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1 Purpose and summary

Purpose

*New Zealand literature review of Māori groupings* provides an analysis of contemporary Māori groupings in New Zealand. The urbanisation of Māori has resulted in changes to the ways that traditional social groupings, such as iwi and hapū, are organised and understood, which required investigation into potential implications for defining and measuring Māori identity.

This literature review used a qualitative approach to do this, to allow the words of Māori scholars and theorists to speak for themselves. Statistics New Zealand has no commitment to any perspective outlined in this report.

Summary

This literature review presents an analysis of contemporary Māori social organisation – within the framework of traditional Māori groupings. Māori culture and society is organised around the principles of kinship as reflected through the whanau, hapū, and iwi groupings. Although hapū are generally understood to be smaller kinship groups within iwi, the boundaries between these concepts are not clearly defined. Presently, iwi affiliation is the most common means of recognising Māori group identification.

Following World War II there was a large shift in Māori society, from one of rural, tribal living to integration within urban communities for a majority of Māori. Living away from tribal lands and from other group members, urban Māori have adapted – building new non-traditional tribes based on residential location rather than whakapapa. Urban Māori feel the spiritual connection to their ancestors, but at the same time they affiliate more with physical markers in their proximity (urban marae, church, or club) that fulfil their need for collective belonging.

The census plays an important role in gathering statistical information on iwi affiliation, for government agencies and iwi organisations to use for policy planning and resource distribution. Unfortunately, defining and measuring tribal groupings such as iwi is problematic. We have no definitive criteria for differentiating iwi from hapū, or other types of social groups, and iwi affiliation is merely one part of the larger whole that is Māori identity.

Researchers need a broader collective identification spectrum than iwi affiliation alone to fully understand the identity of Māori living in towns and cities. The current standard for defining and measuring Māori groupings does not fully capture the complexity of what it means to be Māori and further work in this area is needed.
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2 Māori identity

This chapter examines the history of Māori identity and its central features.

History of identity

Over 1,000 years ago, the first tangata whenua, or people of the land, arrived in New Zealand from East Polynesia (Henare, 2000). This indigenous group, now known as Māori, presently constitutes 15 percent of the New Zealand population (Statistics NZ, 2014a). Māori have wide-reaching influence on the social, political, and cultural context of New Zealand. However, it was not until the arrival of Europeans in 1769 that the term and identity of ‘Māori’ emerged, to distinguish Māori from the European Pākehā.

Māori culture and society is traditionally understood to be organised around the principles of kinship – as reflected through the whanau, hapū, and iwi groupings. Whanau is the extended family, consisting of several generations, while hapū is a grouping of whānau connected by a common ancestor. Iwi is a grouping of many hapū and whānau that serves as a source of identity for many Māori today.

[Note: We’ve added macrons within quoted text to make it consistent with other text.]

By 1,500 AD Māori people were organised in terms of three main corporate groups: the whanau, the hapū, and the iwi. The iwi or tribe was the functional macro-political entity. (O'Regan, 2001, p43).

The tribe is that collection of people of shared descent and belonging to a definable rohe who are recognised by other such groups as distinct tribes... ‘Iwi’ in this sense of ‘tribe’ are comprised of constituent hapū, or subtribes. The whakapapa is the thread that weaves the hapū together to form the ‘iwi’. (O’Regan, 1992, p4).

Collective, tribal identity is very important for Māori people and is often placed above individual identity. Personal identity takes second place to collective identity. (Walker, 1989, p38).

In Māori society today, how people chose to identify and on what basis they do so is of critical importance to the survival and development of collective ethnic identity. (Thomas, 1986, p372).

Most often iwi is defined as tribe and hapū as subtribe; however, these definitions of tribal groupings are not universally accepted and discussion remains around the definition of hapū. Ballara (1998) considers hapū to be clans or tribes rather than subtribes, and regards these groups as being both corporate and conceptual. In other words, they are people who think of themselves as a group because of their kin links through descent. But they also combine in concrete ways to perform various functions for their defence and self-management, as well as to conduct relations with the outside world and in many of their economic affairs.

Some scholars (eg Cox, 1993) consider hapū to be the original, pre-colonisation tribal group, and therefore a more authentic grouping than iwi. Accordingly, these scholars consider iwi to be a grouping that gained importance during colonisation times.

At a political level, Māori operated and functioned as independent and autonomous hapū; this served to impede development of a national body politic among Māori. (Cox, 1993, p42).

These scholars argue that iwi is a Pākehā construct, emerging in the 1850s to unify Māori and make dealing with native people easier for government. The main support for the claim that hapū is the authentic grouping is that the Treaty of Waitangi was signed in 1840 on behalf of hapū, not iwi. Although hapū are generally understood to be smaller kinship groups within iwi, the boundaries between these concepts are not clearly defined.
Regardless, in contemporary New Zealand, iwi groupings appear to be more visible, for reasons that include settlements relating to Crown breaches of the Treaty.

**Whakapapa**

A central feature of tribal identity is whakapapa (genealogy), which links a person to their ancestral lineage and to the natural environment. Professor Whatarangi Winiata (2002) of Ngāti Raukawa explains whakapapa as the ability to ground oneself in something known. ‘Whaka’ he explains as ‘to make as’ and ‘papa’ as the earth or ground. He describes whakapapa as foundational to understanding the Māori world view. Whakapapa is a unifying concept for all tribal groupings – whanau, hapū, and iwi – indicating the intertwined nature of these groupings and the fact that none is more significant than another.

Whanau, Hapū, and Iwi were bound by the common thread of whakapapa. Whakapapa linked the individual to the wider world and guided his or her behaviour within that world. (O'Regan, 2001, p50).

As a symbol of identity, whakapapa was unsurpassed. It told a person who they were and where they came from, clearly establishing their relationships with those around them and the world in which they lived. (O'Regan, 2001, p50).

Often iwi and hapū are mentioned together when authors talk about whakapapa or tribal groupings. These terms are connected rather than being distinct and simply reflect two different means of social organisation based on whakapapa. Affiliation to a certain iwi or hapū differs from person to person and can also change over time.

Unlike a realisation of being Māori, which occurred relatively early in life, a realisation of belonging to a particular iwi or hapū happened differently. Collectively, participants mentioned an array of situations and events that helped to bring about a realisation of their iwi and hapū group membership. Many of the situations and events recalled were marae and hapū focused, that is, they were activities that facilitated, or provided the opportunity for a return to their marae in their iwi homelands. In a strict sense, these activities are more likely to facilitate and maintain whanau and hapū membership and identity. However, because of the interconnectedness of hapū and marae, it should not be considered unusual that participants in this study held such a focus. The curious aspect is the convergence of hapū and marae as the source of their iwi identity. (Nikora, 2007, p203).

Links to tribal groupings at different levels of tribal hierarchy are often mentioned in a fluid expression of one’s identity.

Like most Māori I am able to claim ancestral ties with many of the other Māori peoples of New Zealand. However, I lay claim to my descent line from Tainui waka as a preference. Of the many groups that can claim Tainui origins I affirm my identity as a member of two iwi groups, namely Waikato and Ngāti Maniapoto. Of these two larger groupings I belong to several smaller kinship groups or hapū within these, namely Ngāti Hourua and Ngāti Whare of Waikato and Ngāti Matakore and Ngāti Maniapoto of Ngāti Maniapoto. (Edwards, 2009, p19).

An identity is a sense of uniqueness and of difference from others. It is ‘knowing who one is, and who one is not’. (Harris, 1995, p1).

It is common for tribal members to claim a deep connectedness to a certain place. This place is a source of one’s identity and it is usually a geographical feature – a mountain, sea shore, or river. Another physical marker signifying connection to a group of related people is the marae (traditional meeting place). The marae has a very important place in Māori society and is a significant symbol of belonging and an identity marker for both traditional and non-traditional Māori groups. Nikora (2007) describes the importance of marae to the participants in her narrative interview study:
...many participants were able to identify as belonging to numerous hapū. Some of these hapū were within the same iwi group and reflected the descent lines of one parent, grandparent or other ancestors. Sometimes both parents were of the same iwi and belonged to various hapū in the one iwi. In the majority of cases, the parents of participants came from different iwi and a participant’s belonging to numerous hapū across these iwi regions reflected this. When participants thought about their hapū they usually had three anchor points: their marae, its symbolism and its environmental situation; the marae community, its people, their politics, social issues and their general characteristics; and the nature of their relationship or that of their parents or grandparents to the marae and its community. The marae and its structures typically symbolise the genesis of the hapū. (Nikora, 2007, p216).

Connections to iwi, hapū, and whanau are all important for Māori people. These groups are inextricably linked and are commonly discussed collectively. Ties can change over time and can be different for different people but these tribal groupings all have their place in the Māori world and play an important role in defining one’s identity.
Defining and establishing boundaries between hapū and iwi is difficult due to the dynamic nature of these groupings. This chapter explores the complexity of defining ‘iwi’, and implications for emerging groups seeking autonomy.

Throughout history tribes have been fluid entities, frequently adapting to environmental and population changes, and naturally multiplying and dividing over time (Ballara, 1998). These continual changes to group size, structure, and location prevent the definition of clear boundaries among tribes and subtribes. A hapū might feel their perceived status of hapū no longer reflects the nature of their group and advocate to have evolved into an independent iwi. The same applies to iwi that have relocated from their original settlement and now feel they have formed a separate iwi in the new settlement.

In the process of identity development and defining one’s boundaries people or groups have to go through a process of identifying just what it is that makes them unique. Boundary maintenance is thus a process that the collective goes through in order to redefine or change the criteria which serve to distinguish its members from others. The group will set the guidelines for inclusion and exclusion. (O’Regan, 2001, p39).

The process of evolution and separation of groups and of defining group boundaries is often a political one, influenced by dealings with the Crown and the Crown’s terms.

If, over time, hapū within Kai Tahu become fractionalised and seek their own distinctive autonomy divorced from their tribal identity then that change will have to be dealt with. For the present however, Kai Tahu has articulated its desire to be dealt with and represented on a tribal level. Tipene O’Regan emphasises the importance of maintaining the cohesiveness of the tribe to avoid the fragmentation of the tribal capital and assets. If a tribe as a collective can maintain its economic wealth, then that will in turn provide an incentive to belong, contribute, participate and cohere. (O’Regan, 2001, p169).

Katene (2006) presents the example of Ngāti Tama, a small iwi that reunified in 2002 despite tensions with other iwi and Māori groups in the area. Ngāti Tama descendants wanted their own autonomy and control over affairs and resisted becoming part of a larger collective.

It was important for the newly established group to firstly gain support from those whanau and individuals with whakapapa links to Ngāti Tama tupuna who had lived in Te Whanganui-a-Tara from the 1820s. Next, support had to be sought from other groups, especially the two other recognised Ngāti Tama iwi (Taranaki and South Island) and the local iwi of Ngāti Toa that had close historical associations with Ngāti Tama through shared whakapapa and other connections. Achieving the support of Te Atiawa was considered a distant prospect. (Katene, 2006, p142).

Subsequently, a hui was held with the trustees of Ngāti Tama Iwi Development Trust in New Plymouth on 23 August, 2002. The purpose of the hui was to seek endorsement for Ngāti Tama ki ti Upoko o te Ika in Wellington. Trust agreed to endorse and support the establishment of the society as the representative and manager of the affairs and interests of the descendants of Ngāti Tama people who owned lands in the Wellington region. Most importantly, the Trust did not recognise or support any other group that claimed to represent Ngāti Tama interests in Wellington region. (Katene, 2006, p143).

Claims were made that Ngāti Tama was a hapū of Te Atiawa and not a separate tribe. Those remarks served no useful purpose and demonstrated Te Atiawa’s
interest in not wanting to change the status quo and in preventing a ‘ginger group’ from being set up in competition to it. (Katene, 2006, p172).

The example of Ngāti Tama demonstrates the complexity of establishing a new and unique iwi group. Complications arise when the established iwi has already formed recognised links with the Crown and claims to still represent the newly emerging iwi.

Tribes constantly undergo changing circumstances. Tensions arise when other Māori organisations, especially those that owe their origins to Crown decisions, attempt to assert authority, or when individuals must retrace the steps of their forbears [sic] in order to reconnect with whanau, hapū and iwi. Tribal identity in a complex and modern urban setting is exposed to various demographic, political, economic and commercial imperatives. The example of Ngāti Tama provides an illustration of an iwi seeking to know who it is, what it wants, where it is going, what resources it requires, and how to overcome resistance in all its guises. The Crown, keen to retain its established networks and relationships in which it may have invested heavily over a period of time, may not be inclined to develop a new relationship – especially if it were not in the interest of a favoured group that opposed the re-emergence of that new entity. (Katene, 2006, pp22–23).

It appears that a strong traditional tribe does not commonly welcome a hapū wanting to separate and become an independent iwi. In consequence, an emerging iwi seeking to legitimise its autonomous position faces resistance from certain groups within the original iwi or from its allies. As a result of this complex environment, in which new emerging iwi are separating from larger iwi or hapū are transforming into iwi, numerous agencies provide lists of hapū and iwi that are widely inconsistent. These lists are also difficult to align into an agreed list of iwi and hapū.

Katene (2006), writing about Ngāti Tama, claims:

Today, three autonomous Ngāti Tama iwi entities exist: one in Taranaki, another in the South Island, and Ngāti Tama ki te Upoko o te Ika in Wellington. While the three iwi collaborate as much as practicable through shared waka traditions and genealogical links, each is responsible for its own affairs including inter-iwi relationships within each rohe, Crown liaison, economic advancement, socio-cultural development, and claim management. (Katene, 2006, p132).

The iwi distribution described above is reflected in the Statistics NZ standard classification of iwi (Statistics NZ, 2009). However, the Te Puni Kōkiri website has Ngāti Tama ki Te Tau Ihu in the Golden Bay region and Ngāti Tama in Taranaki, but no Ngāti Tama in Wellington region, while the ‘mother iwi’ Taranaki Whanui ki te Upoko o te Ika features on the website in the Wellington region.
This chapter outlines two perspectives on identity for Māori.

For some commentators, tribal (iwi) identity overrides Māori identity. For Tūhoe leader John Rangihau (1992), being Māori is unconditionally dependent on his history as a Tūhoe person rather than being a Māori person. He says:

> It seems to me there is no such thing as Māoritanga because Māoritanga is an all-inclusive term which embraces all Māori. Each tribe has its own history. And it’s not a history that can be shared among others. How can I share with the history of Ngāti Porou, of Te Arawa, of Waikato? Because I am not of those people. I am a Tūhoe person and all I can share in is Tūhoe history. (Rangihau, 1992, p190).

Mahana Walsh talks about the importance of being Ngāi Tahu.

> It means everything to me, it colours all my thoughts. It affects all my actions, it affects my wairua – who I am and where I fit into the community and the society. It has probably always affected me, from my earliest times. Being Ngāi Tahu has meant that I’ve known I’ve had a special place which we call the marae, our own church – that was the focal point, the marae and the church, the focal point for who I am. My identity is wrapped up in there. If those places did not exist I would feel totally bereft. (O'Regan, 2001, p165).

In contemporary New Zealand, some Māori living in traditional iwi territories might identify with Māori ancestry but not affiliate to any tribal structure, either due to lack of whakapapa knowledge or disconnection from the traditional family structures. Again, affiliation to either identity (as Māori or as iwi member) might be transient and can be expressed differently depending on circumstances. Pearson (1990), Linnekin (1990), and O'Regan (2001) suggest the coexistence of pan-Māori identity and tribal identity is legitimate; that is, they can live side-by-side.

Because these broader identities are often a political response they do not necessarily mean the demise of the composite identities that comprise it. Instead they may develop and crystallise when it is politically advantageous to do so, and alternatively they may fade away when the need or the pressure no longer exists. (Linnekin, 1990, p168–169).

Another response to boundary maintenance that is open to ethnic groups who exist as one of multiple numbers of ethnic groups in a society is the adoption of a larger identity over that of their traditional ethnic identity. In this instance, groups who share a common goal or who have experienced similar oppression may unite in order to provide a strengthening of the collective in the face of the power culture; the identity which results is called a pan-identity. Examples of pan-identities include American Indians, Canadian Indians and Māori, all of which are broad ethnic categories which encompass a range of separate tribal identities. (O'Regan, 2001, p103).

A Māori identity does not replace iwi and hapū identities, but eventually becomes a meaningful, wider social construct that both accommodates and is in tension with more particularistic and traditional lines of affiliation (Pearson, 1990).
5 Urbanisation of Māori

This chapter examines the move Māori made from a mainly rural to a mainly urban environment.

Move leads to change

During the 20th century, Māori culture and way of life underwent transformation. Following World War II there was a significant shift away from a largely rural tribal culture to one that is predominantly urban. In the 1930s, 80 percent of the Māori population lived in rural areas and tribal homelands (Pool, 1991), but by the 1970s, the large majority of Māori were urban dwellers (Statistics NZ, 2012). This rapid urbanisation had a profound effect on the structure of Māori groupings and Māori identity that remains evident in patterns of iwi identification today.

A variety of factors contributed to urbanisation, including a slowing rural economy and an overpopulation of land resources, and urban life presented Māori with an attractive alternative. However, those who moved to urban centres were no longer able to participate in traditional tribal life, resulting in weakened iwi identities (Rarere, 2012).

Along with the shift away from rural living came a shift away from living within a collective of people with similar world views, where common ancestral ties provided secure connections to identity. The new and often hostile urban environment promoted individualism, and integration with the Pākehā-dominated environment.

Once in town they found new problems and the need for a reaffirmation of their Māori identity. A new synthesis had to be found that would allow Māoris to remain Māori while participating in the Pākehā world. (Sinclair, 1990, p224).

‘Urban iwi’ develop

In response, new forms of Māori organisations developed in urban areas, creating a new sense of community and connectedness, as well as providing Māori identification within a pan-tribal context. New non-tribal structures provided whanau-like support networks for dislocated Māori became established within the urban environment. The emergence of Ngāti Poneke in Wellington is an example of this search for collective belonging. Eventually, the newcomers and tangata whenua groups living in the area decided:

That there needed to be a regular meeting-place, a welcoming place – a marae – for the city. So they formed themselves into a synthetic tribe, Ngāti Poneke. Among other things they set about fund-raising with a concert party. (Ritchie, 1992, p15).

As one member recalls, this new ‘urban tribe’ brought a sense of belonging and security:

I became a member of Ngāti Poneke and was enjoying my new-found happiness. I will always be Ngāti Poneke until I die. I owe the club so much – for its protection; for the joyous things we did together; and for the warmth I never got anywhere else. We hung onto each other. It was our whanau. Ngāti Poneke was our turangawaewae, our rock and strength, our protection. Without it we would have gone around like people with no heads. We’d have been lost. At Ngāti Poneke I could stop pretending. ‘Nobody can touch me here’, I thought. It was our Māori house, where I could be where I belonged. I was a different person away from Ngāti Poneke. As soon as I was out those doors I put my iron coat on. (Mhiipeka Edwards in Grace, Ramsden, & Dennis, 2001, p90).
Although Ngāti Poneke claimed to be non-tribal, the reality was that tribal identity and social networking were perhaps its strongest assets aside from people. While, tribal identity may have been important, it also appears that whanau identity and networks were equally important. (Nikora, 2007, p65).

Urban marae and the emergence of new non-kin-based Māori organisations were logical outcomes of urbanisation. They were strengthened by the quest of Māori urban dwellers to belong to like-minded collectives sharing common beliefs. However, while these outcomes are accepted by many, they are not supported or acknowledged by others who promote traditional tribal kin-based structures. As Hana O’Regan (2001) says:

Part of that growing up was the realisation that if I expected others to respect Kai Tahu for our differences and the choices we have made through time, then I needed to respect the choices made by others, including pan Māori groups and urban Māori. This doesn't mean that I have to like what they are saying or the symbols they choose for their identity, but I do have to acknowledge their right to define themselves in a way which best suits them. It may not seem like a big leap-but this was in fact a major mind-shift for me personally. (O’Regan, 2001, pp26–27).

Newly formed iwi often face difficulty, and these emerging urban collectives were no exception. Many urban organisations have multi-iwi origins; the centrality of whakapapa as the basis for iwi definition no longer applies. Maaka (1994) describes conflicts and difficulties faced by urban Māori associations trying to establish a new tribe in their place of residence, independent of the tribe's traditional rohe (regional area):

Conclusions that can be drawn from this experience are that to create a lasting and active tribal entity outside the home territory requires more than just the motivation arising from nostalgia and emotional links with some distant tribe. The numbers of Kahungunu who did not affiliate with the runanga indicate a loss of understanding of a cohesive tribal identity; for these people tribal affiliation is of secondary importance when measured against other social realities of city life. The group needed a material expression of their identity, a communally owned asset. The most appropriate asset would have been a meetinghouse, a building whose style makes a statement about traditional Māori culture. (Maaka, 1994, p16).

Of recent times, especially with the subcontracting of the South Island functions of the new Ministry of Māori Development (Te Puni Kohiri) to Ngāi Tahu, there appears to be some renewed interest in tribal-group associations. However, this time it is unlikely that single groups like the Kahungunu runanga will be at the forefront; more likely, the multistate Matawaka will represent the non-Ngāi Tahu in Christchurch city. Te Runanga o Matawaka is a multistate organization that stemmed from the idea of establishing urban Māori authorities, as suggested in the Runanga Iwi Act, as an option for large urban Māori populations. It has parallels in other cities, such as the Manukau Urban Authority in South Auckland and the Waipareira Trust in West Auckland. Matawaka consists of delegates from the various organized tribal groups and has recently opened an office in central Christchurch. The future of this type of organization will depend on the strength of the commitment of its kaumatua leadership and iwi delegates. It has an image problem both internally and externally, and there is a danger that member groups and individuals will see the Matawaka as a welfare center in place of the former Māori Affairs department. (Maaka, 1994, p20).

Often the attempt by urban Māori to return to their traditions in the new environment is not appreciated by their iwi or official representatives.

Minority indigenous peoples in post-colonial situations struggle to balance a desire to modernise their cultures while retaining those institutions from the past which foster and perpetuate their distinctive identity. (Maaka, 1994, p213).
This tension continues to affect Māori development, as has been observed by some commentators.

[T]he urbanised Māoris of Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch ... too often are devalued by iwi Māoris and the Government. (*The Press*, 20 Feb 1993 as cited in Maaka, 1994).

Māoridom's "march back to tribalism" in recent years was a tragic mistake, the Eastern Māori MP, Mr Peter Tapsell said in Invercargill yesterday. Many Māoris were clinging to tribalism in desperation during a time of great change, even though tribal groupings were of more relevance to the past century than this one, he said. (*The Press*, 29 Sept 1993 as cited in Maaka, 1994).

Parallel to the resistance that hapū wanting to separate and become independent iwi face, urban iwi trying to establish their existence in cities independent from their traditional iwi experience a struggle for legitimacy. This process of separation and establishment can take several years, and has uncertain results, due to differing levels of acceptance from certain groups and differing levels of material support available to these groups.
6 Issues in contemporary Māori identity

This chapter offers some of the issues present-day Māori face in determining identity.

Iwi affiliation persists

Despite the weakening of whakapapa as a basis for iwi formation in the urban context, iwi affiliation still holds a strong presence in the lives of urban Māori, with 80 percent of Māori reporting they identify with at least one iwi in the 2013 Census (Statistics NZ, 2014b). However, it is clear that collectives operating within residential areas have gained importance in people’s lives when compared with Māori in traditional tribal rohe.

In more recent times, conventional Māori social organisational structures such as iwi, hapū, and whanau have changed and evolved from operating within the communal life of the kāinga in a rural setting to more modern urban-based cooperatives; corporate, commercial-orientated land incorporations; and family trusts. (Katene, 2006, p20).

Spiritual connection to one’s ancestors remained present in urban dwellers’ lives but more immediate and physical representation of their belonging to a collective of people outside their traditional rohe gained more importance in the lives of many of them. After the Second World War, when seventy percent of the Māori population migrated to urban centres in search of work, the meeting house as the most potent symbol of Māori identity and cultural pride was transplanted into towns and cities. (Walker, 1996, p50).

The marae which have been built in the urban centres are characteristically not the marae of the takata whenua, but of those Māori people who have left their tribal rohe to live in the cities and who use the marae as a base for their cultural activities. (O’Regan, 2001, p192).

The same pattern is evident in the later proliferation of urban marae across all major cities and towns in New Zealand from about the 1960s and 70s onwards. For example, Nga Hau e Wha in Christchurch, Kirikiri in Hamilton, Mataatua in Rotorua, Hoani Waititi in Waitakere, Te Kotuku in Te Atatu, Awataha Marae on the North Shore, Te Piringatahi o Te Maungarongo in West Harbour, Mataatua in Mangere, and Tira Hou in Panmure. While individual members of these urban hapū still retain both strong and sometimes tenuous links to traditional hapū and iwi their changing circumstances have demanded creative adaptations to new environments and situations. (Nikora, 2007, p67).

Urban collectives develop

Traditional tribes and new non-traditional tribes now coexist. Individuals can retain a traditional tribal identity while at the same time engaging in new urban communities. Establishing new urban collectives did not result in people substituting newly-found kinships for ancestral tribal connections, nor did it replace the tribes traditionally residing in those urban areas.

For example, James Ritchie (1992) recalls the membership in Ngāti Pōneke:

But I soon realised that no one left behind their tribal identity and that, within the structure of the club, tribal affiliation was one of the most important internal networks – one from which, by blood, I had to accept exclusion. However much accepted, I was still, in that sense, manuhiri. (Ritchie, 1992, p18).
There were long established Māori communities of Ngāti Toa and Te Āti Awa around which the urban environment had either grown around or displaced, for example, those kāinga of Porirua, Kaiwharawhara, Kumutoto, Nga Uranga, Pipitea, Piti-one, Te Aro, and Waiwhetu (Grace, Ramsden, & Dennis, 2001). Ngāti Pōneke did not displace these tangata whenua kāinga; rather, it would seem that Ngāti Pōneke developed as a city focus for all Māori and relied upon reciprocal relationships with, and the goodwill of, tangata whenua groups. (Nikora, 2007, p53).

We need a broader collective identification spectrum than iwi affiliation alone to fully understand the identity of Māori living in towns and cities. Generations of Māori have lived in urban settings. Although they may feel the spiritual connection to their ancestors, at the same time they are likely to affiliate with more physical markers in their proximity, such as urban marae, churches, or clubs.

Belinda Borell (2005) argues that urban Māori who become disenfranchised or disaffiliated from traditional tribal ties seek new ways of constituting a Māori collective identity that emphasises ethnicity, class, and locational interests over tribal allegiances. Again, this underscores the dynamics of identity formation and leads us to consider some of the more prevalent assertions.

Roger Maaka (1994) proposes that the tribe is no longer a valid organisational tool for Māori cultural identity in the 20th and 21st centuries. He believes a radical redefinition of the Māori tribal ideology is inevitable and necessary. His proposal is based on the numbers of Māori people living outside their traditional tribal territories (80 percent), and those who claim a pan-Māori identity without acknowledging any tribal affiliation. For Māori to function as a viable and competitive social entity, Maaka argues that Māori social organisation must be centralised and ‘retribalised’. Maaka proposes redefining and constructing a new tribe, one whose membership is determined by factors such as location, association, and commitment. Traditional tribal structures, whose membership is determined by descent, should be confined to the function of managing and receiving communally owned assets (Maaka, 1994). Sinclair (1990) has a different perspective to Maaka and says:

To take the tribe away is to take away the core of Māori cultural identity: the significance of the connection to one’s land, tribal burial grounds and sacred places, one’s whakapapa and history, one’s resource use rights. To remove the tribe would mean a total deconstruction of the Māori cultural world view and the construction of a new world view based on ethnicity. It is perhaps for these reasons that tribal identities have been so durable and powerful throughout post-contact Māori history. (Sinclair 1990, p219).

Pan-Māori and/or iwi choice

O’Regan (2001) and Durie (1998) believe that pro-tribal voices are stronger than pan-Māori ones.

Although there are those who argue for a pan-Māori political approach, they would seem to be outweighed by pro-tribalists. Evidence for this can be seen by the number of tribal and hapū claims that have been put before the Waitangi Tribunal in comparison to pan-Māori claims. (O’Regan, 2001, p168).

Kai Tahu are still Māori, but we are Kai Tahu first. (O’Regan, 2001, p168).

For Māori, a cultural identity based on tribal origin has been more relevant than the notion of a homogenous ‘Māori’ identity. This is partly a reaction to the impacts of urbanisation but also a consequence of tribal claims against the Crown for breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi. (Durie, 1998, p55).

O’Regan (2001) offers a solution to the identity debate.
The issue, therefore, is how these identities manifest themselves within Māori society as a whole. The legitimacy and rights of tribes to act as political, social, economic and cultural entities cannot be undermined if they are chosen by the constituent members as the best vehicle for representing them. On the other hand, if some Māori people choose to identify with and affiliate to a ‘Māori’ entity or collective whose membership derives from common ethnicity or, indeed, locality, then that must also be the prerogative of individuals to do so. The two groupings must, though, be dealt with separately and not just thrown into the same basket as Māori, as they represent two distinct types of ethnic affiliation. If ‘pan-Māori’ people choose to focus on their common historical experience, their shared ethnicity, language and urban marae for example, as core characteristics in their cultural identity, then they must be free to express themselves accordingly and to develop and promote those symbols. They should not be confined to tribal notions of identity, association to tribal lands and whakapapa. (O’Regan, 2001, p171–172).

O’Regan’s suggestion is a potential way forward to define and measure Māori groupings in the dynamic, heterogeneous Māori population that wants to accommodate various means of expressing one’s identity. Any approach in isolation (traditional iwi affiliation, Māori ethnicity only, new Māori urban associations) will not adequately account for the diverse connections that exist in Māori collective groupings. If one approach is taken, dissatisfaction is likely to arise in certain groups, due to conflicting opinions on what is considered a valid Māori affiliation today. In recent years, a growing demand has come from government, Māori organisations, and various service delivery agencies to measure, or at least better define, the urban Māori population (Statistics NZ, 2012).
7 Theoretical approaches to Māori groupings

Several researchers have attempted to categorise the Māori population into typologies, with the distinguishing factors relating mainly to connectedness to Māori culture and the level of integration with Pākehā. This chapter outlines these approaches.

Māori cultural heterogeneity is recognised by Durie (1994), who identified three Māori subgroups:

- ‘Culturally’ – Māori who understand Māori whakapapa (genealogy) and are familiar with te reo Māori (Māori language) and tikanga Māori (Māori customs)
- ‘Bicultural’ – Māori who identify as Māori but also operate effectively among Pākehā
- ‘Marginalised’ – Māori who are not able to relate to either Māori or Pākehā effectively.

A similar typology described by Williams (2000) defines four groups.

- The group representing a ‘traditional Māori core’ are the most enculturated, are often rural dwelling, and speak both Māori and English.
- The second group are ‘primarily urban’ and bicultural.
- A third group are ‘unconnected’. People in this group may be biologically Māori but know little of their Māori heritage and culture.
- There is also a large group of people who are socially and culturally indistinguishable from Pākehā.

In contrast to these categorical typologies, Houkamau and Sibley (2010; Sibley & Houkamau, 2013) take a multidimensional approach to Māori identity. They specify six distinct experiential domains that contribute to the subjective experience of identifying and engaging culturally as Māori. The importance placed on each domain will differ among individuals and therefore it presents an inclusive model of Māori identification.

The six domains are:

- group membership evaluation – subjective evaluation of one’s membership in the social group Māori (‘being’ Māori)
- socio-political consciousness – perceived relevance the historical and socio-political context of being Māori has on one’s self-concept
- cultural efficacy and active identity expression – self-efficacy about personal resources to engage appropriately with other Māori in Māori social and cultural contexts (eg, language, etiquette, reciting whakapapa)
- spirituality – engagement with and belief in Māori concepts of spirituality
- interdependent self-concept – extent to which self-as-Māori is defined by relationships with other Māori, as opposed to being defined as an individual
- authenticity beliefs – extent one believes that to be a ‘real’ or ‘authentic’ member of the social group Māori, one must display specific (stereotypical) features, knowledge, and behaviour.

These efforts to classify and describe the Māori population from a cultural point of view are based on the level of involvement in traditional culture. They present ways to qualitatively and quantitatively assess a person’s identification with Māori culture. However, the usability of these measures for statistical purposes is doubtful. Māori identity questions in the census and other population surveys have limited space; respondents need to be able to accurately and immediately self-identify with a certain grouping. An easy self-identification process results in fewer misinterpretations and misunderstandings and more exact statistics. The typologies and dimensions described
above require in-depth questioning about personal beliefs and experiences, and are not suitable for statistical purposes. Rather, they are suitable for researchers who want to collect rich, detailed information that describes (rather than enumerates) cultural engagement and identification in contemporary Māori society.
Census

Statistics on iwi identification patterns and growth patterns are important to iwi organisations and government agencies for policy and planning purposes, and in relation to Treaty settlements. The census is the primary way to obtain this data. Since 1991, census has collected three indicators of Māori identity: ethnicity, ancestry, and iwi.

Rarere (2012) and Kukutai (2001) emphasise the importance of the census in collecting Māori identity data.

Although the social context and political context has affected how individuals and/or groups form their identities, which in effect affects the way they identify themselves in the census, it is ultimately the census that has an effect on iwi identification because it dictates what ethnic categories and questions are available, how data is categorised and classified. (Rarere, 2012, p50).

Further, the wording of these census questions is important to obtain reliable data.

The wording of the question, the method of data collection, and a host of other factors can impact upon the way in which ethnicity (broadly defined) is reported and counted. (Kukutai, 2001, p3).

For example, a significant growth in the Māori population between the 1991 and 1996 censuses was due to a wording change in the ethnicity question that encouraged multiple responses (Kukutai, 2001).

Walling, Small-Rodriguez, and Kukutai (2009) recommend reflecting post-Treaty-settlement iwi needs by expanding the existing iwi question in the census, and by prompting for tribal registration status and then aggregation to register boundaries. In their opinion, this change would better align official data with the membership concept used by iwi. It would yield data that are more relevant for iwi policy and planning needs.

Moreover, there should also be flexibility for iwi authorities to have access to data that are aggregated according to their register boundaries, rather than those defined by the standard classification, which may be a poor fit. (Walling et al, 2009, p14).

Post-settlement iwi such as Waikato-Tainui are now in a position to play an important role in improving the wellbeing of their members, both through internal capacity building and by influencing external policy formulation and service delivery. In order to do so effectively, however, iwi decision-makers need access to relevant and accurate information about their members. Without a reliable empirical knowledge base, decision-making runs the risk of being based on anecdote and misplaced judgement. In a post-settlement context we ask: How well placed are official statistics to meet the current and future needs of iwi? (Walling et al, 2009, p3).

Registers

An additional source of information on iwi affiliation are tribal registers of enrolled members that many iwi have established. For reasons that include confidentiality issues and inconsistencies of data collection, data from tribal registers is not of the same quality and comprehensiveness as the census, which places the onus of iwi definition and
classification on Statistics NZ, the developers and administrators of the census. The key
difference between census and tribal registers is that census relies on self-identification
while tribal registers require proof of whakapapa. Walling et al (2009) compared census-
based indicators for Waikato iwi with those generated by the tribe’s own register and
found significant differences in population size and composition.

Walling et al (2009) question the ability of official statistics to provide reliable
demographic data relevant for iwi.

Efforts by government agencies to meet the statistical needs of iwi have been
generally well received, but there are several potential shortcomings of relying
solely on official data. One relates to the potential mismatch between how iwi
affiliation is conceptualised in official statistics and the criteria employed by iwi
themselves. As we discuss in more detail, the conceptual basis of iwi affiliation in
official statistics is through self-identification, whereas most iwi registers define
membership through a whakapapa (genealogical) link to constituent hapū (clans)
and/or marae (family groupings). This conceptual disconnect is problematic in that
it may yield populations of different sizes and characteristics. For iwi organisations,
their primary and often statutory obligation is to their enrolled members, and so
there is a compelling incentive for them to have data that reasonably reflects the
characteristics, experiences and needs of their affiliates. The need for data that is
representative of iwi register populations also extends to external agencies tasked
with servicing them. (Walling et al, 2009, p4).

Kukutai and Rarere (2013) single out two important questions they believe iwi are asking
themselves. Reliable data is necessary to provide the answers.

Nevertheless, the intergenerational focus of iwi development means that iwi can ill
afford to ignore future population change. In a post settlement context, iwi leaders
will increasingly need to ask themselves two basic demographic questions: How
fast are our populations likely to grow in the future (e.g. in five, 10 or 20 years’
time)? And, how many members are we likely to have? (Kukutai & Rarere, 2013,
p2).

As well as having reliable data, we need to develop statistical systems that have flexibility
to incorporate and accommodate new and emerging iwi, and non-traditional groups, to
adequately quantify the ever-evolving iwi mosaic.

Iwi classification
Currently, Statistics NZ recognises iwi by considering the following criteria:

- whether the group is separately categorised in earlier iwi or tribal classifications
- whether the group is identified by respondents in previous surveys or censuses
- whether the group has a history of operating as a separate iwi in a business or
  resource management capacity, with legal and/or administrative recognition
- whether historical and genealogical tradition identify the group as distinctive;
- whether the group (as hapū of a larger iwi) is moving to acquire or petition for iwi
  status (Statistics NZ, nd).

Iwi are classified hierarchically, first by rohe (region) and then by individual iwi within the
rohe. The current classification includes 14 rohe and 128 iwi categories, excluding
residual categories (Statistics NZ, 2009). Walling et al (2009) suggest iwi coding needs to
be significantly improved.

Although a list of iwi is included with the census form, respondents are free to
provide any response they see fit. Consequently, Waikato iwi comprises the
Waikato appellation in addition to 370 hapū and place names. Some of these
responses, such as “Waikato Tainui”, clearly indicate that the respondent self-
identifies as descending from Waikato iwi. However, numerous responses that are coded as Waikato iwi do not definitively demonstrate an intention to affiliate in that way. For example, names of places that are within the Waikato-Tainui rohe (e.g. Kāwhia) are coded as Waikato iwi, though residence within the Waikato-Tainui rohe does not necessarily indicate descent from Waikato iwi. A complete analysis of the coding of the iwi affiliation question is beyond the scope of this paper, but our preliminary analysis indicates that coding of New Zealand census iwi data is due for a substantial review. (Walling et al, 2009, p8).

According to Walling et al (2009), aggregated census data results in limited data usability for iwi.

In contrast to the census, the Waikato-Tainui register population is defined in terms of the aforementioned 33 hapū stated in the Deed which, in turn, cover 66 beneficiary marae (Waikato Raupatu Lands Trust, 2008). We compared the list of raupatu hapū with the coding list used by Statistics New Zealand to designate individuals to Waikato iwi and found several differences. The main difference is that seven hapū covered by the Deed are not designated as Waikato iwi, but are instead assigned to Ngāti Raukawa (Waikato), Ngāti Maniapoto, Ngāti Haua and Waikato / Tē Rohe Pōtae undefined. Furthermore, of the marae associated with the Deed hapū, only two (Turangawaewae and Makaurau) appear in the list of Waikato responses. Official data that ostensibly refer to Waikato iwi may encompass different people from those enrolled on the Waikato-Tainui register, with the potential to lead to substantial differences in the parameters and composition of the population measured. (Walling et al, 2009, p9).

Within New Zealand iwi definition and geographical assignation vary. Advances in defining and classifying iwi and Māori groupings for statistical purposes will provide more meaningful and useful data for government agencies and for iwi.
9 Concluding remarks

This literature review presents an analysis of contemporary Māori social organisation within the framework of traditional Māori groupings. Whānau, hapū, and iwi are the basic units of organisation in Māori society, with some authors arguing that hapū were the predominant organisational groups before colonisation. Presently, iwi affiliation is the most common way to recognise Māori group identification. This probably results from the Crown’s preference for ease of communication.

The 20th century saw a pervasive and rapid shift in Māori society, from one of rural, tribal living to being integrated within urban communities for a majority of Māori. Living away from tribal lands and from other group members, urban Māori have adapted – building new non-traditional tribes based on residential location rather than whakapapa. Urban Māori feel the spiritual connection to their ancestors, but at the same time they affiliate more with physical markers in their proximity (urban marae, church or club) that fulfil the need for collective belonging.

This review suggests that to fully understand the identity of Māori living in urban dwellings, we need a broader collective identification spectrum than iwi affiliation alone.

Unfortunately, defining tribal groupings is problematic. Links to groupings at different levels of tribal hierarchy are just one part of a larger whole, and greater importance is not given to one over another. The Māori researchers and Māori participants involved in the research described by the reviewed literature claim their affiliation to Māori groupings on different levels (waka-iwi-hapū-marae) of a tribal and neo-tribal/urban affiliation as a fluid expression of their identity. In particular, affiliations to iwi and hapū are more often than not mentioned together as if one wouldn’t be complete without the other.

The census fulfils the important role of gathering statistical information on self-identified iwi affiliation. This information is used by government agencies and by iwi for policy planning and resource distribution. However, it is clear that further work is needed on understanding and conceptualising Māori groupings. We also need improvements in the classification of this information to better serve the needs of both iwi and the government.

This review describes struggles faced by newly emerging or separating iwi, including urban groups. Without established definitions of terms, and a certain authority dealing with claims from hapū wanting to separate from their original iwi or establish a new iwi, Statistics NZ is exposed to tensions and criticism from applicant groups seeking to affirm their existence. Their legitimacy depends on many factors and is often recognised by some groups and disputed by others.

If Statistics NZ remains in the position of decision maker about inclusions and exclusions of certain groups in the classification, tensions and dissatisfaction about these decisions are very likely to remain. However, at present, no viable alternative recognised authority remains.
Glossary

The definitions below are from *Te Kāhui Māngai, the directory of iwi and Māori organisations* (Te Puni Kōkiri, nd) unless otherwise specified.

Hapū: a sub-tribe; most iwi are comprised of two or more hapū, although a number of smaller iwi have marae but no hapū.

Iwi: in the context of Te Kāhui Māngai, an iwi is a Māori tribe descended from a common named ancestor or ancestors, and is usually comprised of a number of hapū.

Kāinga: home, address, residence, village, settlement, habitation, habitat, dwelling. (Source: maoridictionary.co.nz).

Mana whenua: the exercise of traditional authority over an area of land [whenua]. In the context of Te Kāhui Māngai it is the area over which particular iwi and hapū claim historical and contemporary interests.

Manuhiri: visitor, guest. (Source: maoridictionary.co.nz).

Marae: a traditional meeting place for whānau, hapū, and iwi members usually characterised by a named wharenui [meeting house] and named wharekai [dining house]. Some marae are more commonly known by the name of their wharenui, which is usually named after a tupuna [ancestor].

Rohe: a tribal district; the area over which iwi and hapū claim mana whenua. Maps and text describing iwi rohe are reproduced according to information provided by their representative organisations. The iwi rohe page also lists the local authorities into whose districts the iwi rohe extends.

Tangata whenua / takata whenua: in relation to a particular area, tangata whenua means the iwi, or hapū, that holds mana whenua over that area.

Tikanga Māori: correct procedure, custom, habit, lore, method, manner, rule, way, code, meaning, plan, practice, convention, protocol – the customary system of values and practices that have developed over time and are deeply embedded in the social context. (Source: maoridictionary.co.nz).

Urban marae: non-traditional marae, not specifically associated with any particular hapū, although the mana whenua of the hapū / iwi at the marae site is often acknowledged. They often serve as meeting places for the wider community and may commonly also be called Community; Ngā Hau e Whā; Ngā Mātā Waka; or Pan-tribal marae.

Whakapapa: genealogy, genealogical table, lineage, descent - reciting whakapapa was, and is, an important skill and reflected the importance of genealogies in Māori society in terms of leadership, land and fishing rights, kinship and status. It is central to all Māori institutions. (Source: maoridictionary.co.nz).

Whanau: a family or extended family.
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