remoteness', 'unspoilt nature', 'climate', 'wide open spaces', with the only mention of farmers being "as farmers we work with these natural gifts".[21] As the B+LNZ Chairman explains, the story will build "on New Zealand's farming systems with free-range, grass-fed livestock – farmed to the highest standards of animal welfare".[22] While the idea of farming culture is mentioned by those involved in the campaign, it is not captured within the campaign itself.

---

[17] https://www.stuff.co.nz/business/farming/90113515/farmer-storytelling-to-leverage-new-zealands-grassfed-image

[18] https://beeflambnz.com/news-views/new-red-meat-marketing-strategy-tells-farming-story

[19] https://beeflambnz.com/your-levies-at-work/market-research-and-consumer-insight

B+LNZ's failure to use farming culture is a missed opportunity. Through their market research Theland Farm Group have discovered Chinese consumers are interested in who produced their food. Theland aims to present their dairy products in China using happy people, happy cows, clean air and clean water. While previously the focus was on the last three, as the Theland CEO explains: "As farmers we need to understand our value… so we are the brand of New Zealand milk, so what we do on our farms is what our product developers and our marketers are able to sell." [23] This insight comes from knowledge of its Chinese market, where the identity of the producer is as important as the other factors. By putting a face to the product, the marketing campaign can make an emotional connection with the consumer, with the understanding that different markets have different priorities.

Zespri has a 'meet our growers' page on their website.[24] Here they provide brief bios of six of their growers, providing details about their history and their motivation for growing kiwifruit. They describe how one couple "have long-standing relationships with our orchard workers, their families and casual foreign staff. They often gather around the table for home-cooked meals together" while another couple "have a desire to protect and nurture the environment that provides shelter and a livelihood for their family".[25] These examples personalise the growers, and they subtly inform people that these are family-owned and run operations. They communicate culture. The second example also shows how the 'cultural attributes' can reinforce other credence attributes such as environmental sustainability. Putting a face to the grower and having them talk about their focus on the environment is more powerful than a faceless company making these statements.

Silver Fern Farms has a similar 'meet our farmers' page where they also subtlety outline the culture of their farmers. For example, one bio describes how their family are the "seventh generation on the farm as the legacy continues".[26] Another bio starts by stating "Welcome to a new era in farming, where the focus is about a sense of community, people and partnerships" before the "sixth generation" farming couple explain that they recruit people with "similar values" and "believe in recruiting people who are not only open-minded but who are willing to look at things from a fresh perspective".[27] Here we see the family-owned and run farm narrative meeting the innovative farming culture. This helps create an emotional connection between the producer and the consumer.

---

[20] https://beeflambnz.com/news-views/blnz-finalising-brand-mark-and-strategy-red-meat-story

[21] http://tastepurenaturenz.co.nz/

[22] https://beeflambnz.com/news-views/new-red-meat-marketing-strategy-tells-farming-story

[23] https://www.stuff.co.nz/business/farming/102521490/farmers-are-the-brand-for-new-zealand-dairy-industry

[24] http://www.zesprikiwi.com/meet-our-growers/

[25] http://www.zesprikiwi.com/meet-our-growers/

[26] http://www.silverfernfarms.com/what-were-made-of/meet-our-farmers/cam-and-rachel-mckelvie

The branding and marketing of the winery that Le Heron et al. (2013) use as their example provides interesting insight about flexibility. Called Maimai Creek, in China they do not use the 'Creek' part of the name as there is no translation, while 'Maimai' means 'buy' and has positive connotations. The label itself is what Le Heron *et al*. (2013, p. 230) describes as a "cultural field", a story of "one regional wine economy". Part of their 'marketing', which could more properly be considered supply chain integration, involves the owner of the winery presenting to distributors and retailers. Here he builds on relationships and is himself part of the branding of his company.

Pākehā use of Māori culture in branding needs to be respectful and appropriate. For example, as the New Zealand Intellectual Property Office (IPO) explains, "to associate something that is extremely tapu with something that is noa is offensive to Māori" [28] They then provide the example of 'Papatūānuku cheese'. Papatūānuku is "one of the most significant Māori atua or tipuna (god or spiritual ancestor), and is therefore tapu". Likewise, the IPO outlines how there are some goods and services that would be inappropriate to associate with Māori culture, such as alcohol, tobacco, genetic technologies, gaming and gambling. Thomson (2015, 2) explains that "As a country, we embrace and celebrate our indigenous people and culture a lot more than other countries in the world do. There should be no fear of using the culture to help add value to our product. As long as there is collaboration with local iwi, open communication and integrity with the product most iwi are proud to be able to have their unique brand and or name endorsing and promoting a quality product". This may be somewhat gung-ho but his advice to consult is critical.

---

[27] http://www.silverfernfarms.com/what-were-made-of/meet-our-farmers/william-and-emily-beetham

[28] https://www.iponz.govt.nz/about-ip/maori-ip/concepts-to-understand/

Chapter 7
Conclusion

There are many opportunities for Māori and New Zealand producers to use cultural attributes to add value. Māori beliefs, values and behaviours about food production are well positioned with regard to emerging food cultures of many international markets. For example, the growing demand for animal welfare, environmental sustainability and responsible employment are all resonant with Māori beliefs, values and behaviours. The example of Miraka shows how this works in practice, with the company's behaviour going beyond the regulatory requirements in all these areas because of its adherence to core Māori beliefs and values. The key for Māori producers is to ensure that the supply chain is integrated in such a way as to encourage these at every link and to be able to communicate these attributes to the consumer. Māori culture also lends itself to governing the supply chain in a way that adds value, with the focus on relationships and hospitality seeing Māori producers actively seeking out connections with other links in the chain. With regard to the consumer, this means that Māori producers can find out what the key cultural attributes are directly as they are either integrating or even collapsing the chain. The Tohu Winery example shows how this functions, with the winery actively seeking out connections with other links in the chain both because it added value and because it was part of their food culture.

Similarly, Māori culture sees provenance, authentication and traceability not just as ways of adding value but as of fundamental importance to the embodiment of beliefs, values, and identity. The Ahika Kai project is a good example of this; while it is focused on collapsing the supply chain so that producer can add value, it is driven by and founded on the core belief that these producers want to know who is consuming their food and they want their consumers to know who produced it. This scheme also shows how the beliefs and values shape behaviours.

Māori branding and marketing fit into this need for the producer and consumer to connect as well. The branding and marketing are extensions of provenance for Māori, with the stories about people, place and product all weaving together to create an identity. This can be seen in both Tohu Wines and Ahia, where the branding is essentially tied to the very nature of who is producing it, from the Reserve Wines named after respected elders to the detailed account of what each part of the Ahia logo means. In both cases, the producers are seeking to build an emotional connection and relationship with their consumer.

In contrast, New Zealand has had somewhat of a cultural cringe and while some attributes of Māori culture have been adopted, many of the traditional New Zealand farming culture beliefs, values and behaviours are more suited to the historic 'volume mentality' than they are to the new 'value adding culture'. However, while this is true to some degree, New Zealand farming culture can add value. This comes from several different factors. First, some of the cultural attributes are highly desired by these changing international food cultures, particularly the small, family-owned and run nature of the farms and the ingenuities and efficient way that they are operated. These insights suggest that rather than allowing the supply chain to strive for consolidation of ownership or changes in the way stock are ‘finished’, the best way to add value would be for producers to retain these desirable farming cultural attributes.

Again the volume mentality seems to be limiting New Zealand’s ability to add value through provenance, authentication and traceability. While there are many traceability initiatives schemes in place, the focus is on environmental, ethical and, in particular, food safety. This overlooks the fact that these components are all bound up with wider provenance and authenticity issues. Certainly, they are vital to retain consumer loyalty and trust, but the addition of cultural components would only enhance this. Furthermore, the current systems already provide the necessary information for these cultural attributes to be included in the traceability. For example, while Fonterra is focused on safety, their system already provides them with information about which tanker, and therefore which region, the milk came from, and it would be a short step for them to add information about the farmers in that region to the verification scheme.

It seems that branding and marketing are the most advanced in this area, with many companies seeking to or actively promoting farming culture as a way of differentiating themselves from their competitors. However, many of the efforts are token and fall back on the ‘pure’ branding of New Zealand in general. This is epitomised by Beef + Lamb New Zealand, who discuss the importance of farmers in the supporting literature but then only refer to them with regard to how they work with the environment. Other companies have gone further and provide information on their farmers and growers, and this not only shows how farming culture can be used to add value but also shows how the ‘cultural attributes’ can reinforce other credence attributes. Putting a face to the producer and having them talk about their focus on the other important issues like ethics, the environment and food safety is more powerful than a faceless company making these statements. Branding and marketing is also the space where Pākehā have adopted Māori culture, though this must be done in a careful and consensual manner. There are right ways and wrong ways to use Māori culture to brand and market. As well as being sensitive to Māori it must also be true to the company.

References

Adams, D. C. and Salois, M. J. (2010). Local versus organic: A turn in consumer preferences and willingness-to-pay. *Renewable agriculture and food systems*, *25*(4), 331-341.

Balmer, J. M. (2001). Corporate identity, corporate branding and corporate marketing – Seeing through the fog. *European journal of marketing*, *35*(3/4), 248-291.

Barker, C. (2004). *The Sage Dictionary of Cultural Studies*. London: Sage.

Belich, J. and Wevers, L. (2008). "Understanding New Zealand Cultural Identities." Discussion Paper, Stout Research Centre, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington.

Bensemann, J. (2016). Defining our Kaupapa: New Zealand's role in the future of global agriculture. Nuffield New Zealand Report, accessed at https://nuffieldinternational.org/live/Report/NZ/2016/jessica-bensemann.

Beverland, M. (2006). The 'real thing': Branding authenticity in the luxury wine trade. *Journal of Business Research*, *59*(2), 251-258.

Bisogni, C. A., Connors, M., Devine, C. M. and Sobal, J. (2002). Who we are and how we eat: A qualitative study of identities in food choice. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior*, *34*(3), 128-139.

Bovet, D. and Martha, J. (2000). *Value Nets: Breaking the Supply Chain to Unlock Hidden Profits*. John Wiley & Sons.

Brakenridge, J. (2016). Why are we wasting a good crisis? The value shift our primary sector needs. In Massey, C. (Ed.). *The New Zealand Land & Food Annual: Why Are We Wasting a Good Crisis?* Palmerston North: Massey University Press.

Brand, K. W. (2010). Social practices and sustainable consumption: Benefits and limitations of a new theoretical approach. In Gross, M., Heinrichs, H. (Eds.) *Environmental Sociology: European Perspectives and Interdisciplinary Challenges.* Dordrecht: Springer.

Byrne, D. (1996). Deep nation: Australia's acquisition of an indigenous past. *Aboriginal History*, *20*, 82-107.

Campbell, H. (2009). Breaking new ground in food regime theory: Corporate environmentalism, ecological feedbacks and the 'food from somewhere' regime? *Agriculture and Human Values* *26*(4): 309-319.

Campbell, H. (2015). Spurlock's vomit and visible food utopias: Enacting a positive politics of food. In Stock, P. V., Carolan, M. S. and Rosin, C. J. (Eds) *Food Utopias: Reimagining Citizenship, Ethics and Community*. Oxfordshire, New York: Routledge, pp. 195-216.

Campelo, A., Aitken, R. and Gnoth, J. (2011). Visual rhetoric and ethics in marketing of destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, *50*(1), 3-14.

Chan, K. (2005). "Private approach pays off." *New Zealand Herald.* https://www.nzherald.co.nz/acnielsen/news/article.cfm?o_id=412&objectid=10358921&pnum=1.

Clemens, R. L. and Babcock, B. A. (2004). *Country of Origin as a Brand: The Case of New Zealand Lamb*. Midwest Agribusiness Trade Research and Information Center (MATRIC) Publications 04-mbp9, Iowa State University.

Collier, H. (2015). Change and innovation in a land of milk and honey? Retrieved from http://nzipim.co.nz/Folder?Action=View%20File&Folder_id=65&File=Forethought%20May%202015%20-%20Hilton%20Collier.pdf.

Cook, I. and Crang, P. (1996). The world on a plate: Culinary culture, displacement and geographical knowledges. *Journal of material culture. 1*(2), 131-153.

Cook, I., Crang, P. and Thorpe, M. (1999). Eating into Britishness: multicultural imaginaries and the identity politics of food. In Roseneil, S. and J. Seymour (Eds) *Practising identities*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 223-248.

Cox, A. (1999). Power, value and supply chain management. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, *4*(4), 167-175.

Cui, G. (2001). Marketing to ethnic minority consumers: A historical journey (1932-1997). *Journal of Macromarketing*, *21*(1), 23-31.

Degler, C. N. (1991). *In Search of Human Nature: The Decline and Revival of Darwinism in American Social Thought*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Denning, S. (2006). Effective storytelling: Strategic business narrative techniques. *Strategy & Leadership*, *34*(1), 42-48.

Duffy, R., Fearne, A. and Healing, V. (2005). Reconnection in the UK food chain: Bridging the communication gap between food producers and consumers. *British Food Journal 107*(1): 17–33

Fairweather, J. R., and Keating N. C. (1999). Understanding how farmers choose between organic and conventional production: Results from New Zealand and policy implications. *Agriculture and Human Values*, *16*(1), 51-63.

Fischer, D. H. (2012). *Fairness and Freedom: A History of Two Open Societies: New Zealand and the United States*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fischler, C. (1988). Food, self and identity. *Information (International Social Science Council)*, *27*(2), 275-292.

Forster, M. (2013). Imagining new futures: Kaitiakitanga and agri-foods. *New Zealand Sociology*, *28*(4), 9-32.

Freidberg, S. (2004). *French Beans and Food Scares: Culture and Commerce in an Anxious Age*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Friedmann, H. and McMichael, P. D. (1989). Agriculture and the state system: The rise and fall of national agricultures, 1870 to the present. *Sociologia Ruralis. 29*(2), 93-117.

Goodman, D. (2009). Place and space in alternative food networks: Connecting production and consumption. *Environment, Politics and Development Working Paper Series*, *21*, accessed at https://www.kcl.ac.uk/sspp/departments/geography/research/Research-Domains/Contested-Development/GoodmanWP21.pdf.

Goodman, D., DuPuis, E. M. and Goodman, M. K. (2014). *Alternative Food Networks: Knowledge, Practice and Politics.* London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Gummerus, J. (2013). Value creation processes and value outcomes in marketing theory: strangers or siblings? *Marketing Theory*, *13*(1), 19-46.

Grunert, K. G., Fruensgaard Jeppesen, L., Risom Jespersen, K., Sonne, A. M., Hansen, K., Trondsen, T. and Young, J. A. (2005). Market orientation of value chains: A conceptual framework based on four case studies from the food industry. *European Journal of Marketing*, *39*(5/6), 428-455.

Harmsworth, G. R. and Tahi, M. (2008). Indigenous branding: examples from Aotearoa—New Zealand. In *Proceedings of the FIBEA—Fostering Indigenous Business & Entrepreneurship in the Americas Conference, Manaus, Brazil*, pp. 22-25.

Harris, F., Macfarlane, S., Macfarlane, A. and Jolly, M (2016). Māori values in the workplace. *MAI Journal* *5*(1): 48-62

Hatanaka, M., Bain, C. and Busch, L. (2005). Third-party certification in the global agrifood system. *Food Policy*, *30*(3), 354-369.

Hornborg, A. (2006). Animism, fetishism, and objectivism as strategies for knowing or not knowing the world. *Ethnos* 711, 21-32.

Hutchings, J., Tipene, P., Carney, G., Greensill, A., Skelton, P. and Baker, M. (2012). Hua Parakore. *MAI Journal*, *1*(2), 131-145.

Kittler, P. G., Sucher, K. P. and Nelms, M. (2011). *Food and Culture*. Boston: Cengage Learning.

Kupenga, T. (2017). "Tikanga Māori food verification system extends to other cultures." *Māori Television.* https://www.maoritelevision.com/news/education/tikanga-maori-food-verification-system-extends-other-cultures.

Johnsen, S. (2004). The redefinition of family farming: agricultural restructuring and farm adjustment in Waihemo, New Zealand. *Journal of Rural Studies*, *20*(4), 419-432.

Le Heron, E., Le Heron, R. and Lewis, N. (2013). Wine economy as open assemblage: Thinking beyond sector and region: Wine economy as open assemblage. *New Zealand Geographer*, *69*(3), 221-234.

Lees, N. J. and Saunders, C. M. (2015). *Maximising Export Returns (MER): Communicating New Zealand's Credence Attributes to International Consumers*. AERU Research Report No. 334. Lincoln University: Agribusiness and Economics Research Unit.

Lu, S. and Fine, G. A. (1995). The presentation of ethnic authenticity: Chinese food as a social accomplishment. *The Sociological Quarterly*, *36*(3), 535-553.

MacDonald, N. (2015). "Are New Zealand food brands really Kiwi as?" *Stuff.* https://www.stuff.co.nz/business/better-business/67982990/are-new-zealand-food-brands-really-kiwi-as.

Mead, H. M. (2016). *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori Values*. Wellington: Huia Publishers.

Moe, T. (1998). Perspectives on traceability in food manufacture. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, *9*(5), 211-214.

Montanari, M. (2006). *Food is Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Paliwoda, S. J. and Ryans J. K. (2008). Back to first principles. In Paliwoda, S. J. and Ryans, J. K. (Eds) *International Marketing: Modern and Classic Papers* (1st ed.). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Panelli, R. and Tipa, G. (2009). Beyond foodscapes: Considering geographies of Indigenous well-being. *Health & place*, *15*(2), 455-465.

Parker, W. (2001). Future challenges for grassland farming. *Proceedings of the New Zealand Grassland Association 63,* 7-15.

Parsons, J. (2008). The new industry transformation. How to redesign New Zealand's red meat and wool supply chains. New Zealand Nuffield Farming Scholarship Trust. http://nuffieldinternational.org/live/Report/NZ/2008/james-parsons

Pay, C. J., White, M. R. and Zwart, A. C. (1996). "The Role and Importance of Branding in Agricultural Marketing. Discussion Paper, Lincoln University.

Phillips, L. (2006). Food and globalization. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *35*, 37-57.

Prescott, J., Young, O., O'Neill, L., Yau, N. J. N. and Stevens, R. (2002). Motives for food choice: A comparison of consumers from Japan, Taiwan, Malaysia and New Zealand. *Food Quality and Preference*, *13*(7-8), 489-495.

Reid, J., Barr, T. and Lambert, S. (2013). *Indigenous Sustainability Indicators for Māori Farming and Fishing Enterprises. A Theoretical Framework*. New Zealand Sustainability Dashboard Research Report 13/06. Published online at www.nzdashboard.org.nz.

Reid, J. and Rout, M. (2016). Getting to know your food: The insights of indigenous thinking in food provenance. *Agriculture and Human Values, 33*(2): 427–438.

Reid, J. and Rout, M. (2018). Can sustainability auditing be indigenized? *Agriculture and Human Values, 35*(2), 283–294.

Rigby, C., Mueller, J. and Baker, A. (2011). The integration of Maori indigenous culture into corporate social responsibility strategies at Air New Zealand. *Journal of Marketing Development and Competitiveness*, *5*(6), 116-126.

Roper, S. and Parker, C. (2006). Evolution of branding theory and its relevance to the independent retail sector. *The Marketing Review*, *6*(1), 55-71.

Rosin, C. (2008). The conventions of agri-environmental practice in New Zealand: Farmers, retail driven audit schemes and a new spirit of farming. *GeoJournal*, *73*(1), 45-54.

Saunders, C. M., Dalziel, P. C., Wilson, M. M., McIntyre, T., Collier, H., Kaye-Blake, W., Mowat, A., Olsen, T. and Reid, J. D. (2016). *How Value Chains Can Share Value and Incentivise Land Use Practices: A White Paper*. AERU Client Report, prepared for Our Land and Water National Science Challenge. Lincoln University: Agribusiness and Economics Research Unit.

Seyfang, G. (2006). Ecological citizenship and sustainable consumption: Examining local organic food networks. *Journal of Rural Studies*, *22*(4), 383-395.

Shand, P. (2002). Scenes from the colonial catwalk: Cultural appropriation, intellectual property rights, and fashion. *Cultural Analysis*, *3*, 47-88.

Sibley, C. G., Hoverd, W. J. and Liu, J. H. (2011). Pluralistic and monocultural facets of New Zealand National character and identity. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, *40*(3), 19-29.

Simchi-Levi, D., Simchi-Levi, E. and Kaminsky, P. (1999). *Designing and Managing the Supply Chain: Concepts, Sstrategies, and Cases*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Sligo, F. X. and Massey, C. (2007). Risk, trust and knowledge networks in farmers' learning. *Journal of Rural Studies*, *23*(2), 170-182.

Smythe, M. (2007). The tail of the flying waka. *Prodesign 87*, p. 78.

Starr, R. G. and Brodie, R. J. (2016). Certification and authentication of brand value propositions. *Journal of Brand Management*, *23*(6), 716-731.

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human Groups and Social Categories.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Tellström, R., Gustafsson, I. and Mossberg, L. (2006). Consuming heritage: The use of local food culture in branding. *Place Branding, 2*(2), 130-143.

Thomson, S. (2015). *Indigenous Branding: Creating a Point of Difference to the New Zealand Primary Sector*. Report prepared for the Kellogg Rural Leaders Programme, 2015. Available at https://researcharchive.lincoln.ac.nz/handle/10182/6712.

Wheen, N. and Ruru, J. (2011). Providing for rāhui in the law of Aotearoa New Zealand. *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*, *120*(2), 169-182.

White, T. A., Snow, V. O. and King, W. M. (2010). Intensification of New Zealand beef farming systems. *Agricultural Systems*, *103*(1), 21-35.

Wolfe, P. (2006). Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native. *Journal of Genocide*, *8*(4), 387-409.

Wood, B. A., Blair, H. T., Gray, D. I., Kemp, P. D., Kenyon, P. R., Morris, S. T. and Sewell, A. M. (2014). Agricultural science in the wild: A social network analysis of farmer knowledge exchange. PLoS ONE, *9*(8): e105203. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0105203.

RESEARCH REPORTS

324 Enhancing Value for New Zealand Farmers by Improving the Value Chain
Saunders C, McDonald H and Driver T 2011

325 An International Comparison of Models and Cultural and National Identity and their Implications for New Zealand Innovation
Rinne T and Fairweather J 2011

326 Publication cancelled.

327 The Cost of Psa-V to the New Zealand Kiwifruit Industry and the Wider Community
Greer G and Saunders C 2012

328 50 Years of the AERU: An Examination and Summary of Past Research
Driver T and Saunders C 2012

329 Perceptions of Sustainability of Dairy Support Land Farmers
Bennett M.R, Pangborn MC and Bywater AC 2012

330 Modelling Alternative Dryland Sheep Systems
Gicheha MG, Edwards GR, Bell ST and Burtt ES 2012

331 Report on a Succession and Governance Survey of a Random Stratified Sample of NZ Farmers
Nuthall PL and Old KM 2014

332 Maximising Export Returns (MER): Consumer behaviour and trends for credence attributes in key markets and a review of how these may be communicated
Miller S, Driver T, Velasquez N, Saunders C 2014

333 Consumer Attitudes to New Zealand Food Product Attributes and Technology Use in Key International Markets
Saunders C, Guenther M, Driver T, Tait P, Dalziel, P and Rutherford P, 2014

334 Maximising Export Returns (MER): Communicating New Zealand's Credence Attributes to International Consumers
Lees N, Saunders C 2015

335 The Wheel of Water: The Contribution of the Agricultural Sector in Selwyn and Waimakariri districts to the Economy of Christchurch
Guenther M, Greer G, Saunders C, Rutherford P 2015

336 Maximising Export Returns: Consumer attitudes towards attributes of food and beverages in export markets relevant to New Zealand
Guenther M, Saunders C, Dalziel P, Rutherford P, Driver T 2015

337 Maximising Export Returns: The use of digital media and smart technology in shopping and information gathering for food and beverages in markets relevant to New Zealand
Driver T, Saunders C, Guenther M, Dalziel P, Rutherford P 2015

338 A Socio-Economic Research Plan for Evaluating Possible Interventions in New Zealand's Biosecurity Networks
Dalziel P, Hulme, Philip E, 2016

339 The Land and the Brand
Saunders C, Dalziel P, Guenther M, Saunders J, Rutherford P 2016

340 International Trade Implications for Consumer Attitudes to New Zealand Food Attributes
Saunders JT, Driver T 2016

341 Modelling Agricultural Impacts of EU-NZ Trade Liberalisation
Saunders J, Saunders C, McLellan B, Obadovic I, Driver T 2016

342 New Zealand food and beverage consumer preferences for product attributes and alternative retailers, and in-market use of digital media and smart technology
Miller S, Driver T, Saunders C, Tait P, Rutherford P 2016

343 Measuring the Economic Impact of Whānau Ora Programmes: He Toki ki te Mahi Case Study
Dalziel P, Saunders C, Guenther M 2017

344 Unlocking Export Prosperity: An Introduction to the Research Programme
Saunders C, Dalziel P, Harker R, Reid, J, and Cammock P 2017

345 Assessing New Zealand public preferences for native biodiversity outcomes across habitat types: A choice experiment approach incorporating habitat engagement
Tait P, Saunders C, Miller S, Rutherford P, Greer G, Abell W 2017

346 Consumer insights and willingness to pay for Attributes: Kiwifruit in Shanghai
Tait P, Rutherford P, Driver T, Li X, Saunders C, Dalziel P 2018

347 Consumer insights and willingness to pay for Attributes: New Zealand yogurt products in Shangai, China.
Tait P, Rutherford P, Driver T, Li X, Saunders C, and Dalziel P 2018

348 Consumer insights and willingness to pay for Attributes: New Zealand beef yogurt products in California, USA.
Tait P, Rutherford P, Driver T, Li X, Saunders C, Dalziel P and Guenther M 2018

349 Consumer insights and willingness to pay for attributes: New Zealand wine in California, USA
Tait P, Rutherford P, Driver T, Li X, Saunders C, Dalziel P and Guenther M, 2018