MIHI

Ko Tākitimu tōku waka.
Ko Mauao, ko Puwhenua ōku maunga.
Ko Te Awanui tōku moana.
Ko Waimapu, ko Kopurererua ōku awa.
Ko Ngāti Ranginui tōku iwi.
Ko Ngāi Tamarāwaho tōku hapū.

Tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou katoa.
ABSTRACT

Many hapū and iwi in New Zealand are moving from a time dominated by a struggle to have historical grievances resulting from breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi (1840) addressed, to an era of economic development and political reconstitution. As these communities continue to evolve in response to various social and economic forces, an increased awareness within hapū and iwi relating to issues of the constitution of their identity has emerged.

The purpose of this research is to examine the hapū of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, and the changing nature of its identity from the traditional (pre-colonial) era through the colonisation (colonial) era to the contemporary (post-colonial) era. Attention will be focused on the impact of the socio-historical process of colonisation on hapū identity, drawing on role theory, social identity theory and situated identity theory as a means of interpreting the construction and evolution of Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity. Consideration is given to the impact of socio-historical context on identity.

The narratives of eight members of Ngāi Tamarāwaho are analysed to determine how the identity of the hapū has evolved from the traditional era to the contemporary era. The findings reveal that the socio-historical contexts of the three phases of time considered in this thesis influence the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, which evolved in response to the phenomena evident in each era.

One of the conclusions reached in this study is that given the events that unfolded in New Zealand, particularly in the colonisation era, it is necessary to consider the multiple and hybrid sites of identification that exist for many members of different tribal groups, and to challenge static and essentialist notions of identity.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Positioning the Research

The primary goal of this research is to examine how the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho has evolved from the traditional era (pre-colonial) through the colonisation era (colonial) to the contemporary era (post-colonial). It aims to provide a timeline that reveals how the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho has evolved in response to the socio-historical contexts of these phases. Factors considered in this thesis are how hapū (tribe) identity was constructed in the traditional era, the impact colonisation has had on the identity of the hapū, and how the identity of the hapū is influenced in the contemporary era.

Identity resides at the heart of any human society (Royal, 2007). In New Zealand, there is a current trend of Māori identity emerging as an integral component of Māori autonomy and self-determination and it is, therefore, timely to explore this phenomenon as it appears in the context of a specific hapū setting, namely, that of Ngāi Tamarāwaho. Therefore, the key research question asked is, ‘How has the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho evolved from the traditional era to the contemporary era?’ In order to provide some context for the research question, it is necessary to note that Ngāi Tamarāwaho settled their claim with the Crown in 2012 for historical breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi. As the hapū moves from a time dominated by a quest to have their historical grievances addressed to one of growth and restoration, there is an increased awareness within Ngāi Tamarāwaho relating to issues of identity and cultural engagement. This thesis sits as a key point in the broader context of the survival of the hapū, and provides some direction for Ngāi Tamarāwaho in the future. Therefore, this thesis is more than simply an analysis of hapū identity. It is a story of human endurance and resilience about a people who refused to be defined by their circumstances, and who persevered in the face of unrealised dreams and dastardliness to ensure their voice remains heard. It is, at its heart, a story of hope.
1.2 Notes on Terminology

As an initial orientation to this thesis, it is necessary to provide some background information. First, the term ‘Māori’ refers to anyone who claims descent from the indigenous people of New Zealand, and the term ‘Pākehā’ refers to settlers of non-Māori descent and their present-day descendants. It must be noted that in the traditional era, the term ‘māori’ had a meaning associated with ‘normal’ (Sharp, 1990). ‘Māori’ as a term to identify an ethnic group only emerged following contact with Pākehā as a means of distinguishing the collective hapū groups from the new settlers (O’Regan, 2001). Where it appears in this thesis, the term ‘Māori identity’ refers to the pan-Māori collective of hapū. However, it is acknowledged that each hapū had its own identity, and differences exist between tribal groups. It is important to stress that the terms ‘pre-colonial’, ‘colonial’ and ‘post-colonial’ are used to refer to periods of time rather than ‘pre-’, ‘during’ or ‘post-’ the social process of colonisation. Finally, the term ‘hapū’ as opposed to ‘iwi’ (extended tribe) is predominantly used to refer to tribal communities to illustrate that the focus of this thesis is hapū identity. It must be noted that Māori words are not italicised in this thesis as they are in many academic works, because the researcher wants these words to be read as part of the thesis rather than appear like ‘an other’. However, direct quotes from the research participants have been italicised in order to illustrate the participant voice. Furthermore, while some indigenous researchers advocate for the capitalisation of the term ‘indigenous’, so as to not diminish these groups from Western counterparts, this research uses a lower case ‘i’ when the term ‘indigenous’ appears. The term ‘Western’ as it refers to a cultural concept is capitalised to differentiate it from the geographical ‘western’, which has a lower-case ‘w’. Indigenous, on the other hand, does not have any alternative and, therefore, does not need to be capitalised to give it a distinct meaning. Moreover, it can be argued that the term ‘indigenous’ is a hybrid notion that does not recognise the unique features of each indigenous group, and capitalising the term consolidates the hybridisation of these groups. However, a detailed discussion on this idea is outside the scope of this research. Finally, some researchers use combinations of Aotearoa and New Zealand to refer to the country of New Zealand, but in this research, the term ‘New Zealand’ is used. ‘Aotearoa’ implies
a single Māori name of the country existed in pre-colonial times, but before the arrival of Pākehā in New Zealand, politically at least, New Zealand was not a country. Sovereignty lay predominantly with hapū, with some nominal sovereignty resting with iwi (mutu, 2005; te rito, 2007). There was no single political or legislative body governing the country; therefore, the notion of a single indigenous state with its own name could be interpreted as a colonising construct.

1.3 The Research Setting

Ko Tākitimu te waka
Ko Mauao, ko Puwhenua ngā maunga
Ko Te Awanui te moana
Ko Kopurererua te awa
Ko Ngāti Ranginui te iwi
Ko Ngāi Tamarāwaho te hapū

Tākitimu is the canoe
Mauao and Puwhenua are the mountains
Te Awanui is the sea
Kopurererua is the river
Ngāti Ranginui is the extended tribe
Ngāi Tamarāwaho is the tribe

Ngāi Tamarāwaho is a hapū of the Tauranga iwi, Ngāti Ranginui. They are descendants of the captain of the Tākitimu waka, Tamatea Arikinui, who is known by many names. To Ngāi Tamarāwaho, he is Tamateapokaiawhenua. The hapū name comes from their ancestor, Kinotaraia, who was the grandson of Tamateapokaiawhenua and son of Kinonui, the great chief of Mauao. After Kinonui was killed at the Battle of Te Kokowai on Mauao, Kinotaraia was given the name Tamarāwaho, the Son of the Sea Breeze, when he moved inland and settled the area ‘touched by the breeze’ that blows from Mauao to Puwhenua (Riseborough, 1999). Since the arrival of the Tākitimu in Tauranga, Ngāi Tamarāwaho has occupied their
ancestral lands, which lie between the Waimapu and Wairoa Rivers, go as far inland as Te Ri o Tamarāwaho in the Mangorewa Gorge and extend beyond Te Papa out to sea. The map below (see Fig. 1) illustrates the tribal area of Ngāi Tamarāwaho and the neighbouring hapū, with whom Ngāi Tamarāwaho had close interactions. These relationships are outlined in further detail in Chapter Three.

Figure 1. The tribal area of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, and the positions of neighbouring hapū (source: Mikaere, B. (2015). Te Mana o Ngāi Tamarāwaho Incorporated)
1.4 Methodological Approaches

This research is located in a kaupapa ā-hapū (hapū-centred) ideological framework, which is an approach that encompasses all of the various methods of data collection used in this study. It is not a method for gathering data in itself, but rather an approach to implementing research methods that generate data. Kaupapa ā-hapū research stems from kaupapa Māori (Māori-centred) research. This approach is part of the wider kaupapa Māori movement that seeks solutions from within Māori cultural understandings (Irwin, 1994). Kaupapa Māori research is informed by a set of culturally appropriate, ethical guidelines that advise the researcher on the suitable process of engagement within Māori communities. These guidelines are the cornerstones of kaupapa Māori research (Smith, 1996):

- Aroha i te tangata (respect others)
- Kanohi kitea (engage face to face)
- Titiro, whakarongo...kōrero (look, listen...speak)
- Manaaki i te tangata (be generous)
- Kia tūpato, kaua e takahia te mana o te tangata (do not make people feel inferior)
- Kaua e mahaki (do not flaunt your knowledge)

Essentially, the key outcome of kaupapa Māori research is knowledge that supports the self-determination of Māori cultural well-being (Smith, 1990).

While kaupapa Māori research recognises the need for research to be located with a Māori paradigm, the kaupapa ā-hapū approach requires research within a hapū setting to be placed within a framework relevant to the context of the research. Royal (1992) stresses the need to be mindful that ‘Māori history is tribal history’ (p. 13). In the traditional era a hapū, rather than an iwi, was often an autonomous and independent entity, acting in its own interests, with its own leadership and resources, and guided by its own customs (Himona, 2013; Rangihau, 1992; Royal, 1992). This autonomy was displayed when most chiefs signed the Treaty of Waitangi on behalf of their hapū as opposed to their iwi (P. Moon, personal communication, 30 September, 2013). Therefore, the kaupapa ā-hapū approach is firmly based on a Māori cultural

framework and shares the same key outcome of self-determination, but it is located within a hapū setting rather than a pan-Māori context (McNeill, 2007).

Supporting the ideological framework guiding this research is a qualitative research methodology. The epistemological stance of qualitative research seeks to reveal the underlying assumptions of the realities in the research setting (Olson, 1995). The intention of this approach is to gain an in-depth understanding of the participants' perceptions, attitudes, values, experiences, feelings and behaviours. It is necessary to stress at this point that Māori ideas concerning identity are crucial to this thesis; however, the theoretical framework used to interpret these ideas has been predominantly produced by non-Māori theorists. Houkamau (2006) contends that literature discussing Māori identity tends to be descriptive rather than explanatory; it tends to focus on how Māori identity reflects the cultural traditions, values and behaviours of Māori as a people. The theoretical perspectives analysed in Chapter Two of this thesis do not approach the topic of identity from a uniquely Māori perspective. However, the ideological framework in which this research is centred, and the focus on key Māori concepts such as whakapapa (affiliation to a kin group), mana whenua (connection to ancestral lands) and te reo me ngā tikanga (language and cultural practices), ensures that this research, as much as possible, is underpinned by a Māori worldview, with non-Māori aspects assisting to reveal how the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho has evolved. Furthermore, it has not been suggested by the identity theorists referenced in this thesis that their theoretical perspectives were devised with the intention of being applied solely to non-Māori social groups and within a non-Māori setting. Indeed, several researchers working from a social science perspective have given voice to a wide range of views from Māori communities by using non-Māori frameworks of analysis1 and, given the position of Māori communities as social organisations that belong to the wider global community, it seems restrictive to suggest that using non-Māori perspectives to enhance Māori research is entirely inappropriate.

---

1 Examples of such research include Cram, Smith and Johnstone (2003); Edwards, McManus and McCreanor (2005); Liu and Tamara (1998); Liu, Wilson, McClure and Higgins (1999); McCreanor, Tipene-Leach and Abel (2004). The full reference details are provided in the bibliography of this thesis.
This research relies on phenomenology to elicit and explore data from the participants. Phenomenology is concerned with how people make sense of the world around them (Bryman, 2008; Neuman, 2011; O'Leary, 2010). It is, essentially, the study of the experience of the relationship between people and phenomena, and how the phenomena are presented in people’s individual awareness and experience (Bogdan & Taylor, 1975; Bryman, 2008). Perception, rather than the supposed reality, is the focus of investigation (O'Leary, 2010). The key outcome of a phenomenological study is the generation of rich descriptions of the interplay between people and phenomena (Bryman, 2008).

This study also employs ethnomethodology which, like phenomenology, focuses on the way people interpret their everyday worlds (O'Leary, 2010). Ethnomethodology is a method for understanding how people make sense of the world through analysing their accounts and descriptions of their day-to-day experiences (Coulon, 1995). Ethnomethodology is based on the belief that human interaction takes place within a consensus and interaction is not possible without this consensus (Garfinkel, 1967). Consensus plays a crucial part in ensuring a society functions, and it is made up of an agreed set of norms for behaviour that members of a society adhere to (Andersen & Taylor, 2011). It is assumed that people in a society share the same norms and expectations for behaviour, and it is only by disrupting these norms that it is possible to study more about that particular society (Andersen & Taylor, 2011; Garfinkel, 1967). Essentially, the existence of norms only becomes apparent when they are violated.

The basis of the interpretation of the data generated is the filtering of observations through frameworks that are, naturally, influenced by a researcher’s own worldview (O’Leary, 2010). This then begs the question, ‘Can an outsider ever truly know, describe, and interpret the reality of being an insider?’ In response to such a question, Smith (1999) argues that research by non-Māori researchers in Māori communities has distorted notions of what it means to be Māori which, in turn, has entrapped Māori within a cultural definition that does not connect with their lived reality. The credibility of phenomenological and ethnomethodological studies, therefore, depends on the ability of the researcher to consider their impact on the interpretation
of data (O'Leary, 2010). Kaupapa Māori research requires the researcher and the participants to be of Māori ethnicity, Māori culture and Māori worldview (Smith, 1999). This is to ensure the research is credible to the Māori community. In keeping with Smith’s view, the researcher is a member of the hapū involved in the study.

This research also relies on a review of literature for themes of identity and the evolving identity of indigenous communities over various historical periods. A function of theory is to present a framework within which various studies of phenomena can be situated (Mutch, 2005). In this study, the theoretical foundation established by the literature review acts as a lens through which the evolution of Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity is viewed and interpreted. The research also draws upon oral traditions as repositories of hapū information and history. Vansina (1985) argues that oral traditions ‘contain the sum total of past human experience and explain the how and why of present day conditions’ (p. xi). For societies who use the spoken word to transfer knowledge, such as Māori, their histories are carried through memory from generation to generation (Ka’ai-Mahuta, 2010) and are, therefore, a representation of the past told in the present. Oral tradition differs from oral history in that oral tradition covers a period of history that is no longer contemporary. ‘They have been passed from mouth to mouth for a period beyond the lifetime of the informants…. As messages are transmitted beyond the generation that gave rise to them they become oral traditions’ (Vansina, 1985, p. 13). Therefore, not all oral sources can be defined as oral tradition. Mahuika (2012) claims that for indigenous peoples, including Māori, oral traditions are key to their past, present and future; therefore, this research relies upon oral tradition as a legitimate and valued source of hapū history and knowledge.

These methodological approaches are used to examine the lived experiences and perceptions of a cohort of eight hapū members who were selected to assist in viewing and interpreting how the identity of Ngai Tamarāwaho has evolved from the traditional era to the contemporary era.
Applying the Theory to the Case Study

The principal theoretical approaches inherent in this research are role theory, social identity theory and situated identity theory, and fundamental to these theoretical perspectives is the notion that identity is socially constructed and has social acceptance at its core (Houkamau, 2006). These theories are applied to hapū identity, and its changing nature, from the traditional era through to the present day, to produce themes about the evolution of identity that relate specifically to Ngāi Tamarāwaho. Attention is also given to ethnic identity and the particular considerations associated with the concept, as well as to the construction and evolution of the identities of various indigenous groups globally. Examining the experiences of other indigenous groups allows parallels to be made with the specific experience of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, which enhance the understanding of the evolution of hapū identity. In this study, elements of these theories and perspectives are used to examine the data collected, and to explore themes relating to the title of this research, Te Whanaketanga o Ngāi Tamarāwaho: The evolution of hapū identity.

The intention of this thesis is to explore how the identity of Ngai Tamarāwaho has evolved over specific historical phases, and the influence that the socio-historical contexts of these phases have had on hapū identity. Drawing upon elements inherent in the theoretical perspectives guiding this research, the data collected are examined for schemas. Common schemas identified in the participants’ narratives are further examined for shared incidents or epiphanies that resulted in a change in construct.

In addition to understanding how identity is constructed and applying these notions to the evolution of hapū identity, this thesis also examines the impact of socio-historical contexts on identity. This study addresses the social phenomenon of colonisation. Attention is focussed on how this process has influenced Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity. Participants’ narratives are examined for schemas that illustrate this impact. The following section summarises role theory, social identity theory, situated identity theory and ethnic identity, which are examined in detail in Chapter Two, and provides examples of how they have been previously applied to various case studies. The theories are also situated in the context of this research.
i. Theory one: role theory

Researchers observe that, in any given society, members of a group occupy certain social roles (Biddle, 1986; Burt, 1982; Davies & Harre, 1990; McCall & Simmons, 1966) and these roles provide members with a framework within which to define themselves, as well as a template for socially-acceptable behaviour relevant to that social group (Biddle, 1986; Burt, 1982; McCall & Simmons, 1966). Some analysts also argue that not only do individual members in the group see themselves as occupying certain roles but they also view others in the group as occupying their own respective roles (Bates & Harvey, 1975; Biddle, 1979; Zurcher, 1983). It is necessary for people to impose an identity upon others in order to operate effectively in a social group (Davies & Harre, 1990; Houkamau, 2006), and this is done by applying stereotypes according to the social role that someone appears to occupy. These stereotypes are then used as a template to guide how members of a group should act towards someone else. Expectations within roles, as well as stereotypes placed on others, influence how those members come to view their identity (Davies & Harre, 1990; Houkamau, 2006; McCall & Simmons, 1966).

The concept of role theory has been applied in studies to explain how members of a group are influenced by social conventions associated with a role. They see themselves and others in a certain way and, consequently, behave according to the socially constructed norms attached to that role. For example, Davies and Harre (1990) illustrate the influence of roles on our identity in their discussion of mothers. As they noted, it is widely known in society what the role of mother means and how a mother ought to behave in that role. Mothers who fall short of social expectations risk social disapproval and rejection. Conversely, mothers who conform to what society expects of an individual in that role gain social approval and acceptance.

In a study of strangers, McCall and Simmons (1966) observe that when approaching a stranger, an individual identifies a stranger by applying stereotypes associated with the role the stranger appears to occupy. These stereotypes are then used as a frame of reference that dictates how that individual interacts with the stranger. Biddle (1979) notes similar behaviours in a study in which he followed his neighbour, whom he named Urban Dweller, to work. Biddle observed that Urban Dweller successfully
negotiated contact with more than 5000 people in the space of a one hour twenty
minute trip from his home to his office, and only a handful of the 5000 people were
known to him. Urban Dweller identified roles that included his wife, drivers and
passengers, a beggar and the senior partner of the firm at which he worked. By
identifying these people as members of various roles, Urban Dweller was able to
apply stereotypes associated with the roles and, consequently, interact with them
accordingly. Essentially, roles give an individual a means of defining themselves and
others, as well as a blueprint for socially acceptable behaviour (Davies & Harre, 1990;
Houkamau, 2006; McCall & Simmons, 1966). Applying role theory in this research
requires examining roles that are occupied in a hapū, and how these roles may have
changed over time; therefore, contributing to the evolution of the identity of Ngāi
Tamarāwaho.

ii. Theory two: social identity theory
A later theoretical development, social identity theory, extended on role theory by
considering the impact of personal identity on identity overall (Houkamau, 2006;
Tajfel, 1981). Tajfel (1981) explains the difference between personal identity and
social identity, defining the latter as ‘that part of an individual’s self-concept which
derives from his knowledge of his membership in a social group (or groups) together
with the value and emotional significance attached to that group membership’ (p.
255). Three key processes associated with social identity theory are ‘categorisation’,
‘identification’ and ‘social comparison’ (Cardwell, 2000). In order to maintain positive
associations with an identity, members of a group compare their group (in-group)
with other groups (out-group). The more positive the evaluation of the in-group; the
more likely its members are to value their membership of that group; and the more
positively they will view their identity (Liu et al., 1999; Stets & Burke, 2000).
Essentially, social identity theory enhances the understanding of the relationship
between members of a group and their social world (Moloney & Walker, 2007).

West (2012) applied social identity theory to a study on how the Māori adoptee
navigates their ethnic identity. Using the theory as a framework, West examined the
interaction between the self and the social, and found that in the process of balancing
self-generated views of their identity, and socially-generated expectations of
behaviour and group membership, the Māori adoptee’s identity is fluid and influenced by internal and external factors. The Māori adoptee could switch between identities in order to gain social approval in a particular setting. Social identity theory is applied in this study to examine the interplay between the internally-held views participants have and their membership of and identity associations with Ngāi Tamarāwaho.

### iii. Theory three: situated identity theory

Situated identity theorists consider the influence of the social domain on the identity members of a group express but give little credence to personal identity. Instead, situated identity theorists argue that members of a group express representations of their identity in social interactions in order to gain approval from others and be socially accepted (Alexander & Lauderdale, 1977; Alexander & Wiley, 1981; Davies & Harre, 1990). Goffman (1959, 1963) argues that members of a group pre-empt being socially ostracised by creating a short term 'situated identity', or temporary version of themselves, which they change according to the social context. In this way, members manage the impression they make on others, particularly in an effort to avoid social stigma (Mills, 1999; Skipper & McCaghy, 1978).

Nagel (1994) conducted a study using situated identity theory on Native American women and found that participants who viewed Native Americans as subject to prejudice distanced themselves from this ethnic group in certain social contexts in order to avoid stigma and gain social acceptance. Situated identity theory is applied in this study to examine the impact of stigma, real or perceived, on the evolution of the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho.

### iv. Ethnic identity

Considerations associated with ethnic identity are applied in this research to enhance the understanding of the evolution of hapū identity. Research has been conducted to measure the influence of ethnic identity on group identity and the findings show that members of a group who view their ethnic group positively are more likely to value their membership of that group. Furthermore, they have higher self-esteem and are less susceptible to the impact of racism on their feelings of self-worth (Blash & Unger,
v. Identity and socio-historical contexts

In addition to the theoretical perspectives summarised in the preceding sections, this research also considers the impact of socio-historical context on identity. Strauss (1959, 1994) argues that in order to understand identity and behaviour, the socio-historical context must be considered. He suggests that examining a generation and the common socio-historical experiences they share will reveal that members of that generation have similar identities and behavioural tendencies. Studies have been conducted in which different generations of an ethnic group were compared to highlight the influence of socio-historical contexts on identity. Korgen (1998), Schulz (1998), and Houkamau (2006) conducted intergenerational studies on bi-racial Americans (individuals with both an African American and a white American parent), Navajo women and Māori women respectively to illustrate the relationship between socio-historical contexts and identity. The researchers compared different generations within these ethnic groups and contextualised participants' responses by considering the socio-historical settings in which the research participants were raised. The findings of these studies are discussed in more detail in the following chapter and demonstrate how social and political changes, in particular, shaped the identities of members of these ethnic groups, thus validating the need to consider socio-historical contexts in studies on identity.

About the Participants

The research participants consist of five males and three females born between the years 1932 and 1983. The participants were selected principally because they belong to Ngāi Tamarāwaho. The only additional criterion for participation in this research is that participants possess recognised knowledge of the hapū. Categories such as
marital status, education, income level and location of residence were not considered relevant to selection, as they have little bearing on the depth of knowledge the participants possess. However, it must be noted that while it was not a requirement that participants were of a specific age, there is a correlation between depth of knowledge and age in that the older the participants are, the greater is their knowledge of the hapū. Therefore, by default, the majority of the participants are in their senior years. The participants were asked to consider their own experiences and opinions during the interviews. It is important to stress that their opinions do not necessarily reflect those of every member of the hapū, but they do provide a perspective that allowed the researcher to make deductions based on common responses among the participants and material gleaned from other sources.

The participants were approached through the researcher’s personal networks after endorsement from the hapū trust of their suitability. They were provided with an information sheet (see Appendix 1), potential interview questions (see Appendix 2), and a consent form (see Appendix 3) to read before agreeing to participate in the research. The material was made available to the participants in both English and te reo Māori.

i. Roimata
Roimata was born in the early 1930s at Huria and grew up on the marae. She started school at the age of seven, at Otumoetai Primary, before being transferred to Bethlehem Native School. She attended Tauranga College for three years and then left school to commence work as a clerk at the Bay of Plenty Times. In 1952, she married a man from another hapū of Ngāti Ranginui, and has spent the majority of her adult life involved in his hapū. When her husband passed away she returned to Ngāi Tamarāwaho and has been very actively involved in hapū life since coming home.

ii. Tane
Tane was born in the early 1940s at Huria and was raised on the marae by his extended whānau (family). He started school at Bethlehem Native School, and from there went to Tauranga Boys’ College. After this, he attended Te Reinga Native School
in the Hawke's Bay. After he left school he worked at the freezing works for 23 years before he found employment at the Bay of Plenty Polytechnic. He has always been very actively involved in the life of the hapū, and is a hapū representative on numerous local bodies in Tauranga.

iii. Kiwa
Kiwa was born in the mid-1940s in Tauranga and spent his childhood moving between extended whānau in Tauranga, Hamilton and Auckland. He started school at Greerton School, and then went to Tauranga Intermediate before attending Tauranga Boys’ College. After he left school, he moved to Kawerau and worked in the paper mill there. He then got a job as a health inspector in Invercargill, where he worked for 16 years before moving back up north to Hamilton. He currently works for the Waikato District Council. His hapū knowledge comes from a combination of studies and lived experiences.

iv. Kahu
Kahu was born in the early 1950s in Nuhaka in the Hawke’s Bay. His father was a carver, and Kahu moved home to Tauranga when his father was asked to carve the new wharenui (meeting house), Tamateapokaiwhenua, in the mid-1950s. He spent his childhood moving to different places depending on where his father was required to work. He attended Church College in Hamilton before moving to Auckland. In 1978, he was living in Auckland, and pursuing a career in music, when his father asked him to attend a meeting regarding the land confiscations. He relocated to Tauranga and became a member of the team that negotiated the hapū settlement with the Crown for historical breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi. He is a hapū representative on local government bodies and has extensive knowledge of hapū history.

v. Tai
Tai was born in the mid-1950s at Huria and was raised on the marae. He started to learn about hapū history after hearing the story of the Battle of Gate Pā and, since that time, he has been actively involved in learning hapū history. He was extremely influential as a member of the team that advanced, negotiated and settled the hapū
Treaty of Waitangi claim and is currently a hapū representative on numerous tribal and local government bodies, as well as being a repository of hapū history.

vi. Atawhai
Atawhai was born in the early 1970s in Huria, where she was raised by her grandparents. She attended Tauranga Seventh Day Adventist Primary School and Tauranga Girls’ College. She then completed a double degree in Māori and Music at Waikato University, graduating with honours. After completing a postgraduate teaching qualification, she commenced work at Mount Maunganui College. She has worked on a number of Māori contracts relating primarily to education initiatives and also for the Huria Management Trust. Currently, she teaches a diploma in te reo Māori through Huria marae and is actively involved in hapū life.

vii. Ana
Ana was born in Auckland in the early 1980s and moved home to Tauranga when she was at intermediate school. She started school in Tauranga at Otumoetai Intermediate and went to Otumoetai College. When her son started at kohanga reo, Ana started to teach te reo Māori at the same kohanga reo. She then furthered her knowledge of the language by completing qualifications at Te Wānanga o Aoteaora, where she currently works as a lecturer in te reo Māori and tikanga Māori. She is actively involved in hapū life and is a current member of the Ngāi Tamarāwaho Tribal Authority Trust.

viii. Nikau
Nikau was born in Tauranga in the early 1980s and has lived in Tauranga for most of his life. He was part of the first cohort enrolled at the Huria Kohanga Reo when it opened in the mid-1980s, before attending Bethlehem Primary School. He went on to Otumoetai Intermediate and Otumoetai College. After he finished high school, he enrolled at Waikato University where he completed a Bachelor of Laws. He moved home to Tauranga after he graduated with his degree and worked at the community law centre. He now works for the Western Bay of Plenty District Council. He has been a member of the Ngāi Tamarāwaho Tribal Trust Authority since its conception in 2012, and has served as its chairperson during his tenure. He is actively involved in hapū life.
Procedure

The primary method of inquiry was the gathering and analysis of the narratives of the aforementioned hapū members. In order to collect sufficient empirical data to produce an understanding of the research topic, one to two hour, in-depth, semi-structured interviews were conducted between August 6 and August 23, 2015. In accordance with the principles of kaupapa ā-hapū research, the interviews took place kanohi ki te kanohi (face-to-face) in Tauranga at the hapū marae (community centre), Tamateapokaiwhenua, or, if requested by the participants, at their home. The interviews were divided into four sections: introduction, collection of demographic information, collection of narrative and conclusion. Details of this process are as follows:

i. Introduction

The participants were given an information sheet explaining the research, a list of potential interview questions, and a consent form to sign before the interviews commenced. All written information pertaining to the study (Appendices 1, 2 and 3) was available in both English and te reo Māori.

ii. Collection of demographic information

The participants were asked to talk about themselves in an informal manner, in particular their age, marital status, children, education, occupation, and how they acquired their hapū knowledge.

iii. Collection of narratives

Closed and probing, open-ended questions were asked by the researcher to generate rich descriptions of the lived experiences and perceptions of the participants. They were also questioned about their involvement in the hapū. A correlation of the participants’ perceptions and experiences, alongside their associations with the hapū, contributed to the broader picture of the evolution of hapū identity. The intention of this was to inform the key question central to this study. The data collected in the interviews were recorded on an audio device and then transcribed by the researcher into a written format.
iv. Conclusion
When the participants were satisfied with the answers they had given, they were asked to clarify any material that was unclear. They were given an opportunity to reflect upon the interview and to ask the researcher any questions.

Analysis
A thematic analysis was conducted based on the theoretical perspectives inherent in this study. These themes include the social construction of identity and the influence of socio-historical contexts on identity. This was a small case study that produced a snapshot of the reflections of the participants. It is not assumed that all hapū members share the views expressed by the participants. Consideration must be given to the fact the researcher is known to the participants and that, ultimately, the researcher decided which elements of the participants’ narratives to include or exclude for analysis.

Ethical Considerations
Before conducting the interviews, the participants were told that they could withdraw from the study at any stage and would not be disadvantaged if they chose to do so. They were assured of their anonymity, and that the information given to the researcher would remain confidential unless they consented to their recorded interview being offered back to the hapū. AUT ethical approval was granted by the AUT Ethics Committee before the interviews commenced.

1.5 Thesis Structure

Chapter Two
This chapter explores theories of the construction of indigenous identity in pre-colonial (traditional era), colonial (colonisation era) and post-colonial (contemporary era) contexts. These theoretical perspectives provide a framework within which the construction and evolution of hapū identity, specifically, Ngāi Tamarāwaho, can be viewed and interpreted. This chapter considers the influence of the socio-historical context on identity, and there is a significant focus on the construction and evolution
of the identities of various indigenous groups globally in the pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial eras, with the intention of allowing parallels to be made with the experiences of Ngāi Tamarāwaho.

Chapter Three
This chapter analyses hapū identity in the traditional era, which, in the context of this research, is the period of time prior to the arrival of Pākehā settlers in New Zealand. Aspects of the theoretical constructs explored in Chapter Two are applied to dimensions of hapū identity in order to reveal how the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho was constructed in the traditional era. Three key influences of identity construction are examined in this chapter for their impact on hapū identity, specifically, mana whenua, whakapapa and te reo me ngā tikanga. In order to illustrate how hapū identity was formed in this era, the construction of Māori identity is explored in the opening sections of this chapter before the focus shifts to the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, specifically. This chapter acts as a basis from which comparisons with the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho in future socio-historical phases can be made.

Chapter Four
This chapter advances the line of analysis of Chapter Three by applying the same theoretical perspectives to hapū identity in the colonisation era, which, in the context of this research, commenced in 1814 with the arrival of Pākehā settlers to New Zealand and concluded in 1975 with the establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal. This chapter is the second phase in the chronological analysis of hapū identity, and its major focus is the impact of the social process of colonisation on the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho. This chapter, when compared with Chapter Three, reveals how the identity of the hapū has evolved during the socio-historical contexts of the traditional and colonisation eras. In order to provide cohesion, mana whenua, whakapapa and te reo me ngā tikanga are analysed for changes that may have occurred to these influences on identity, particularly in response to colonisation.

Chapter Five
This chapter completes the timeline of analysis about the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho by exploring hapū identity in the contemporary era.
In the context of this research, the contemporary era commenced in 1975, when the Waitangi Tribunal was established, and continues to the present day. The theoretical constructs applied to dimensions of hapū identity in Chapters Three and Four are used in this chapter to view and interpret Ngai Tamarāwaho identity in the contemporary era. Particular consideration is given to the impact of the Treaty settlement process on the influences of identity, especially mana whenua and whakapapa. The major focus of this chapter is the attempts by the hapū to restore or revive their mana whenua, whakapapa and te reo me ngā tikanga. Examples from wider Māori society are woven in with the specific experiences of Ngāi Tamarāwaho in order to provide an understanding of the wider context of the contemporary era, and the influence this has on hapū identity.

*Chapter Six*

This chapter summarises the findings of Chapters Three, Four and Five, and draws some conclusions about how the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho has evolved over the historical phases of time considered in this research. This chapter also explains how this thesis contributes to the body of knowledge associated with the topic and, in particular, the contribution it makes to the expansion of Ngāi Tamarāwaho tribal knowledge, and the role the researcher hopes the thesis will play in assisting the hapū with its planning for its future. This chapter concludes by making recommendations for further research in this field.
CHAPTER TWO: THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In Chapter One, the intention of this thesis was outlined in general terms. Details relating to the terminology, methodological approaches, theoretical perspectives and research participants were provided, and it concluded with an outline of the structure of the remainder of the thesis. The purpose of Chapter One was to outline the overall architecture of the thesis, and to summarise how the hypothesis it raised will be tested. Chapter Two explores theories of the construction of indigenous identity in the pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial contexts. The intention of this analysis is to provide a conceptual lens through which the evolution of hapū identity can be viewed and interpreted. A function of theory is to construct a framework within which various studies of phenomena can be viewed and interpreted (Mutch, 2005). The phenomenon explored in this research is colonisation, and attention is given to the experience of the relationship between Ngāi Tamarāwaho and this phenomenon, and the impact it has had on the evolution of the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho during the aforementioned socio-historical phases.

To enable an analysis of how the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho has evolved since the traditional era, there are a number of theoretical dimensions of identity that require investigation. These include examining identity and its construction, the impact of socio-historical context on identity, and the intricacies of ethnic identity. Three principal theoretical perspectives are explored in this chapter for the insights they offer into the construction of identity. These perspectives include role theory, social identity theory and situated identity theory. This chapter considers some of the assumptions of these theories and how they might inform the overall intentions of this research.

In addition, as Ngāi Tamarāwaho is a hapū of the indigenous people of New Zealand, consideration is given to particular elements of indigenous identity with the intention of allowing parallels to be drawn from the experiences of various indigenous groups and, specifically, those of Ngāi Tamarāwaho. In order to ensure consistency between indigenous experiences and those of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, the exploration of indigenous
The identity uses the same influences on identity that are used to examine hapū identity; namely, mana whenua, whakapapa and te reo me ngā tikanga. The Māori concepts of mana whenua, whakapapa and te reo me ngā tikanga are explained in Chapter Three of this thesis, but it is important to note that when connection to ancestral lands, affiliation to a kin group, and knowledge of language and cultural practices are referred to, they are underpinned by the notions associated with mana whenua, whakapapa, and te reo me ngā tikanga. The analysis of indigenous groups, together with the theoretical perspectives examined in this chapter, will advance the understanding of the experiences of Ngāi Tamarāwaho and the evolution of its identity since the traditional era.

2.1 The Social Construction of Identity

Many theorists have examined identity and, while there is increasing agreement on key theoretical features that inform identity, no single way of defining the concept currently exists (Houkamau, 2006; Howard, 2000). Erikson (1968) uses the concept of identity as a vehicle for discussing the intricacies of self-awareness and personal identification. Some analysts view identity as the means by which members of a group situate themselves in social relations (Gross & Stone, 1964; Stone, 1962), or as a source of motivation for behaviour (Foote, 1951). Others suggest identity is a way of providing meaning for members of a group in mass society (Klapp, 1969; Vidich, Stein, & White, 1960). A number of theorists, however, do concur that identity relates to a specific kind of knowledge about ‘the self’, and that social acceptance is pivotal in determining identity (Alexander & Lauderdale, 1977; Alexander & Wiley, 1981; Cooley, 1956; Ethier & Deaux, 1994; Goffman, 1959; Houkamau, 2006; Josselson, 1996; Rosenberg, 1981; Williams, 1989). However, differences exist in the detail of their definitions of identity, with some theorists arguing ‘the self’ that is presented in social interactions is an individual’s identity (Baldwin, 1897; Cooley, 1956; Goffman, 1959; Mead, 1934), while others prefer to see identity as a set of self-concepts people internalise as a result of group affiliation (Harre, 1998; Neisser, 1988; Scheibe, 1998; Tajfel, 1981). Other theorists combine these two schools of thought, and they suggest that the concept of identity manifests itself not only at the level of the individual but
also at the level of societies and in interactions between groups (Harris, Blue & Griffith, 1995; Woodward, 2000). This thesis focuses on the theories that suggest that identity is derived from participation in a group situation. It is necessary to acknowledge that there are other schools of thought relating to the formation of identity, but they sit outside the scope of this research.

The seminal idea that identity is socially constructed (Baldwin, 1897; Cooley, 1956; Mead, 1934) gave rise to several theoretical approaches to identity within the social sciences (Houkamau, 2006). The theories examined in this chapter primarily argue that identity is socially constructed and influenced by different social contexts and that, essentially, members of a group learn what it means to define themselves in certain ways by participating in a group and adhering to socially constructed norms (Houkamau, 2006; Pampel, 2000).

**Role Theory**

According to Biddle (1986), role theory concerns one of the most important features of social life – specifically, characteristic behaviour patterns, or roles. Theorists explain roles by suggesting that people are members of social positions and, consequently, hold expectations for their own behaviour and for that of others (Biddle, 1986; Burt, 1982; Davies & Harre, 1990; McCall & Simmons, 1966). McCall and Simmons (1966) observe that in any given society, members of a group occupy certain social roles. Some roles members are born into, such as ethnicity, while other roles are the result of interpersonal relationships, such as mother. Sometimes a role is allocated within a social group, such as chief. Analysts suggest that societies construct rules of conduct that specify what is socially acceptable behaviour within that society and within various roles (Biddle, 1986; Burt, 1982; Davies & Harre, 1990; McCall & Simmons, 1966). In turn, members of a group adopt the social conventions attached to each role, and store these ideas in their minds (Bates & Harvey, 1975; Biddle, 1979; Zurcher, 1983). These ideas then determine how those members should think, feel and behave as an occupant of that role. Essentially, these social roles provide members with a framework within which to define themselves, as well as a template for socially acceptable behaviour relevant to that social group.
Furthermore, theorists argue that not only do members of a group see themselves as occupying certain roles but they also see others as doing the same (Bates & Harvey, 1975; Biddle, 1979; Turner, 1979; Zurcher, 1983). Some theorists contend that it is essential to impose an identity upon others in order to operate effectively in a social group (Davies & Harre, 1990; Houkamau, 2006). Other theorists suggest imposing an identity on someone is done by applying stereotypes according to the social role that someone appears to occupy (Biddle, 1979; McCall & Simmons, 1966). These stereotypes are then used as a frame of reference to indicate how members of a group should act towards someone else. Therefore, an individual acts out their role and, in turn, interacts appropriately with others according to different sets of socially constructed regulations. Davies and Harre (1990) concur, and argue that expectations within roles, as well as stereotypes placed on others, influence how members of a group come to view their identity. Biddle (1979) summarises role theory as concerning itself with the study of behaviours that are characteristic of members of a group within contexts together with the various processes that produce, explain, or are affected by those behaviours.

**Social Identity Theory**

Although it was influential in providing an initial framework for the development of theoretical approaches to identity, some theorists labelled role theory and, specifically, that identity is constructed solely via social expectations of roles, as too simplistic (Houkamau, 2006). As a later theoretical development, social identity theory extends on role theory by suggesting that identity has both personal and social aspects. Hegel, Marx, Freud, and Mead were among the first theorists to argue that the self is unable to exist independent of the social domain (Alcoff & Mendieta, 2003). Building on this idea, Tajfel devised social identity theory (Smith, Bond & Kagitcbasi, 2006), which is a theory used to understand the relationships between members of a group and their social world (Moloney & Walker, 2007). However, Tajfel (1981) argues that personal identity must also be taken into account. He makes a specific distinction between personal identity and social identity, defining the latter as ‘that part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership in a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that group membership’ (p. 255). He defines personal
identity as consisting of personal beliefs about the self, such as skills and abilities, and argues that while an individual’s identity is shaped by their membership of a social group, it is not completely determined by it, and personal identity is unique to each individual. Houkamau (2006) agrees with this idea, and suggests that by differentiating between social and personal identities, social identity theory still acknowledges the relevance of role theory in understanding identity because ‘an individual’s identity is seen as shaped by their group membership [although] not completely determined by it’ (p.17). Social identity theory, essentially, reflects the notion that the level of commitment to an identity is dependent on the ‘strength of one’s relationship to others, while in a particular role identity’ (Burke & Reitzes, 1991, p. 241).

Cardwell (2000) explains that the three processes associated with social identity theory are ‘categorisation’, ‘identification’ and ‘social comparison’. The theory proposes that members of a group position themselves within an ‘in-group’ or an ‘out-group’, and through these interactions a social identity is formed (Moloney & Walker, 2007). In order to see themselves as the embodiment of the in-group and, consequently, to be accepted by the other members of that group (Stets & Burke, 2000), the members conform to the norms and behaviours required of the group. To maintain positive group associations, members compare their in-group with out-groups (Cardwell, 2000). Without such comparisons and verification of membership, belonging to the in-group has little salience, meaning, or effect (Stets & Burke, 2000). Following such comparisons, Liu et al (1999) argue that in-group favouritism then occurs, which is the tendency to evaluate one’s own group more positively than other groups.

Stryker (1968, 1980 and 1987) extends on the ideas of social identity theory by introducing the notion of social contexts. He expands on the notion that identity is constructed within social roles by arguing that members of a group could assume different identities depending on social demands. He suggests that because members of a group generally yearn for social acceptance they switch between identities depending on the social context. The more people who expect members of a group to be certain kinds of people that behave in a certain kind of way, the more likely those
members are to assume the behaviours associated with those assumptions (Stryker & Statham, 1985).

Essentially, the identity that receives the most support and acceptance is more likely to be assumed by members of a group than one that is demeaned or ignored. Overall, according to Stryker, the identity expressed by members of a group does not reflect the skills or abilities they each have, but, rather, emerges from a mixture of role identities. Members of a group value these identities in their minds and express them based on the degree of prominence and social approval that those identities hold (Ethier & Deaux, 1994; Woodward, 2000). This raises the question of whether identities are real or whether they are simply an act determined by the need for acceptance in different social contexts. Houkamau (2006) states that identity is ‘multi-dimensional with many different role identities varying in salience depending on environmental demands and the associated requirement upon the individual to express them’ (p. 18) and, thus, captures the development of social identity theory and its extension on role theory.

**Situated Identity Theory**

Similarly, situated identity theorists acknowledge the influence of social circumstances on the identity members of a group express but give little credence to personal identity. Instead, theorists in this area focus specifically on the representations of identity that members of a group express in social interactions (Alexander & Lauderdale, 1977; Alexander & Wiley, 1981; Davies & Harre, 1990; Goffman, 1959). Situated identity theory assumes that ‘expressions’ are pervasively communicated by ongoing activities in a social setting (Alexander & Epstein, 1969). Theorists suggest that people must mutually negotiate their respective identities before interaction is possible and they continue to reinforce or renegotiate their identities throughout the encounter. Alexander and Lauderdale (1977) explain that the ‘critical point’ in situated identity theory is that a situated identity must be established and maintained as a prerequisite for social conduct. They argue that ‘not only are situated identities essential as a basis for initiating interaction [but they are also] crucial for guiding and anticipating the course of that interaction’ (p. 225).
Like social identity theorists, analysts examining situated identity theory believe members of a group seek approval from others and, therefore, act in a certain way in order to be socially accepted (Alexander & Lauderdale, 1977; Alexander & Wiley, 1981; Goffman, 1959).

Central to the concept of situated identity theory is the notion of stigma. Goffman (1959) argues that members of a group pre-empt being socially ostracised by creating a short term ‘situated identity’, or temporary version of themselves, which they change according to the social context. In this way, members of a group manage the impression made on others, particularly in an effort to avoid social stigma. Goffman (1963) also contends that members belonging to a social group that is subject to stigma, such as an ethnic minority, will engage in what he refers to as ‘identity management’. Goffman suggests that those members will associate themselves, or distance themselves, from a social group to which they belong in an effort to affiliate with, or avoid, the stereotypes attached to that particular group. Skipper and McCaghy (1978) and Mills (1999) agree with this notion that members of a group will avoid social disapproval or rejection by denying membership in a stigmatised group.

At the core of role theory, social identity theory, and situated identity theory is social acceptance, with all three theoretical approaches acknowledging that members of a group form their identity through exposure to social norms via their occupation of a role or group membership. Some key differences between these approaches, however, exist. Situated identity theorists argue that members of a group are constantly changing to fit their social environment, and construct temporary identities solely to gain social acceptance. This view seems rather extreme and suggests identity lacks continuity, depth and consistency. This theory does not allow for members of a group to have a ‘true’ identity but rather suggests their desire to gain social acceptance is more important.

While social identity theory also acknowledges this need for social approval, the view is that the different ‘versions’ of an identity displayed by members of a group in various social settings are, in fact, exactly that – different versions of the same reality, thus suggesting that identity is multi-faceted rather than temporarily constructed.
There is, in fact, little evidence to suggest that an individual’s identity is so fragmented and constantly changes to gain social acceptance in this way (Glover, 1988; Rosenberg, 1981; Smith, 1988). What seems more likely is that members of a group have an identity that they view to be a ‘true’ reflection of their ‘self’, which is multi-dimensional in nature and allows them to engage appropriately with others in a variety of social settings where they occupy numerous roles. For this reason, role theory does seem too simplistic in its definition, although the importance of occupying certain roles in a group, and the influence this has on identity, is valid. Situated identity theorists also argue that members of a group will associate or disassociate themselves with certain groups, in order to avoid social stigma. This notion is supported by examining ethnic identity and the challenges associated with the concept. Attention is given to ethnic identity later in this chapter.

2.2 Identity and Socio-Historical Contexts

In addition to the influences on identity discussed by identity theorists, it is necessary to also consider the wider spectrum of a specific range of social phenomena and their impact on identity. Strauss (1959, 1994) argues that in order to understand identity and behaviour, the socio-historical context must also be considered. Furthermore, Strauss (1959) suggests that examining a generation and the common socio-historical experiences they share will reveal that members of that generation have similar identities and behavioural tendencies. Therefore, by identifying the shared commonalities and the social processes from which they derive, the impact of socio-historical context on identity can be addressed (Labov & Waletzky, 1967; Strauss, 1959, 1994).

Researchers compared different generations within an ethnic group to highlight the influence of socio-historical contexts on identity. Korgen (1998), Schulz (1998) and Houkamau (2006) conducted intergenerational studies on bi-racial Americans (individuals with both an African American and a white American parent), Navajo women, and Māori women, respectively, to highlight the relationship between socio-historical contexts and identity. The researchers compared different generations
within these ethnic groups and contextualised the responses by considering the socio-historical settings in which the research participants were raised. The findings in all three studies demonstrate how social and political changes, in particular, shaped the identities of members of these ethnic groups. For example, Navajo women born when tribal members were still raised in traditional communities speaking their native language acknowledged their tribal affiliations, and stressed the importance of their language and culture in defining their identity. Women born a generation later when Native American leaders were resisting government policies to eradicate tribal communities by promoting a pan-tribal ‘Indian’ identity were more likely to define themselves as ‘Indian’ and espouse the benefits of unity between the tribes, while the youngest participants, born when the Navajo culture and language was undergoing a renaissance, were bicultural, bilingual and politically aware (Schulz, 1998). Similarly, in Korgen’s (1998) study on bi-racial Americans, the impact of the political changes that took place due to the Civil Rights Movement can be witnessed in the identities of the three generations of participants. Houkamau (2006) examined three socio-historical processes and their impact on the identities of three generations of Māori women. Her research shows that social contexts influenced by phenomena such as urbanisation, assimilation, and political and cultural renaissance impacted on the participants’ identity. All three studies validate the impact of socio-historical conditions on identity and, consequently, stress the need for future research to consider such conditions and the influence they may have.

2.3 Ethnic Identity

In considering the place of Ngāi Tamarāwaho as part of the wider ethnic group of Māori, the indigenous ethnic minority in New Zealand, it is necessary to define ethnic identity and acknowledge the particular considerations associated with the concept. Generally, ethnic identity refers to an individual’s identification with a particular ethnic group or groups, and includes their personal understanding of what that identification or belonging means (Aboud, 1987; Tajfel, 1981). Although peoples of all ethnic categories are, by definition, ‘ethnic groups’, the term ‘ethnic’ typically refers to minority peoples and peoples of colour (Houkamau, 2006). These groups are
often socially and economically disadvantaged, and many are subject to negative stereotypes, prejudice and racism from other groups in society (Porter & Washington, 1993).

A basic premise of role theory, social identity theory and situated identity theory is social acceptance. Situated identity theorists argue that members of a group will manage their identity in order to gain social approval by associating themselves with a group that is viewed ‘favourably’ by society and will, conversely, avoid social rejection by disassociating themselves with a stigmatised group, such as an ethnic minority (Goffman, 1959; Mills, 1999; Skipper & McCaghy, 1978). Tajfel (1981) contends that members of a group strive for what he calls a ‘positive social identity’. In the context of ethnic identity, the more positively an ethnic group is perceived by society, the more positively its members will view their identity, and the more they will value their membership of that group. In contrast, members who belong to a stigmatised group may be prone to a ‘negative social identity’ (Brown, 2000; Tajfel & Turner, 1986), which may lead to disassociation from that particular ethnic group.

Research has been conducted to support Tajfel’s ideas about positive and negative social identity. Findings show that members of a group who view their ethnic group positively, and value their membership in that group, have higher self-esteem and are less susceptible to the impact of racism on their feelings of self-worth (Blash & Unger, 1995; Dukes & Martinez, 1997; Walker et al., 1995). Positive evaluation of an ethnic group by its members results in those members valuing their ethnic identity (Lee, 1997). Findings from other studies indicate that members of a group who do not develop positive relationships with their ethnic group are more likely to have negative views of their ethnic identity. This means they are less likely to value their membership in that group and may, consequently, disassociate themselves in order to avoid stigma and social degradation (Phinney, 1993).

This leads to the question, ‘How is a positive ethnic identity formed?’ The work of some researchers demonstrates that members of a group who learn their own language and cultural practices – a social process known as enculturation – are more likely to have a positive view of their ethnic identity and, consequently, value their
membership of that group (Tucker, 1999; Zimmerman et al., 1992). Furthermore, studies indicate that parents who promote a positive view of ethnic identity in the home encourage children to also have a positive identity and, in turn, those children are better able to deflect or overcome negative stereotypes about their ethnic group that may be presented to them in the wider society (Emshoff, Avery, Raduka, Anderson & Calvert, 1996; Lee, 1997).

Considering these findings, many ethnic groups encourage members to learn their own language and cultural practices in order to increase the positive identity associations of those members (Houkamau, 2006). The belief is that if members of a group understand their own language and cultural practices and are, therefore, culturally competent, they gain a sense of pride and self-worth that enables them to better cope with discrimination, negative stereotypes, and racism (Durie, 1997; Rangihau; 1992; Taylor, 1997).

Therefore, like the development of identity, ethnic identity, in general, is also influenced by both personal beliefs and relationships held by the members of the group, and by external social influences; namely, commonly held perceptions about the particular ethnic group (Houkamau, 2006). When considering ethnic identity, it must be acknowledged that ethnic minorities have specific experiences that are separate from the experiences of majority cultures, and those experiences may have a profound impact on their identity. A consideration of this is vital when examining hapū identity because Ngāi Tamarāraho belongs to the wider ethnic group of Māori, and Māori, as an ethnic group, has been subjected to social and economic disadvantage, prejudice and racism.

2.4 Indigenous Identity

Examining indigenous identity provides some context for the analysis of hapū identity, as well as reveals trends in the evolution of the identity of indigenous groups that can be applied to the Ngāi Tamarāwaho experience. The following sections examine indigenous peoples around the world from the traditional era to the
contemporary era. The first section addresses indigenous identity and the traditional influences that contribute to its development. The second section defines colonisation and analyses the experiences of various indigenous peoples around the world. The final section discusses contemporary indigenous identity and some of the challenges associated with the concept.

Trask (1999) defines indigenous peoples as a group that is based on ‘collective aboriginal occupation prior to colonial settlement’ (p. 33). She warns that indigenous peoples are not to be confused with minorities or ethnic groups, and that the number of indigenous peoples does not constitute a criterion in their definition (or existence). While the term ‘indigenous’ is used to refer to the hundreds of distinct indigenous cultures globally, with specific reference given to some groups that are used as examples to illustrate a point or trend, it is necessary to acknowledge the dangers of what Moon (2015) terms ‘indigenous hybridisation’. Moon contends that in international fora, indigenous groups are increasingly portrayed as one homogenous group as opposed to recognition being given to the many diverse indigenous cultures that exist globally, and this often results in ‘unique, variegated indigenous identities being discarded in favour of a single, hybridised model’ (p. 33). Indigenous hybridisation is a contemporary challenge faced by indigenous groups that is discussed later in this chapter.

**Traditional Indigenous Identity**

This section examines traditional indigenous identity and three primary influences; namely, connection to ancestral lands, affiliation to kin groups, and language and cultural practices that informed indigenous identity in a setting free from the influence of their Western counterparts. It must be noted that factors influencing identity are not limited to the three aspects discussed in this research.

i. *Traditional expressions of mana whenua*

In considering the identity of any group, some analysts argue it is necessary to acknowledge the role that ‘place’ has. ‘Place’ is often explained by contrasting its meaning with ‘space’ (Butcher, 2012). Space is an area that is purely geographical or geometrical, and space becomes place when people attach some form of meaning to
it (Butcher, 2012; Easthope, 2009). Various researchers have examined the link between place and identity, arguing that place is where the physical environment allows people to create and maintain expressions of identity (Butcher, 2012; Easthope, 2009; Scannell & Gifford, 2009). While place plays an important role in the formation of identities across any social group, Butcher (2012) argues that place has a special meaning in indigenous cultures, and that place, specifically ancestral lands, is deeply intertwined in the identity of indigenous groups. Trask (1999) concurs, and argues that for indigenous groups ‘who we are is determined by our connection to our lands…. Therefore, our birthplace tells our identity’ (p. i). For indigenous peoples, connection to land is both physical and spiritual (Alfred, 2009; Griffin-Pierce, 1997; Harris, 2002; Kelly, 1980; Moreton-Robinson, 2003; Trask, 1999). Kelly (1980) discusses the physical connection of Native Hawaiians to their ancestral lands and explains that ‘under the Hawaiian system of land-use rights, the people living in each ahupua’a² had access to all the necessities of life... [including] forest land, taro and sweet potato areas, and fishing grounds’ (p. vii). Similarly, Harris (2002) describes the First Nation’s people of Canada’s traditional land use, which involved a combination of ‘land-based practices, wage labour, small-scale horticulture, and food fishing, depending on the region and specific location’ (p. iv). Butcher (2012) argues that the ability to provide for oneself generates a sense of autonomy and control that contributes to a positive association with an identity. The physical connection of indigenous peoples to their ancestral lands in the traditional era allowed them to feed their respective kin groups and, therefore, encouraged the development of positive identity associations with the group.

In addition to physical sustenance, ancestral lands also contribute to the spiritual wellbeing of indigenous groups (Moreton-Robinson, 2003; Trask, 1999). Trask relays the Hawaiian narrative of creation, where:

Papahānaumoku (earth mother), mated with Wākea, (sky father), from whence came our islands, or moku. Out of our beloved islands came the taro, our immediate progenitor, and from the taro, our chiefs and people. Our relationship

² Each of the eight inhabited islands of Hawai‘i were divided into separate districts, known as ‘okana, running from the mountains to the sea. Each ‘okana was then sub-divided into ahupua’a, which were wedge-shaped blocks of land also stretching from the mountains to the sea. Each ahupua’a was fashioned into ‘ili, on which resided the ‘ohana (extended families) who cultivated the land.
to the cosmos is thus familial... We must care for our lands and waters, and they will feed and care for us (p. 59).

Trask adds that the notion of reciprocal care between people and the land is indigenous knowledge, which is not unique to Hawaiians but, rather, shared by most indigenous peoples throughout the world. The Aboriginal creation narrative is similar to that of other indigenous groups, including Hawaiians. Moreton-Robinson (2000) explains:

Indigenous people’s sense of belonging to their land is derived from a relationship [with] the Dreaming.... During the Dreaming, ancestral beings created the land and life.... Because the ancestral spirits gave birth to humans, they share a common life force, which emphasises the unity of humans with the earth... (p. 32).

These stories are similar to the Māori story of creation, a summary of which is given in Chapter Three. Trask (1999) sums up the holistic relationship of indigenous groups with their land by stating, ‘The land cannot live without the people of the land, who, in turn, care for their heritage, their mother. This is an essential wisdom of indigenous cultures...’ (p. 60). Trask's statement alludes to the familial relationship of indigenous groups with their ancestral lands, and suggests that these lands were not only the physical space in which kin groups lived but they were also part of the genealogy of these groups.

**ii. Traditional expressions of whakapapa**

In addition to connection to ancestral lands, affiliation to kin groups was pivotal to indigenous identity. Morris (1989) explains the importance of kin groups to identity by stating:

The interconnectedness of self to others is related to those with whom one is familiar: those with whom one is related, one grows up with or, more specifically, those with whom one engages in relations of mutuality... where notions of generalised reciprocity shape and form daily interactions (p. 215).

Trask (1999) argues that for indigenous peoples, genealogy and kin groups are paramount. She asserts that ‘who we are is determined by our connection... to our families. Therefore, our bloodlines... tell our identity’ (p. i). Likewise, Moreton-Robinson (2003) describes the importance of kin groups to the identity of Aboriginal
people and states: ‘Life histories are based on inter-generational relationships between extended families and communities’ (p. 34). Alfred (2009) describes many indigenous societies before contact with Westerners as being organised by tribes or chiefdoms where the necessities of life, which he identifies as land, water, food, collective identity and support were available to everyone. In illustrating this, Trask (1999) describes Hawaiian society, whereby kinship formed not only the economic basis of Hawaiian society with ‘ohaha (extended families) who lived near the sea exchanging goods with those who resided inland, but where it also established a complex hierarchy of ali‘i (chiefs), kahuna (specialists) and maka‘āinana (commoners). The society was based on mutual reciprocity, where maka‘āinana were free to move with their ‘ohana to live under an ali‘i of their choosing and, in return, the more ‘ohana an ali‘i had in his domain, the more prestige the ali‘i possessed, thus incentivising the leaders of this society to ensure their constituents were cared for. In summary, Alfred (2009) describes indigenous kin groups as ‘cohesive communities’ that functioned ‘according to teachings that sustained indigenous people and the earth for thousands of years’ (p. 57). Like Māori kin groups, which are discussed in Chapter Three, many indigenous groups had clearly defined roles, social expectations, behaviours, and obligations, all of which allowed for appropriate engagement in the group. This, in turn, led to social acceptance, which, as numerous identity theorists suggest, is at the core of positive associations with an identity.

**iii. Traditional expressions of te reo me ngā tikanga**

Another significant aspect informing the construction of indigenous identity is knowledge of native languages and customs. Thiong’o (1986) contends that language is both a means of communication and a carrier of culture. Using the English language as an example, he explains that this language is spoken in Britain, Sweden and Denmark. For British people, English is a tool for everyday communication but is also a carrier of their culture and histories. For Danish and Swedish people, however, English is merely a means of communication with non-Scandinavians. It is not a carrier of their culture. Trask (1999) illustrates language as a carrier of culture by using the Hawaiian language as an example. This language reflects, among other things, social structures and connection to ancestral lands. The Hawaiian language shows possession in two ways – through the use of the ‘a’ possessive, which reveals
acquired status, and through the use of the ‘o’ possessive, which denotes inherent status. Trask explains:

My body (koʻu kino) and my parents (koʻu mākua) take the ‘o’ form; most material objects, such as food (kaʻu meaʻai) take the ‘a’ form. But land, like one’s body and one’s parents, takes the ‘o’ form (koʻu ‘āina). Thus, in our way of speaking, land is inherent to the people; it is like our bodies and our parents. The people cannot exist without the land... (p. 116).

Similarly, Moreton-Robinson (2003) describes the way in which the five hundred plus languages spoken by Aboriginal kin groups reflect their culture, specifically, their connection to the land. These kin groups belonged to particular tracts of ‘country’, which is the term used to refer to their ancestral lands, and they were taught to know the land to which they belonged. They communicated this knowledge via their languages, and this, in turn, led to the development of cultural practices and customs relating to their lands. Moreton-Robinson also explains that Aboriginal oral traditions, which relay knowledge about the Dreaming, established the Aboriginal ways of life or customs. Ancestral beings from the Dreaming provided the rules for expectations of behaviour, and this resulted in a moral code or framework for interaction in social groups. Knowledge of what can and cannot be done through both good and bad behaviour allowed members of the kin groups to interact appropriately and, thus, gain social acceptance. Thiong’o (1986) captures the symbiotic relationship of language and culture with his statement:

Language as communication and as culture are... products of each other. Communication creates culture: culture is a means of communication. Language carries culture, and culture carries... the entire body of values by which we come to perceive ourselves and our place in the world (p. 15-16).

In summary, cultural and linguistic competency allowed members of indigenous kin groups to engage appropriately with the wider group in social and cultural contexts.

Indigenous identity in the traditional era was informed by connection to ancestral lands, which provided physical nourishment and contributed to the spiritual wellbeing of kin groups. Members of the kin groups were aware of what constituted socially acceptable behaviour, the framework of which was often derived from the
respective creation narratives of indigenous groups. Language served to ensure oral traditions were maintained and the knowledge and histories of these groups was passed from generation to generation. Language also acted as a means of communication between the members of indigenous kin groups. Analysis of the development of the identities of some indigenous groups provides a lens through which to analyse the development of Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity in the traditional era. Attention is given to this in Chapter Three.

**Indigenous Identity and Colonisation**

This section examines the effects of colonisation on indigenous populations worldwide. It is intended that this will provide greater insight into the Māori experience and, more specifically, contribute to one of the intentions of this thesis, which is to explore how Ngāi Tamarāwaho responded to colonisation. This section defines colonisation and explores the effects of this socio-historical process on indigenous peoples globally. Attention is given to the effects of colonisation on indigenous kin groups, the connection to ancestral lands, and language and cultural practices. It is expected that this will provide some insight into the overall effects of colonisation on the identity of these groups.

*i. What is colonisation?*

First, it is necessary to distinguish between the terms ‘colonialism’ and ‘colonisation’. An investigation into the definition of colonialism revealed it is the policy of acquiring full or partial political control over another country, occupying it with settlers and exploiting it economically. Central to this policy is the notion of cultural supremacy (Thiong’o, 1986; Trask, 1999), whereby the settlers, or colonisers, are ‘convinced of their own superiority and ordained mandate to rule over the indigenous population’ (Osterhammel, 2005, p.16). Colonisation is the result of this colonial belief. It can be summarised as the process of acquiring control of another country by a variety of means for the purposes of economic exploitation, increased power and prestige over other empires, and civilising indigenous peoples (Alfred, 2009; Thiong’o, 1986; Trask, 1999). It must be noted that for indigenous groups, however, colonisation is associated with ‘the resource exploitation of indigenous lands, residential school syndrome, racism, expropriation of lands, extinguishment of rights, wardship, and
welfare dependency’ (Alfred, 2009, p. 43). In summary, colonialism is, essentially, the ideology that informs the process of colonisation (R. Ka'ai-Mahuta, personal communication, 14 September, 2015). In the context of this research, the term ‘colonisation’ is used to refer to the experiences of indigenous peoples and, more specifically, of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, following contact with foreign settlers.

**ii. The indigenous experience**

As the Western world expanded, the colonisation of indigenous peoples occurred in a number of countries worldwide, and the effects of this expansion on indigenous populations were remarkably similar and profound. Trask (1999) argues that colonisation has, as one of its goals, ‘the obliteration rather than the incorporation of indigenous peoples’ (p. 26), and for indigenous populations the world over, colonisation has resulted in similar histories and group profiles. Indeed, by examining the colonial experiences of various indigenous groups in different countries, similar trends that highlight the effects of colonisation emerge. Trask (1999) notes this and states:

> Injustices done against Native people, such as genocide, land dispossession, language banning, family disintegration, and cultural exploitation [occurred] whether we are speaking of French settler colonies like Tahiti, New Caledonia, and Algeria or British colonies like Australia, New Zealand, and India or Portuguese colonies... or Dutch colonies... or the United States of America (p. 25).

Specific examples from Canada's First Nations people, from the Aborigines of Australia, and from Native Hawaiians support Trask’s statement. Alfred (2009) describes the plight of Canada’s indigenous people:

> Colonially-generated cultural disruptions [have] created near total psychological, physical and financial dependency on the state. Social suffering... historical trauma and cultural dislocation [have] limited First Nations’ opportunities for self-sufficient, healthy and autonomous lives.... Indigenous people have developed complexes of behaviour and mental attitudes that reflect their colonial situation (p 42).

Similarly, Moreton-Robinson (2003) comments on the experience of Aborigines, who were ‘systematically dispossessed, murdered, raped and incarcerated... and denied their customary proprietary rights under international law.... Indigenous people
continue to be the most socio-economically impoverished group in Australian society today’ (p. 25). Trask (1999) illustrates the Hawaiian experience:

We suffered a unilateral redefinition of our homeland and our people, a displacement and a dispossession in our own country.... Hawaiians continue to suffer the effects of colonisation.... Preyed upon by corporate tourism, caught in a political system where we have no separate legal status to control our land base, we are by every measure the most oppressed of all groups living in Hawai‘i, our ancestral land (p. 16).

As a result of the injustices associated with colonisation, indigenous peoples were rendered politically and economically powerless. Literature on the interactions between various indigenous groups and colonising powers reveals not only similar experiences of colonisation but also comparable long-term effects. Indigenous groups register the same socio-economic profile: high unemployment, catastrophic health problems, low educational attainment, high incarceration rates, high state dependency, and increasing migration from traditional ancestral lands that amounts to a diaspora.

**iii. Assault on mana whenua**

Trask (1999) points out that most indigenous groups refer to themselves as ‘people of the land’ and they gain ‘a sense of identity [through] an attachment to place... and the natural world’ (p. 104). The alienation of indigenous peoples from their ancestral lands not only brought about a sense of displacement but also affected their ability to prosper and lead healthy lives (Alfred, 2009). The imposition of Western systems of land ownership disrupted indigenous land uses, and included severing access to traditional food sources, timber, water, and other necessary resources (Alfred, 2009; Trask, 1999). Indigenous kin groups were often confined to reserves, missions, cattle stations, or remnants of ancestral lands that were poor in quality and were too small and under-resourced to properly support their communities (Alfred, 2009; Moreton-Robinson, 2003). Over-crowding, lack of access to sufficient food, poor sanitation, and a limited supply of clean water contributed to high rates of infectious and, often, fatal diseases (Alfred, 2009; Trask, 1999). Over-crowding also led to many indigenous peoples leaving what remained of their ancestral lands and relocating to areas where they had a greater potential to lead prosperous lives (Alfred, 2009; Trask, 1999).
In addition to lowering socio-economic outcomes and scattering the populations of indigenous groups, the loss of ancestral land also affected spiritual and cultural connections with their lands (Alfred, 2009; Moreton-Robinson, 2003). Morgan (1987) discusses the Aborigines’ spiritual connection with the land and provides the example of the caribberie\(^3\) being heard in the swamp when someone is ill, which is understood as the spirits’ recognition of the ailing person’s pain and mental turmoil. When they pass away, the caribberie is no longer heard. Moreton-Robinson (2003) contends that such experiences illustrate the way in which the spiritual nature of the world influences a connection with the land, and that ‘the spiritual world is immediately experienced because it is synonymous with the physiography of the land’ (p. 34). Therefore, the severance of indigenous groups from their lands not only stripped them of an economic base and political power, but also affected their spiritual wellbeing. Moreover, the alienation of ancestral lands affected indigenous identity. Moreton-Robinson (2003) argues that the relationship of indigenous peoples with the land serves to ground their cultural identities, and that the experience of dislocation not only disrupted the indigenous sense of belonging but also provided the conditions for the development of multiple and hybrid identities.

**iv. Assault on whakapapa**
Disconnection from ancestral lands undermined social structures and organisation (Moreton-Robinson, 2003; Trask, 1999). Following the loss of extensive land holdings, extended families and wider kin groups suffered incessant pressure to fragment into nuclear units that consisted only of parents and children. This affected inter-generational relationships, collective memory, and the transfer of knowledge, which Moreton-Robinson argues underpins indigenous extended families and communities. Trask (1999) maintains that the emergence of the indigenous nuclear family altered the traditional roles that members of kin groups occupy. Alfred (2009) concurs, and further claims that the breakdown in indigenous social structures resulted in discord among communities due to an inability to fulfil traditional social and cultural obligations. He argues that this had a profound effect on indigenous

---

\(^3\) A caribberie is an Aboriginal ceremony that involves singing and dancing. Songs and dances performed during the ceremonies passed on information about The Dreaming, or spiritual realm [retrieved 25 September, 2015 from http://www.indigenousaustralia.info/culture/corroborees-a-ceremonies.html](http://www.indigenousaustralia.info/culture/corroborees-a-ceremonies.html).
groups because the lack of cohesion in their communities made it extremely challenging to resist the ongoing marginalisation and disempowerment that was caused by colonisation.

v. Assault on te reo me nga tikanga

The breakdown in indigenous social structures affected the prevalence and use of indigenous languages and cultural practices. Opportunities to practice cultural traditions and to converse in native tongues were limited after the scattering of indigenous populations. The disastrous effects of this were compounded by colonial policies of assimilation that attacked language and culture in an attempt to recreate indigenous peoples in the image of the colonisers. Schools banned the use of indigenous languages, and replaced native tongues with the language of the colonisers. Thiong’o (1986) argues that, for the process of colonisation to be complete and effective, the destruction or the deliberate undervaluing of indigenous culture, specifically their art, dances, religions, history, education, oratory, literature, and knowledge, was imperative. Concomitant with this was the suppression of indigenous languages and elevation of the language of the colonisers. Thiong’o suggests that the domination of a people’s language by the language of a colonising group was crucial to the domination of the minds of indigenous groups, and this, combined with dislocation and communal discord, had an overwhelming effect on indigenous identity. He believes that to control a people’s culture is to control their tools of self-definition and identification. By banning the use of indigenous languages and cultural practices, the colonisers undermined indigenous identity and recreated the colonised in their image. Freire (1993) explains:

> Cultural invasion...serves the end of conquest. The invaders penetrate the cultural context of another group, in disrespect of the latter’s potentialities... and curb their expression. Cultural conquest leads to the cultural inauthenticity of those who are invaded... the more they mimic the invaders, the more stable the position of the latter becomes (p. 152-153).

Trask (1999) argues that who we are closely parallels where we live, how we live, and with whom we live. The alienation of ancestral lands, the breakdown in kin groups and the oppression of indigenous languages and culture profoundly affected the identities of indigenous peoples. This was consolidated by imposed systems of
identification that Trask believes were ‘instituted to separate [indigenous] people from our lands, culture, and from each other in perpetuity’ (p. 104). Who indigenous groups believed themselves to be was often at odds with how the colonial system defined them, and Trask claims that colonisers used legal definitions and blood quantum to define indigenous groups out of existence, or to categorise them in a manner alien to their cultures in the hope of further severing ancestral attachment to kin groups. Alfred (2009) summarises the experience of colonisation for indigenous peoples by stating that they were left with ‘three basic options... destruction, dependency, or assimilation’ (p. 53). The global indigenous experience of colonisation provides a context from which to draw parallels with the Ngāi Tamarāwaho experience. Attention is given to this in Chapter Four.

*Contemporary Indigenous Identity*

This section examines contemporary indigenous identity and addresses some of the challenges indigenous groups face as they attempt to reconstruct their indigenous identities following the colonisation era. This process often involves navigating multiple sites of belonging and resisting what some analysts call neo-colonialism. Internationally, indigenous peoples have long attempted to negotiate with nation states for the recognition and redress of historical injustices perpetrated as part of the colonisation process (Verdeja, 2003). This section discusses indigenous attempts to reconnect with ancestral lands, revive their native languages and cultural practices, and strengthen their communities.

*i. Contemporary expressions of mana whenua*

In varying degrees around the world indigenous groups have sought state recognition of their rights of sovereignty over their lands and their rights of self-governance, which includes the ability to control their assets. Indigenous claims for redress and recognition gained wider acceptance by non-indigenous peoples in the 1960s and 1970s, and have continued to gain momentum in the decades that followed (Verdeja, 2003). In his book, ‘The Guilt of Nations’, Barkan (2001) examines the growing international practice of nations negotiating restitution with victims of historical injustices, including the indigenous groups of Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the United States of America. He specifically addresses their attempts to assert what he
refers to as ‘cultural patrimony’ over lands seized by colonial settlers. In response to such claims, nation states implemented policies or established systems and processes through which to return land or provide redress to indigenous groups. For example, the Australian government adopted policies that allowed for various forms of material and cultural restitution, beginning with the Aboriginal Land Right (Northern Territory) Act 1976 (ALRA). The Act was the first attempt by an Australian government to legally recognise the Aboriginal system of land ownership, and to put into law the concept of inalienable freehold title. Langton and Palmer (2003) describe the Act as a fundamental piece of social reform. Since the passing of the Act, considerable parts of remote regions of rural Australia have been returned to Aboriginal groups. In 2010, over 20 per cent was owned by Aborigines (Altman, 2010). Official statistics indicate that approximately 100,000 Aborigines live in just over 1000 settlements, with the majority of these communities having a population of fewer than 100 people each (Altman, 2010). While many Aboriginal traditional owners have been able to successfully reclaim at least parts of their ancestral lands, the land returned to these owners is often in remote parts of Australia, and away from densely populated areas where land is more commercially productive (Langton & Palmer, 2003).

Furthermore, Aboriginal claimants must engage in a Western legal system in order to have their lands returned to them, and Wolfe (1999) terms this process ‘repressive authenticity’. Sections 3 and 223 of the ALRA require Aborigines to ‘prove’ that they practised traditional customs to ensure both their physical and spiritual connection to the land was maintained, and that this connection has continued since colonisation. Altman (2010) contends that these requirements meant Aborigines have become trapped in a Western legal definition of authenticity to gain formal title to their lands. Moreover, after the land is returned, their activity is measured by a cost/benefit and input/output calculation that is at odds with traditional land uses, and does not take spiritual connections to the land into account (Altman, 2010). Measuring indigenous land productivity with a Western system often produces results that suggest indigenous failure or shortcomings, and this can lead to stereotypes that have a negative impact on identity associations. In 2006, the Australian government amended the ALRA, and the aim of this amendment was captured in the
memorandum that states: ‘The principal objectives of this Bill are to improve access to Aboriginal land for development, especially mining’ (as cited in Stringer, 2007, p. 1). Aboriginal communities have secured the return of some of their tribal lands, but continuous amendments to the ALRA means they face ongoing land alienation through policies of privatisation that undermine traditional communal land ownership and development that places Aboriginal lands under threat (Stringer, 2007).

While the scope of this research does not allow for a detailed discussion about the experiences of all indigenous groups reconnecting to their ancestral lands, research did reveal that other indigenous groups face similar challenges as those encountered by the Aborigines as lands were returned to them. Brodeur (1985) describes similar experiences for the Mashpee, Passamaquoddy and Penobscot Indian tribes of New England. In a speech delivered at a world conference of indigenous women in Norway, Trask (1999) illustrates the shared experiences of indigenous peoples globally, and comments: ‘Indigenous peoples... are surrounded by other, more powerful nations that desperately want our lands and resources.... This is just as true for the Indians of the Americas as it is for the aborigines of the Pacific’ (p. 103). Additionally, she contends:

Indigenous land once held in common for use by all has nearly everywhere come under the threat of private property tenure.... The constant fighting over land and water that we see throughout Indian country, in Hawai‘i, New Zealand, Australia, and other parts of the world is played out in the language of property law. The inevitable conflict between land that is collectively held and land that is individually owned will never cease because it is a conflict between cultures whose values are directly opposed (p. 107).

Trask’s statement illustrates the challenges indigenous groups face in their quest to express their mana whenua in the contemporary era. The return of ancestral lands has also affected the traditional structure of kin groups.

**ii. Contemporary expressions of whakapapa**

In 2006, the Australian government replaced the ALRA’s companion legislation, the Aboriginal Councils and Associations Act 1976, with legislation called the Corporations (Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander) Act 2006 (CATSI).
This Act established existing and future indigenous organisations, such as councils, associations, and existing corporations, as corporations that operate ‘to the same standards of corporate governance’ as the rest of corporate Australia (Stringer, 2007). This Act effectively imposed the Corporations Act on indigenous communities, which were then expected to operate in accordance with ‘modern corporate governance laws’ in dealings relating to land and the provision of federally-funded programmes and social services. The concern raised by CATSI is that corporate governance may be inappropriate as a prescribed model for indigenous communities and organisations, and that the existence of indigenous structures for economic and social organisation is ignored. Stringer (2007) contends that CATSI also ‘operated as a further instrument of government control by making indigenous communities newly vulnerable to blame-shifting claims of corporate failure in the management of programmes that are inadequately funded in the first instance’ (p. 1). Comparably, Durie (1998) comments on the imposition of corporate structures on tribal groups in Alaska that have ‘all but ousted traditional tribal structures’ and ‘fail to capture the essential cultural basis of the tribe’ (p. 226-227). Samson (2003) describes a similar threat to indigenous structures faced by the nomadic Innu tribe of Davis Inlet in Canada. Amendments to the Indian Act 1876 resulted in the establishment of the band council system, which Samson argues altered traditional structures of authority and governance in the Innu communities from being ‘diffused, dynamic and accommodating of indigenous cultural values to rigid, static and controlling’ (p. 9). Moreover, the Indian Act further attacked kin groups and traditional structures by defining who and who was not Indian, and therefore, who was allowed or, conversely, denied membership in bands.

Indigenous kin groups have come under further threat by the urbanisation of tribal groups and the development of hybrid or multiple sites of belonging. In his seminal work, ‘The Location of Culture’, Bhabha (1994) explores cultural hybridisation and examines, among other things, the potential for the concept to result in the ‘mutation’ of indigenous cultures that are susceptible to the process of hybridisation as a result of colonisation. In the colonisation era, alienation from tribal estates and their economic base resulted in a migration of indigenous tribal populations to urban centres, primarily in search of work (Dahl & Jensen, 2002). Nowadays, the majority of
most indigenous populations reside in towns and cities. For example, in Canada and the United States of America, over half of the indigenous populations now live in an urban area while, in Australia and New Zealand, levels of indigenous urbanisation are approximately 80 per cent (Senese & Wilson, 2013). Bhabha (1994) contends that in these new spaces of existence, which are heavily influenced by non-indigenous cultures, a merging of culture is occurring, whereby what originally defined an indigenous culture is merging with non-indigenous influences. This results in a form of hybridised indigeneity that is changing the traditional identities of indigenous groups (Moon, 2015).

The relationship that exists between urban-dwellers and those who reside in traditional tribal areas is mixed. Urban-dwellers will often retain a connection with their ancestral lands because many have kinfolk still living in traditional areas (Dahl & Jensen, 2002). However, the extent to which urban-dwellers continue to identify as part of their original indigenous group differs according to circumstances, and the choice need not be one of identifying either as belonging solely to the indigenous group or solely to the nation state. The diasporic nature of indigenous kin groups has, for many indigenous groups, resulted in the development of multiple or hybrid identities (Moreton-Robinson, 2003). Kishigami (2002) concludes that many Inuit, who were raised in Montreal, and whose parent or spouse was a non-Inuit, began to regard themselves as indigenous people of Canada or Canadian of Inuit descent, rather than simply as Inuit. Moon (2015) contends that belonging to an indigenous community is not necessarily exclusive, and that an individual can cite multiple sites of belonging, including to that of the dominant, colonial other.

However, this does not mean that urban-dwellers severed contact with those in traditional areas. Kishigami (2002) examines the ties between Inuit living in Montreal and those who remained in native villages, and finds that most Inuit living in Montreal maintain a relationship with their kinfolk in traditional areas. Food sharing is a traditional practice common in Inuit communities. In the Arctic villages, food sharing helps to maintain familial relationships between different settlements, and this practice also consolidates the relationship that urban dwellers have with their kin in the Arctic region, with northerners sending traditional foods, such as frozen caribou,
Arctic char and seal meat south to the Inuit in Montreal. Additionally, in Montreal, this practice helps to develop friendships between Inuit from various villages who may not be blood relatives.

While Dahl and Jensen (2002) observe that there are trends whereby the longer indigenous peoples have lived in an urban environment, the less they tend to identify with their original indigenous group, there are also, in some places, trends towards urban-based pan-tribal mobilisation. Kishigami (2002) observes that the cultural identities of most Inuit living in Montreal are always threatened by multi-ethnic situations dominated by people of French Canadian descent. Montreal Inuit interact frequently with non-Inuit populations and, consequently, lack conditions to foster a socio-cultural Inuit lifestyle and identity. This led to the establishment of the Association of Montreal Inuit in 2000, which is a group comprising Inuit from various Arctic regions (Mesher, 2000). While the Inuit in Montreal still maintain social relationships with the Inuit in the north, they are creating a new community and social relationships based on the shared experience of being Inuit and living in Montreal. The urban Inuit still practice traditional customs, such as food sharing, but the organisational focus of this group is different from that of the traditional Arctic Inuit, whose community is still based on traditional concepts of kinship and connection to tribal lands.

The development of pan-tribal, urban-based organisations has, in some instances, led to conflict between urban-dwellers and those who remain in traditional areas. Dahl and Jensen (2002) note that indigenous people who reside in urban centres are often ‘looked down upon’ by those living in rural settings, and are not treated as being ‘truly indigenous’. This may be even more pronounced for urban-dwellers who descend from mixed marriages. Dahl and Jensen (2002) also contend that the urban-tribal conflict is often further exacerbated, or even produced, by the state’s divide-and-rule policies, especially because indigenous peoples living in urban centres often form the majority of the indigenous population. Trask (1999) argues that this is a state attempt to undermine the identity of indigenous groups by questioning their existence.
iii. Contemporary expressions of te reo me ngā tikanga

There have, however, been attempts to strengthen indigenous identity both in traditional and urban areas with the revival of indigenous languages and culture. Since 1970, the Hawaiian language has undergone much rejuvenation, primarily as a result of the rise of Hawaiian language immersion schools (Trask, 1999) and the Hawaiian language being recognised as an official language of the state of Hawai‘i. Concomitant with the revitalisation of the Hawaiian language is an increase in Hawaiian cultural practices. For example, traditional subsistence activities like farming, fishing and gathering are being practised again, and indigenous craft and dance are being revived, especially the ancient form of dance called hula kahiko (Trask, 1999). Similarly, Alfred (2009) observes that through the regeneration of their communities around land-based cultural practices, First Nations people are starting to rebuild autonomous social and cultural identities. There is a general consensus among indigenous groups internationally that Māori are at the forefront of the indigenous quest to revitalise language and culture; this is discussed in further detail in Chapter Five.

While Weaver (2001) argues that indigenous identity includes being ‘connected to a sense of peoplehood inseparably linked to sacred traditions, traditional homelands, and a shared history as indigenous people’, Moon (2015) contends that indigenous self-identification, that is how indigenous peoples identify themselves in specifically indigenous terms, is critical in defining contemporary indigenous identity, where being indigenous for some is simply ‘ticking a category on a census form’, and for others it means to portray ‘as many traits that are perceived as indigenous as possible’ (p. 35). However, community identity and group membership must be considered alongside individual assertions of identity. Durham (1993) argues that an individual must belong to, and be accepted by, the wider indigenous community in order to be regarded as ‘fully indigenous’. Moon (2015) explains that membership of an indigenous community means individual assertions of identity can be confirmed by members of that group who claim the same identity. In this way, group membership and social acceptance are central to the notion of indigenous identity. Griffin-Pierce (1997) argues that the shared sense of belonging derived from membership of the wider indigenous group can be enhanced by affiliation to ancestral lands; and Weaver
(2001) adds that a claim to having a unique language and, particularly, a unique status within a country, further strengthens indigenous identity affiliations.

2.5 Summary

The intention of this chapter was to explore themes of identity that relate specifically to the construction of indigenous identity in the traditional, colonisation and contemporary eras. It is intended that this exploration will provide a context for analysing the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho in order to gain insight into how the identity of the hapū has evolved over the last four centuries. While research for this chapter highlighted that the concept of identity is extremely subjective, there is a general consensus among identity theorists that identity is socially constructed through group participation, influenced by different social contexts, and has social acceptance at its core (Alexander & Lauderdale, 1977; Alexander & Wiley, 1981; Cooley, 1956; Ethier & Deaux, 1994; Goffman, 1959; Houkamau, 2006; Josselson, 1996; Rosenberg, 1981; Williams, 1989).

Role theorists explore the influence of the occupation of social roles on identity. Analysts examining this theory, essentially, suggest that social roles provide a framework within which members of a group define themselves, as well as provide a template for socially acceptable behaviour relevant to that social group (Biddle, 1986; Burt, 1982; Davies & Harre, 1990; McCall & Simmons, 1966). Members of the group who occupy various roles store the behaviours associated with each role in their minds and this, in turn, guides each member during group interaction. Social identity theory expands on role theory and provides a framework for understanding the relationship between members of a group and their social world (Moloney & Walker, 2007; Tajfel, 1981). Three key processes associated with social identity theory are ‘categorisation’, ‘identification’ and ‘social comparison’ (Cardwell, 2000). Social identity theorists propose that members of a group conform to the behaviours and norms required of the in-group in order to gain acceptance into the group (Stets & Burke, 2000). Comparisons are made with out-groups, and the more positively the in-group is evaluated, the more likely members are to value their membership of that
group. Social identity theory is also concerned with social contexts and the influence they have on identity. Theorists suggest that members of a group switch between identities in order to gain acceptance in different social contexts (Ethier & Deaux, 1994; Stryker & Statham, 1985; Woodward, 2000).

Similarly, situated identity theorists acknowledge the influence of social contexts on identity and theorists propose that members of a group assume an identity that is relevant to a social situation and behave in a way that reinforces that identity throughout the social exchange (Alexander & Epstein, 1969). Situated identity theory is also concerned with the impact of stigma on identity, and theorists posit that members of a group will disassociate themselves from a stigmatised group in order to avoid being associated with negative stereotypes (Goffman, 1959; Mills, 1999; Skipper & McCaghy, 1978). This chapter also considered the influence of socio-historical contexts on identity. Various studies (Houkamau, 2006; Korgen, 1998; Schulz, 1998) comparing different generations of a group revealed that members of each respective generation had similar identities and behavioural tendencies, which were derived from shared experiences relevant to each particular era. Concepts associated with ethnic identity were also considered and, essentially, the more positively society views an ethnic group, the more positively members of that group view their group and their membership of it (Lee, 1997; Phinney, 1993). Furthermore, members of an ethnic group who have knowledge of their language and cultural practices are more likely to have positive associations with their identity.

The second half of this chapter addressed indigenous identity. In order to provide cohesion between the analysis of the evolution of the identity of some indigenous groups over specific phases of time and the evolution of the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, the same influences on identity were examined, specifically, mana whenua, whakapapa and te reo me ngā tikanga. Furthermore, analysis of the identity of indigenous groups was divided into the same socio-historical phases, namely, the traditional era, the colonisation era and the contemporary era, as those used in relation to Ngāi Tamarāwaho. Analysis of indigenous identity revealed that the identities of various indigenous groups have evolved over time, specifically in response to the social phenomenon of colonisation. It is intended that this analysis
will allow parallels to be drawn between the wider indigenous experience and that of Ngāi Tamarāwaho.

In Chapters Three, Four and Five, elements of role theory, social identity theory and situated identity theory are applied to reveal how the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho has evolved over the last four centuries. Consideration is also given to ethnic identity and the experiences of indigenous groups. These chapters are divided into specific historical eras; namely, the traditional era, the colonisation era and the contemporary era. It is intended that this will provide some insight into how the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho responded to the various influences of each era and, therefore, illustrate how socio-historical contexts influence identity. Most importantly, however, these chapters will form a timeline that, when examined in its entirety, will reveal how the identity of the hapū has evolved over the specific socio-historic phases that are examined. The following chapter discusses Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity in the traditional era.
CHAPTER THREE: THE TRADITIONAL ERA

In Chapter Two, theories of indigenous identity construction in pre-colonial, colonial, and post-colonial phases were explored in order to provide a context within which the evolution of Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity can be examined. This chapter analyses Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity in the traditional era and the primary aspects that influenced its conception. In the context of this research, the traditional era refers to the period of time before the arrival of Pākehā settlers in New Zealand and concluded when settlers began to arrive in 1814.

Hapū identity in the traditional era is examined in the context of various aspects of the theoretical perspectives analysed in Chapter Two. These aspects include role theory, specifically, the branch that addresses the application of stereotypes to roles within a group; social identity theory, in particular the comparison and evaluation of social groups; and situated identity theory; namely, the element that discusses the impact of stigma on identity. This chapter applies these aspects of the theories examined in Chapter Two, and uses them as a lens to explore and interpret dimensions of hapū identity in this era. In order to gain an understanding of how the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho may have evolved over time in response to various social phenomena, particularly colonisation, it is necessary to locate a starting point to guide the subsequent analysis. This chapter acts as the basis from which comparisons with future socio-historical phases can be made, and, therefore, contributes to the intention of this research, which is to examine the evolution of Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity. The first half of this chapter addresses Māori identity in a generic manner, and the latter sections focus on the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho. Three primary influences that informed identity in the traditional era are examined: specifically, whakapapa, mana whenua and te reo me ngā tikanga. It must be noted that the researcher, based on literature relating to indigenous and Māori identity, identified these influences as being significant. However, factors influencing the construction of identity are not limited to the three aspects discussed in this research.
3.1 The Construction of Māori Identity

Inherent in this research is the notion that socio-historical context has a significant impact on identity. Strauss (1959, 1994) argues that in order to understand identity and behaviour, the socio-historical context must be considered. Furthermore, theorists suggest that the characteristics and tendencies of a generation are shaped by shared experiences, and identifying these commonalities, and the sources from which they derive, will reveal the impact of the socio-historical context on the identity of that generation (Labov & Waletzky, 1967; Strauss, 1959, 1994). The first settlers arrived in New Zealand from East Polynesia in approximately AD1250 (Knapp et al., 2012), and established a society in an environment devoid of contact with the outside world (Moeke-Pickering, 1996). Considering the impact of socio-historical context on identity, it is important to acknowledge the monocultural nature of the traditional era and the influence it had on traditional Māori identity. In Chapter Two, the founding idea put forward by identity theorists was introduced; specifically, that identity is socially constructed by participating in a social group in certain roles (Baldwin, 1897; Cooley, 1956; Mead, 1934). In the traditional era, identity was conceived through the strata of tribal structures that made up Māori society, those being whānau, hapū and iwi (Barlow, 1991; Maaka, 1994; Rangihau, 1992; Walker, 1996). Tribal members were aware of what constituted socially acceptable behaviour (Barlow, 1991; Durie, 1997; Maaka, 1994; Rangihau, 1992; Walker, 1996). They learnt and understood the knowledge, customs and language needed to participate as active members of these kin groups.

While this research is primarily guided by theories that argue that identity is socially constructed, it is necessary to also consider the influence of economic arrangements on emerging social structures. One of the most comprehensive accounts of social structure was provided by Karl Marx, who argued that the economic base, or economic structure, substantially influenced the superstructure – that is, law, state, religion, ideology, culture, and politics – of a society (Calhoun, 2002). Considering this idea alongside the development of Māori society in the traditional era reveals that the economic conditions of the time influenced the nature of the society. For example, during the 16th century, the global drop in temperature impacted on the ability of the
emerging tribal groups to grow kūmara, a staple source of food. The kūmara-growing region nearly halved in size due to the cooler temperatures, which caused a migration to commence as groups moved north to warmer areas where kūmara could still be grown. This movement of people created competition for resources and contributed to the development of inter-tribal warfare, as stationary groups sought to protect their lands and resources from migratory parties (Walker, 2012). Marx (1904) suggests that the economic structure of a society is the real foundation on which cultural, social and political structures are built. The economic conditions in the 16th century affected both the nature of Māori society and the emerging social structures in which the identity of tribal groups was formed.

*Traditional Expressions of Whakapapa*

Chapter Two considered the social construction of identity and the importance of a positive evaluation of a group by its members. In the traditional era, the iwi was the largest social group that showed a distinct autonomy in its internal organisation and in its external relations with other parallel groups (Bourassa & Strong, 2002; Buck, 1949; Winiata, 1967). Structural relations within the iwi were maintained by constant interaction between constituent groups expressed, in some instances, through warfare or kinship, attachment to a specific geographical area, and common traditions, language and histories (Buck, 1949; King, 2003; Royal, 1992; Winiata, 1967).

Iwi were made up of several hapū and provided a well-defined framework of relationships between hapū, which had a considerable degree of rangatiratanga (autonomy). In fact, some writers argue that the hapū was the main political unit, an autonomous and independent entity acting in its own interests with its own leadership and resources, and guided by its own tikanga (cultural practices) (Bourassa & Strong, 2002; Himona, 2013; Houkamau, 2006; Liu et al, 1999; Rangihau, 1992; Royal, 1992; Petrie, 2013; Ward, 1999; Winiata, 1967). The concept of a geographically unified iwi was often not possible to sustain in reality. The only exceptions were those iwi that had small populations and were confined to a relatively small geographical area (Himona, 2013; Walker, 1990). While a hapū would acknowledge common descent with other hapū, thus creating the illusion of a unified
there are no records that indicate that hapū thought of themselves as being subordinate to iwi in a social, economic or political sense (Himona, 2013; Liu et al, 1999; Petrie, 2013; Ward, 1999; Woller, 2005). Furthermore, some commentators argue that the concept of iwi was the result of government policies of colonisation, which saw a movement towards a closer association of hapū joined by descent from a common ancestor as an administrative convenience following the establishment of the settler government (Ballara, 1998; Bourassa & Strong, 2002; Himona, 2013; Rangihau, 1992; Winiata, 1967; Woller, 2005). When a hapū had secured control of the lands it occupied, other tribal groups recognised its standing as an independent entity.

Hapū ranged in size from 200-300 people and occupied a defined stretch of tribal territory, which provided the basis for a more compact organisation (Winiata, 1967). Ideally, the territory would have access to both water-based and land-based food sources. Hapū members worked together to undertake tasks necessary for group survival (Bourassa & Strong, 2002; Houkamau, 2006; Petrie, 2013) and cooperated on large-scale land-use projects and fishing operations as well as building of major assets like a canoe or a meeting house. The survival of a hapū was dependent on its ability to defend its tribal lands against invading groups and, in such instances, a hapū would often rely on alliances with other hapū of the same iwi for support (Bourassa & Strong, 2002; Ward, 1999).

Hapū consisted of a number of whānau, or extended family groups, which comprised three to four generations and might number as many as 30 people (Bourassa & Strong, 2002; Buck, 1949; Firth, 1963; Winiata, 1967). A whānau was the basic social unit in traditional Māori society and its main function was the procreation and nurture of children (Walker, 1990). Whānau were headed by kaumatua, who were the male and female elders of the group (Bourassa & Strong, 2002; Winiata, 1967). Kaumatua (elders) were the repositories of the knowledge necessary to survive in their community, which they passed on to successive generations (Walker, 1990). They also cared for and mentored the children of the whānau, often while the parents were gathering food or performing other tasks necessary for the day-to-day functioning and survival of the whānau. Whānau were self-sufficient in most matters
except defence, and this was where kinship and connection to the hapū was crucial to survival as whānau banded together at the hapū level during times of warfare (Liu et al, 1999; Pere, 1988).

McCall and Simmons (1966) observe that roles within a society provide a framework within which members define themselves and their place in the wider group, and also provide a template for socially acceptable behaviour relevant to that social group. Traditional Māori society was hierarchical in nature, with a relatively rigid structure. Central to the kin groups was the concept of rangatiratanga, which is the right of these groups to exercise their exclusive authority in matters concerning their group. Within the kinship groups of iwi, hapū and whānau, members occupied clearly defined roles. Research on the structure of tribal groups in the traditional era reveals that roles played a crucial part in ensuring society functioned appropriately by providing members with a set of guidelines for behaviour and interaction within the group. The ariki (paramount chief) was the most senior leader in an iwi or hapū, and held his position by way of descent from the senior line. The rangatira (chief) held a position slightly lower than that of the ariki because he descended from the junior line. At the head of a whānau were kaumatua, recognised by members of the whānau as their leaders because of their age, wisdom and experience (Bourassa & Strong, 2002; Kawharu, 1984; Winiata, 1967). Within whānau, kinship terms of tuakana (senior) and teina (junior) were allocated to indicate the order of birth of siblings. These terms were important in arranging status and the roles and responsibilities that came with each position (Winiata, 1967).

Another key role in these kin groups was that of tohunga, who was a specialist in a given area. Tohunga influenced social, political and economic affairs within a kin group (Robinson, 2005; Winiata, 1967). Some tohunga were specialists in the arts and worked as builders or carvers. Others were high priests. Those with a particular calling were trained in special schools and graduated with the ability to command the elements and call on supernatural forces. Tohunga were revered in traditional Māori society, and were pivotal in guiding and regulating human behaviour.
Analysts exploring role theory argue that not only do members of a group see themselves as occupying certain roles but they also see others within the group as doing the same, and that it is essential to impose an identity upon others in order to operate effectively in a social group (Bates & Harvey, 1975; Biddle, 1979; Houkamau, 2006; Turner, 1979; Zurcher, 1983). Imposing an identity on someone is done by applying stereotypes according to the role that someone appears to occupy (Biddle, 1979; McCall & Simmons, 1966), and these stereotypes are then used as a frame of reference to indicate how an individual should act towards someone else. In traditional Māori kin groups, the position of the person occupying a role was validated by the members of the group who recognised their right to that position. For example, if a member occupied the role of rangatira and his position was accepted and, consequently, validated by the rest of the group, he was aware of the expectations for behaviour that were attached to that role. Essentially, the occupation of each role was reinforced by the respect and loyalty of the people. Stryker & Statham (1985) suggest that the more people who expect a member of a group to behave in a certain way, or to express a particular identity, the more that member acts in accordance with those assumptions, and the more committed, focused and loyal to that particular role the member is. These expectations ensured that members who occupied the roles that regulated traditional kin groups behaved in a manner that met group expectations and this contributed to the overall functioning of the tribal group. Furthermore, an understanding of the socially constructed norms associated with other roles allowed the members to behave appropriately in their own role. In the traditional era, members of tribal groups were aware not only of their own position within the group, but also how that position informed their interaction with other members (Houkamau, 2006; Kawharu, 1984).

Because members of these kin groups were bound together by whakapapa, this connection prevented the development of any serious subservient relationships between members (Winiata, 1967). It is necessary to stress that the significance of whakapapa extends well beyond the idea of human genealogy that is often applied to it. Mikaere (2011) contends that whakapapa enables members of a group to understand their position within the group as well as their relationship to the other members. Furthermore, she argues that whakapapa enables a group to explain where
they have come from, and to envisage where they are going. Whakapapa creates an intricate web of relationships that allow key Māori concepts such as utu (reciprocity), kaitiakitanga (guardianship) and mana (respect) to be manifested. Pere (1988) explains that whakapapa is at the very core of tribal identity and, indeed, the survival of tribal groups, in that it engenders a sense of connectedness and, therefore, an obligation to generations, both past and future. In the traditional era, the relationship between rangatira and commoners was one of mutual respect and reciprocity, and involved clearly established rights and obligations that were attached to each role within the group (Houkamau, 2006; Kawharu, 1984; Petrie, 2013). This sense of connectedness was paramount to the survival of the group. Intertribal warfare was common and each individual’s commitment to their tribal group ensured a greater chance of survival when they were required to defend themselves against invading parties (Bourassa & Strong, 2002; Pere, 1988; Petrie, 2013).

The success of the leaders of the group, particularly during warfare, was important as it affected the prestige of the group. For example, if a rangatira was captured, the acquired stigma was transferred from one generation to the next, just as success and increased prestige were also passed on (Houkamau, 2006; Winiata, 1967). A number of theorists examine the impact of stigma on identity, and find that individuals will distance themselves from a group in order to avoid stigma (Goffman, 1963; Mills, 1999; Nagel, 1994; Skipper & McCaghy, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Furthermore, members of a group will compare their social group with others and, when their group is seen as superior to other groups, the members of that group are more likely to value their membership of the group and have positive associations with the identity of the group (Cardwell, 2000; Liu et al, 1999; Stets & Burke, 2000). In the traditional era, Winiata (1967) argues that death itself was preferred to being taken prisoner during a battle; such was the impact of stigma on the tribal group. The structure and continuity of the group was affected by such an event, particularly in instances where members were able to cite affiliation to multiple tribal groups. Members would distance themselves from hapū that had been disgraced in battle, choosing to affiliate with what may have previously been a secondary kin group (Bourassa & Strong, 2002; Winiata, 1967). Several identity theorists suggest that members of a group long for social acceptance and will pre-empt being socially
ostracised by switching identities according to the social context (Alexander & Lauderdale, 1977; Alexander & Wiley, 1981; Goffman, 1959). In the traditional era, the disgrace brought about particularly by defeat in battle had a significant impact on group identity and survival. This argument is supported by theorists who examine ethnic identity, whereby the more positively a group is perceived by society, the more positively its members will view their identity, and the more they will value their membership of that group (Blash & Unger, 1995; Houkamau, 2006; Lee; 1997; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). While applying the lens of ethnic identity to the traditional era begs the question, ‘Do ethnic groups exist in an environment where constituent groups are all of the same ethnicity?’ the relationship between stigma and positive identity associations is clearly illustrated by this concept.

The story of the Battle of Te Kokowai exemplifies the impact of stigma on identity. Tai (personal communication, August 6, 2015) recounts the events of the Battle. In the traditional era, there were two main iwi occupying lands in Tauranga; namely, Ngāti Ranginui and Ngāi Te Rangi. The latter tribal group descended from the Mataatua waka (canoe) and occupied lands to the south and west of Tauranga Harbour. A prolonged period of inter-tribal warfare culminated in the Battle of Te Kokowai, which resulted in Ngāi Te Rangi taking the great pā (fortified settlement) on Mauao away from Ngāti Ranginui. The pā was well fortified with terraces, banks and palisades, and the mountain on which it was located was almost completely surrounded by water. Ngāi Te Rangi had to employ cunning tactics to win this battle. They waited for a stormy night to implement their plan. On such an evening, approximately 140 warriors arrived at the section of the pā that was occupied by the Ngāti Ranginui chief, Kinonui. They carried with them baskets of kokowai (red ochre) and explained their late arrival by the need to stop frequently to protect the kokowai from the rain. It was not customary for guests to arrive at night but they were invited in nonetheless. The baskets of kokowai were stacked away ready for a formal presentation the following day. However, the baskets contained mostly dirt disguised by a thin layer of kokowai on top. It is at this point that historical accounts of the Battle of Te Kokowai vary between the two iwi.
According to Ngāi Te Rangi, their men entered the pā and went to sleep. During the night, the warriors woke and killed their hosts before burning them and taking the pā from the remaining few Ngāti Ranginui warriors who tried to defend it. Ngāti Ranginui, however, disputes this account, citing tikanga as evidence of the inaccuracy of the Ngāi Te Rangi story. Tikanga dictates that a group cannot just arrive at a place, enter and go to sleep, but rather, a pōwhiri (welcoming ceremony) must be performed, which concludes with both parties sitting down to eat together. It is at this point that the pōwhiri is complete and the guests are no longer seen as guests. Ngāti Ranginui argues that a pōwhiri took place and the two iwi shared a meal before going to sleep. At this point, the accounts concur, with Ngāi Te Rangi waking to attack their hosts and take the pā.

The reason for the variations in the story is driven by stigma. If Ngāi Te Rangi did, in fact, share a meal with Ngāti Ranginui at the conclusion of the pōwhiri, they broke the tikanga of the ceremony by sharing a meal then killing their hosts. It is more socially acceptable to portray an image of adhering to tikanga, hence their version of events. Ngāti Ranginui, however, maintains that Ngāi Te Rangi did eat because that was what tikanga dictated. Tai believes that even though Ngāti Ranginui was defeated during this battle the iwi does not carry the shame of that defeat but, rather, Ngāi Te Rangi carries the shame of how they reached a victory. He recalls being in the presence of a man from Ngāi Te Rangi and when a third party asked his companion who owns Mauao? The man from Ngāi Te Rangi replied: ‘We do, but we’re not proud of it.’ Various theorists examine the impact of stigma on identity associations and, consequently, suggest that the desire to avoid social stigma can influence acknowledgement of membership of a group (Mills, 1999; Skipper & McCaghy, 1978; West, 2012). To this day, Ngāi Te Rangi and the subterfuge they used to take the pā, is viewed negatively in the Tauranga region. Where normally defeat in battle would bring about feelings of dishonour and shame to those who lost, in this instance, Ngāti Ranginui to this day feels proud of the actions of their ancestors, and believe that the dishonour and shame rests with Ngāi Te Rangi. This event illustrates both the impact of stigma on identity associations and the salience of positive group evaluation to identity. Following Ngāti Ranginui’s defeat, Ngāi Te Rangi contended that the former no longer existed as a separate iwi, having been wiped out during the Battle of Te
Kokowai (Riseborough, 1999; Winiata, 1967). However, descendants of those who fought in this battle for Ngāti Ranginui simply relocated to lands on the other side of Tauranga Harbour, and continued their familial lines.

*Traditional Expressions of Te Reo me ō ngā Tikanga*

Various theorists argue that knowledge of socially constructed norms allow members of a group to interact appropriately with each other and, consequently, to be accepted by the other members of that group (Biddle, 1979; Davies & Harre, 1990; Houkamau, 2006; Stets & Burke, 2000). In the context of this research, another critical aspect informing identity in the traditional era is te reo me ngā tikanga (Durie, 1995; Houkamau & Sibley, 2010; Karetu, 1993; Pere, 1988; Ward, 1999). As traditional Māori identity emerged, it became necessary to develop a shared system of understandings that were meaningful and relevant (Emery, 2008). Tikanga developed, and this set of customs was used to guide behaviour (Butcher, 2012; Durie, 2005; Mikaere, 2011). The philosophical constructs underlying tikanga allowed Māori to frame their world in a manner that was distinctly Māori, and it was by participating in the customs within these kin groups that identity was formed (Durie, 1997; Marsden & Henare, 1992; Pere, 1988; Rangihau, 1992). Social expectations, behaviours and obligations were clearly defined to allow for appropriate engagement in the group, where survival depended on mutually beneficial relationships (Biggs, 1960; Houkamau, 2006; Pere, 1988). West (2012) comments on the salience of tikanga to identity in the traditional era, and argues that knowledge of the customs allowed members to gain social acceptance from the wider group. Essentially, tikanga provided a framework for Māori to live as Māori. The framework was clear, functional and relevant in ensuring optimal identity development and the social, cultural and economic survival of the tribal group.

In addition to appropriate understanding and implementation of the socially constructed norms associated with tikanga, linguistic knowledge was also a fundamental aspect of traditional Māori identity (Ward, 1999). Ka‘ai-Mahuta (2010) argues that ‘the Māori language is at the heart of Māori society and is connected to all other cultural concepts within the Māori world’ (p. 59). Karetu (1990) concurs and adds that te reo Māori (the Māori language) is central to Māori identity and what it
means to be Māori. Thiong’o (1986) contends that language is both a means of communication and a carrier of culture, and knowledge of te reo Māori, indeed, had both practical and spiritual significance. In the first instance, the language was a tool for everyday communication between tribal members, which contributed to the functioning of the social groups. It was the means by which the transmission of knowledge, histories, and whakapapa occurred. Pere (2005) states:

The transmission of whakapapa has always been through the language, through the oral language, which is passing down from one repository to another of tribal history. Without the language, everything else becomes unimportant. The language and oratory are the lifeline that keep all things tribal and Māori together (p. 51).

However, the language also had spiritual value. In Te Ao Māori (the Māori world), everything has a mauri, which can be loosely translated as 'life force'. A well-known whakataukī (proverb) cites the spiritual importance and centrality of te reo Māori: 'Ko te reo te mauri o te mana Māori. Language is the life force of Māori.' Te reo Māori not only acted as the medium by which the culture was transmitted, it also carried the mauri of the people to whom the language belonged (Royal, 1998), thus creating a symbiotic relationship between the speaker and the spoken word. Te reo Māori also provided insight on the Māori culture. The way in which people communicate, and the words they attach to values, concepts, objects, feelings, and actions reflect their unique worldview. The value of te reo Māori, therefore, extended beyond that of a tool for practical communication to that of a vehicle to express a worldview. It allowed Māori to name their world in their own unique way and, consequently, provided an avenue into a way of thinking, explaining and experiencing life (Mikaere, 2011; Royal, 1998). Kaʻai and Higgins (2004) state, ‘The Māori language is the window to the soul of the people and to sustaining their cultural identity’ (p. 22), and thus capture the importance of te reo Māori to identity.

Houkamau & Sibley (2010) cite the understanding of language and cultural practices as relevant to identity in that this knowledge allows Māori ‘to engage appropriately with other Māori in Māori social and cultural contexts’ (p. 10). Some identity theorists propose that through interactions with others an identity emerges, which then directs thoughts, feelings and behaviours (Cardwell, 2000; Moloney & Walker, 2007; Tajfel,
Knowledge of te reo me ngā tikanga allowed members of the kin groups to interact appropriately with each other and, consequently, develop an identity. Stets and Burke (2000) state that when members identify with a group, they conform to the roles, norms and behaviours required of that group. Furthermore, they argue that while there are multiple reasons why people identify with a group, such as the need to feel competent, effective, and valuable; identification with a group also requires each member to be accepted by the wider group. Te reo me ngā tikanga provided a framework for interaction and participation in the group, and members who were able to operate effectively within this framework were more likely to gain approval from the wider group and, consequently, develop positive self-concepts and identity associations. Therefore, knowledge of language and cultural practices, and competency in implementing them, were critical to traditional Māori identity (Karetu, 1990; Rangihau, 1992; Walker, 1989).

*Traditional Expressions of Mana Whenua*

In addition to whakapapa and te reo me ngā tikanga, mana whenua was also pivotal to traditional Māori identity (McCormack, 2011; Mikaere, 2011; Moeke-Pickering, 1996; Panelli et al, 2008; Pere, 1988; Walker, 1989; Ward, 1999). The concept of mana whenua was explained by Moorfield (n.d.) as:

Territorial rights, power from the land, authority over land or territory, jurisdiction over land or territory - power associated with possession and occupation of tribal land. The tribe’s history and legends are based in the lands they have occupied over generations and the land provides the sustenance for the people and to provide hospitality for guests (Retrieved 28 October, 2015, from [http://maoridictionary.co.nz/](http://maoridictionary.co.nz/)).

Various researchers examine the link between place and identity, and argue that place is where the physical environment allows people to create and maintain expressions of identity (Butcher, 2012; Easthope, 2009; Scannell & Gifford, 2009). In addition, while Tajfel (1981) agrees with the notion inherent in the preceding sections that identity is constructed by membership of a social group, he adds that membership of the group must have value and emotional significance. Whakapapa provided much significance, which was strengthened by an association with tribal lands and places. In the traditional era, Māori had a robust connection with the land. When a Māori
child was born the whenua (placenta) was buried, creating an inherent connection to Papatūānuku (Earth Mother) and the land where the whenua was placed (Durie, 2005). In the Māori language, the word ‘whenua’ means both land and placenta, and this dual meaning illustrates the importance of land to an individual’s sense of belonging to a particular place, which is strengthened by burying the placenta in a significant area. The connection to land was consolidated at a tribal level by occupation of a particular area of land, to which an intimate attachment was formed over time. Bennett (1979 as cited in Moeke-Pickering, 1996) explains that traditional Māori identity ‘emanates from the land’ because, for Māori, their tribal lands were the place where their self-awareness and a sense of identity originated. Butcher (2012) suggests Māori formed genealogical connections to tribal places and landmarks, which then became part of the ancestral heritage of the tribal group. Similarly, Walker (1989) observes that tribal lands and significant tribal landmarks, such as mountains and rivers, were an intrinsic part of identifying as Māori, and references to these landmarks featured prominently in traditional Māori descriptions of identity (Broughton, 1993; Karetu, 1990; Mead, 1999; Rangihau, 1992; Walker, 1990).

It is necessary at this point to also consider the influence of spirituality on Māori identity in the traditional era, particularly in the context of connection to ancestral lands. Eliade (1978) argues that sacred and spiritual experiences are paramount to the human experience, and that the beginnings of culture are embedded in religious experiences and beliefs. Moreton-Robinson (2003) explains that for indigenous peoples, the spiritual nature of the world is incorporated in all things, and is particularly influential in relation to the connection these groups have to their tribal lands. The Māori narrative of creation suggests that the world as it is today emerged after Ranginui (the sky father) and Papatūānuku, who were previously locked in an embrace, were separated by their children. This action marked the transition from Te Pō (the world of darkness) to the world in which we all now live, Te Ao Mārama (the world of light). Ranginui and Papatūānuku became part of the ancestral heritage of tribal groups. Physical and spiritual environments are not conceptualised as separate realms but rather are inextricably linked, and the identity of the people is also connected to all things (Marsden & Henare, 1992; Royal, 1998). This narrative is similar to the creation narratives of other indigenous groups, in particular, Hawaiians.
For Māori, connection to land was more than a spiritual and cultural one. Land also provided physical sustenance by way of food and water. Butcher (2012) argues that the ability to provide for oneself generates a sense of autonomy and control that contributes to a positive association with an identity. Tribal groups made claims of ownership over stretches of streams, lakes, sea frontage, rivers and land due to hunting and gathering food over a long period of time (Bourassa & Strong, 2002; Kawharu, 1984), and these claims ensured the groups were able to continue to provide for themselves. Ward (1999) contends that Māori lived as much off the sea and inland waters as off the land, if not more so. Early Pākehā explorers marvelled at the range of tribal fishing techniques, from individual fish-traps to nets hundreds of metres long, which Ward explains were used in inter-tribal fishing drives that occurred seasonally and yielded huge catches of fish, some of which was preserved for the winter months. Portions of the catch were given to inland tribes in exchange for produce from the bush and inland waters, although Ward contends that most inland tribes had access to places on the coast for seasonal fishing. It was important to note that these were not mere commodity exchanges but also demonstrated complex inter-tribal relationships and expressions of mana (status), both competitive and co-operative. On this basis, Ward argues that connection to waterways was crucially important to Māori society both in an economic and social sense.

Members of hapū were also allocated their own area of land to cultivate on their own and the rangatira, who had extended acreage, became the envy of rival tribes, which further emphasises the social and economic value attached to food (Petrie, 2013; Winiata, 1967). Moreover, the ability of the rangatira to provide optimum and sufficient food supplies was essential to the retention of his political and economic power. Leaders with access to the greatest resources were able to attract and retain a greater following, which enhanced their position and status (Petrie, 2013). Conversely, their power could diminish if they failed to adequately provide for their kin. According to Buttimer (1980 cited in Easthope, 2009), place influences identity through the interactions between the self and the physical environment. Extensive and sustained use of lands and waterways over a long period of time, compounded by an emotional connection to significant landmarks and places, resulted in a profound
effect of tribal lands on identity in the traditional era, both in a physical and spiritual sense.

In summary, identity in the traditional era was socially derived, constructed through interactions with others within the kin groups in a culturally significant geographical location where guidelines for behaviour were clearly understood and adhered to. Such influences allowed positive identity associations to develop, and contributed to the overall survival of the group. The work of Beaglehole and Beaglehole (1946) indicates that the understandings of what constituted traditional Māori identity are still widely held among Māori after 100 years of sustained contact with Pākehā. Findings from Fitzgerald’s (1969) study of 75 university graduates of Māori descent show that the majority of participants cited kinship ties, group orientation and identification, and knowledge of the Māori culture and language as central to their identities. A more recent study of 16 participants of Tūhoe descent (an iwi located in the central North Island of New Zealand) highlights several recurring themes relating to both Māori and Tūhoe identity. Liu and Tamara (1998) observe that participants believe identity is informed by connection to kin groups and tribal lands as well as competency in the Māori language and cultural customs.

While there seems to be a resilience and continuity of traditional influences of identity among modern Māori communities, the number of people who are, in fact, culturally and linguistically competent, with an active connection to traditional kin groups and tribal lands, has significantly decreased since the arrival of Pākehā settlers in New Zealand due largely to the process of colonisation. This is addressed in detail in the following chapter.

3.2 The Construction of Ngāi Tamarāwaho Identity

The following sections examine Ngāi Tamarāwaho, a hapū of the Tauranga iwi, Ngāti Ranginui. It must be noted that resources that captured hapū life in the traditional era are limited. However, there is no evidence to suggest that the hapū did not develop in the same way as constituent groups in wider Māori society during this era. Accounts
provided by participants reflect their opinions and inherited knowledge passed on by way of oral traditions as opposed to experienced events, and the researcher sometimes made deductions based on the existing information. However, it is necessary to stress that Māori culture is based on a sustained oral tradition of inter-generational knowledge transfer (Kaʻai-Mahuta, 2010; Mahuika, 2012). Therefore, this research views oral traditions as legitimate and valued sources of hapū history and knowledge.

*Traditional Expressions of Whakapapa*

Members of a group learn what it means to define themselves in certain ways by participating in the group and adhering to socially constructed norms (Houkamau, 2006; Pampel, 2000) and, in the traditional era, identity was conceived through the strata of tribal structures that made up Māori society, those being whānau, hapū and iwi (Barlow, 1991; Maaka, 1994; Rangihau, 1992; Walker, 1996). Ngāi Tamarāwaho are descendants of the captain of the Tākitimu waka, Tamatea Arikinui, who is known by many names. To Ngāi Tamarāwaho, he is Tamateapokaiwhenua. The hapū name comes from Kinotaraia, the grandson of Tamateapokaiwhenua and son of Kinonui, the great chief of Mauao. After Kinonui was killed at the Battle of Te Kokowai on Mauao, Kinotaraia was given the name Tamarāwaho, the Son of the Sea Breeze, when he moved inland and settled the area touched by the breeze that blows from Mauao to the mountains of Puwhenua and Otanewainuku (Riseborough, 1999). The hapū descends from Ranginui, son of Tamateapokaiwhenua, whose pā was on the western bank of the Wairoa River at Pukewhanake. From Ranginui comes his grandson, Te Kaponga, whose pā was at Tutarawananga, at the mouth of the Waimapu River. In a direct line of descent from Te Kaponga comes Tahuriwakanui, whose pā, Ranginui a Tamatea, was at Poike on the banks of the Waimapu River. Tahuriwakanui married Taumata; their daughter, Waikohua married Arona, who stands in a direct line from Kinonui, the brother of Ranginui. Their son was Rauhea Koikoi, the great chief who fought at the Battles of Pukehinahina and Te Ranga. The hapū hold the seven children of Rauhea Koikoi as central to their whakapapa, and, in the contemporary era, whānau are often grouped together under the child with whom they share common descent (Tai, personal communication, August 6, 2015). Kinotaraia (Tamarāwaho) was the leader of Otamataha pā. His son, Tuaurutapu, resided at Motuopae, which is
now the urupa (burial ground) of Ngāi Tamarāwaho. Tuaurutapu’s son, Pareoana, lived at Orangipani, now known as Huria. The chart below (see Fig. 2) illustrates the male lines of descent from Tamateapokaiwhenua, and includes key Ngāi Tamarāwaho ancestors. The forward slashes indicate the existence of ancestors who are not named in the chart.

![Chart of Ngāi Tamarāwaho whakapapa](source: Tai, personal communication, August 6, 2015).

Tajfel (1981) suggests that membership of a group must have value and emotional significance. Bishop (1998) argues that whakapapa strongly influenced Māori identity in the traditional era by providing a platform where common understandings and meanings were built. Furthermore, he suggests whakapapa created a sense of collective responsibility, which helped to ensure the survival of the tribal group. The aforementioned ancestry of the hapū provided the basis for the development of Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity through whakapapa, thereby establishing who had the right to be a member of the group. Tai (personal communication, August 6, 2015) states: ‘The strategic alliances through intermarriage supported our position here. We made those connections in order to protect our rohe (territory).’ The interaction Ngāi Tamarāwaho had with neighbouring kin groups, as Bishop (1998) suggests, helped to ensure the survival of the hapū and at the same time protect their way of life.

While the role of the hapū in traditional Māori society has been variously debated, it is clear from an examination of hapū history that Ngāi Tamarāwaho operated as an independent social, political and economic unit. Woller (2005) describes Ngāi
Tamarāwaho as the group through which members ‘organised their lives’ and explains that the hapū played a central role in promoting group identity, language and culture. The members of Ngāi Tamarāwaho lived in whānau groups on their tribal lands and, while each settlement operated on its own on a day-to-day basis, they were constantly interacting with associated whānau in a mutually beneficial manner with common leadership (Woller, 2005). The seminal idea inherent in this research is that identity is socially constructed via membership of a group. Considering this notion alongside the construction of identity in the traditional era in tribal groups that were bound by genealogy demonstrates the importance of the daily interactions within the hapū to their identity.

Ngāi Tamarāwaho was also united by way of their relationships with external groups (Winiata, 1967). Cardwell (2000) suggests that members of a group position themselves within an in-group or an out-group, and, in order to see themselves as the embodiment of the in-group, they conform to the norms and behaviours required of that group. To maintain positive group associations, members compare their in-group with the out-groups. Without such comparisons and verification of membership, belonging to the in-group has little salience, meaning or effect (Stets & Burke, 2000). In-group favouritism occurs when members view their group more positively than other groups (Liu et al, 1999). Traditionally, the hapū interacted with out-groups in two ways: first by way of a relationship with other hapū of the same iwi and, second, by way of a relationship with other iwi in the Bay of Plenty region. In the traditional era, Ngāi Tamarāwaho shared its boundaries with three other hapū, and associated freely with these groups (Riseborough, 1999; Winiata, 1967). Common descent united them and, at times, intermarriage took place to ensure amicable relationships were maintained (Kahu, personal communication, August 7, 2015). The interaction between Ngāi Tamarāwaho as the in-group, and other hapū in the region as the out-groups, contributed to positive identity associations within the hapū, particularly when Ngāi Tamarāwaho was evaluated higher than other tribal groups.

These hapū were united under the mantle of their iwi, Ngāti Ranginui. While Ngāi Tamarāwaho had localised leadership, each of the hapū within the iwi recognised iwi leaders and senior descent lines (Winiata, 1967). Hapū links were consolidated at an
iwi level by opposition to Ngāi Te Rangi, the other major iwi in the Tauranga district. In the traditional era, many battles were fought between the two iwi as each struggled to establish their claim and authority in the region (Stokes, 1990).

The work of McCall and Simmons (1966) indicates that roles within a society provide a framework within which members of a group define themselves and others in the group. Roles also help to ensure the group functions smoothly. The organisational structure of Ngāi Tamarāwaho in the traditional era was hierarchical in nature, with senior descent lines according superior status and position within the hapū (Tane, personal communication, August 21, 2015). Tane explained: ‘Whakapapa always played a part, like Te Hare descended from Te Mokoroa so therefore the mana is with him.’ The possession of qualities and skills appropriate to the role or situation was not always paramount, although knowledge was certainly passed from generation to generation to ensure members were well prepared for their intended roles within the group. Illustrating this, the Piahana whānau was the senior family in terms of descent (Tai, personal communication, August 6, 2015), and the title of tuakana was applied to members of that family, despite the fact that in some instances, junior relatives were in possession of greater skills necessary for various roles within the hapū, particularly those of leadership (Winiata, 1967). The roles occupied by members of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, as in the wider Māori society in the traditional era, were validated by other members of the group. Tane (personal communication, August 21, 2015) explains, ‘Traditionally, our roles were like the whare (house): you have a carving done by a man, then a tukutuku panel done by a woman. Men and women worked together.’ Mutual respect and reciprocity were key to ensuring a sense of connectedness and belonging was maintained, which, in turn, increased the chances of the survival of the hapū particularly during the inter-tribal warfare between Ngāti Ranginui and Ngāi Te Rangi. Whakapapa played a pivotal role in the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho in the traditional era by establishing the criteria for group membership. Genealogical links between the members were consolidated by various day-to-day interactions both within the tribal group and with external groups. These mutually beneficial interactions were crucial to the survival and development of the group and, consequently, provided a sense of value from belonging to the group for its members.
Traditional Expressions of Mana Whenua

The link between place and identity is acknowledged by various researchers, who argue that place is where the physical environment allows people to create and maintain expressions of identity (Butcher, 2012; Easthope, 2009; Scannell & Gifford, 2009). Moreover, this connection enhances the value and emotional significance attached to group belonging. In addition to strong kinship ties and clearly defined roles, Ngāi Tamarāwaho developed a strong sense of mana whenua as well as a robust bond with the land. The long occupation of their lands; and the physical and spiritual ties they have to it bear witness to the important role their tribal lands played in shaping their identity. Their place names indicate their association with their lands, as do their stories. Tai (personal communication, August 6, 2015) explains:

When Tamateapokaiwhenua came here there were three things that he did that entrenched us [Ngāi Tamarāwaho] into this whenua forever. He anchored [his waka] at Te Awa-iti, dove to the bottom of Tirikawa, and he placed the mauri [of the Tākitimu waka] in the rock.... The name of that mauri was Uinukurangi. Then he climbed Mauao... and built two altars.... He had two seeing stones that he carried with him in his top-knot. They were so sacred that no one could touch them... and he placed those stones on top of those altars. The stones were called Hikutai and Rehutai, and they could see the future. Then he began karakia (incantation) with the tohunga, and planted the flax that symbolised planting his people into the land. The name of that flax was Haukoromoerangi.... Then he pointed his staff south towards Puwhenua, and he names that maunga (mountain) after the puwhenua tree that was given to him by Waitaha to build his waka back in Taputapuatea.... The third thing he did was to set up a wānanga (place of learning) so that they could continue to pass on their knowledge and history.

Kiwa (personal communication, August 16, 2015) states:

This is the land that was promised to us by our tūpuna (ancestors) back in Hawaiki. What Tamateapokaiwhenua did was simply fulfilling the prophecy that Tauranga is ours... the mana whenua is ours. We [Ngāi Tamarāwaho] are the keepers of the prophecy. It’s part of who we are and why we are here and why we need to survive.

Researchers examining the link between place and identity observe that place contributes to identity through the interactions between people and the physical environment (Butcher, 2012; Buttimer, 1980 as cited in Easthope, 2009). The story of the actions of Tamateapokaiwhenua in cementing Ngāi Tamarāwaho in their tribal lands is one example that illustrates the transition of those lands from space to place,
brings with it value and meaning, which, consequently, contributed to the identity of the hapū.

In the traditional era, Ngāi Tamarāwaho had a strong physical connection to their lands. Various archaeological studies and excavations, particularly in the Kopurererua Valley, revealed widespread living areas, pits, terraces, cultivation soils, middens, obsidian flakes, post holes and burial sites, which indicate a long occupation and extensive use of tribal lands over many years (Riseborough, 1999). Radiocarbon dating suggests the occupation commenced sometime in the late 16th century, or early 17th century. The hapū used their tribal lands and waterways to provide nourishment. Lands were tilled to grow crops and waterways were fished for food. The Waikareao Estuary, in particular, provided sustenance for the hapū since they settled the area. The Kopurererua River, which feeds the estuary, acted as a highway for access into tribal lands at Taumata, and was also a rich source of marine and aquatic food (Riseborough, 1999). Ngāi Tamarāwaho’s ancestral lands were among the best agricultural lands in New Zealand, and the region is currently renowned for its soil fertility and ability to raise large crops (During, 1984). The hapū used the land to produce an abundance of root crops, especially kūmara (Evans, 1997). The ability to provide for themselves was a source of pride to the hapū, which Butcher (2012) argues contributes to a positive association with an identity. Additionally, the more abundant and rich the food, the more envied the hapū was by neighbouring groups. Prestige, like stigma, influences identity associations (Goffman, 1963), and the hapū was proud of their ability to provide physical nourishment to both their members and visiting groups.

Scannell & Gifford (2009) argue that place also influences identity by way of an emotional connection to an area, and the connection Ngāi Tamarāwaho had to their lands in the traditional era went beyond physical occupation and use of the lands and waterways. In addition to providing physical sustenance, the Kopurererua River had spiritual significance to the hapū because it was carved by their taniwha (water guardian), Taurikura, who named important tribal places as she journeyed down the valley and out to sea. She took up residence on Te Moutere o Karewa in the form of the tuatara, which are still found on the island to this day (Riseborough, 1999). Te
Moutere o Motuopae, which is the present day hapū burial ground, was formerly a hillock among many small hills inland of Otumoetai. Motuopae was in love with one of these hills but his affections were not returned. Motuopae could not bear to watch the object of his affection ignoring him in favour of someone else so one night he decided to swim out to sea. But he only got as far as the Waikareao Estuary before the first rays of the early morning sun caught him on the mudflats of the estuary and fixed him in his place, where he remains to this day (Stokes, 1990). These are but two of many stories that illustrate the spiritual connection the hapū had to their tribal lands. Connection to tribal lands contributed to the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, both in a physical and spiritual manner, and provided value and emotional significance to members of the hapū.

*Traditional Expressions of Te Reo me ngā Tikanga*

Theorists researching the social construction of identity suggest that socially constructed norms regulate group behaviour and members of a group adhere to these norms in order to gain acceptance from the wider group (Biddle, 1986; Burt, 1982; Davies & Harre, 1990; Houkamau, 2006; McCall & Simmons, 1966; Pampel, 2000). Furthermore, commentators examining Māori identity note the salience of te reo me ngā tikanga to identity (Durie, 1995; Houkamau & Sibley, 2010; Karetu, 1993; Pere, 1988; Ward, 1999; West, 2012). In the traditional era, interaction within their kin groups on their tribal lands allowed Ngāi Tamarāwaho tikanga and language to develop in the same way, albeit on a smaller scale, as tikanga did in the wider society. Evidence to support this is both difficult to produce and, at the same time, glaringly obvious. Tikanga in the wider society allowed Māori to live as Māori and, therefore, the tribal variations of tikanga that developed in each kin group allowed that group to live in their own distinct way. Hapū members conformed to the roles, norm and behaviours expected of them, which resulted in their acceptance by the other members of the group (Stets & Burke, 2000). Essentially, the fact that Ngāi Tamarāwaho are still in existence as a hapū to this day is evidence that their tikanga, which provided a framework for living as Ngāi Tamarāwaho, was adhered to, and this resulted in the continuation of the hapū.
Just as the customs of Ngāi Tamarāwaho provided a framework for appropriate group interaction, their language allowed them to communicate effectively with other members of the group in a manner that reflected their experiences, values and perceptions. The hapū attached their own names to a variety of objects in their environment, and this is best illustrated by considering the names they gave to tribal places. For example, the estuary that was a fundamental food source to the hapū was named Te Kete Kai o Ngāi Tamarāwaho, which translates to the Food Basket of Ngāi Tamarāwaho (Roimata, personal communication, August 7, 2015). This shows the importance of the estuary to the hapū in providing physical sustenance and nourishment. Similarly, place names also reflected significant events that took place in a particular location. Te Rī o Tamarāwaho is a stretch of land in the Mangorewa Gorge that was named after a truce was finally called between Ngāi Tamarāwaho and Rangiwewehi, a neighbouring hapū belonging to the iwi of Te Arawa who occupied land on the other side of the gorge. Tai (personal communication, August 6, 2015) speaks about the ongoing warfare between Tamarāwaho and Kereru, who was the son of Rangiwewehi, taking its toll on both parties, so they agreed to end the fighting by creating a rī, or demarcation line. It was established in the middle of the Mangorewa Gorge, and formed the tribal boundary between Ngāi Tamarāwaho and Rangiwewehi. It is known to this day as Te Rī o Tamarāwaho. Acknowledging events through names also applied to people. For example, a key Ngāi Tamarāwaho ancestor, Tahuriwakanui, was given this name after members of the hapū were overturned in a waka near Tuhua (Mayor Island) (Kahu, personal communication, August 7, 2015). The names given to people and places, in particular, reflected Ngāi Tamarāwaho history, experiences and worldview, and illustrate that language was a key influence on the identity of the hapū in the traditional era. Knowledge of tribal tikanga and language provided members with a framework for interacting and communicating with others in the group, which contributed to the development of group identity. Hapū members who were able to effectively engage within this framework were more likely to gain acceptance by the wider group and were, therefore, more likely to have positive identity associations.
3.3 Summary

This chapter explored the construction of hapū identity in the traditional era, and examined three key aspects that played a pivotal role in influencing identity; specifically, whakapapa, mana whenua and te reo me ngā tikanga. Specific elements of role theory, social identity theory and situated identity theory were applied within the socio-historical context of this era and they acted as a lens through which traditional hapū identity was viewed and interpreted. The findings indicate that the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho in this era was socially constructed through interactions with others in the kin group, and was influenced by engagement with other tribal groups (Winiata, 1967; Woller, 2005). Members of the tribal group occupied clearly defined roles, and stereotypes were attached to these roles, which determined group behaviour and interaction. The tikanga of Ngāi Tamarāwaho also provided a framework for behaviour, and their language acted as a means of communication (Woller, 2005). Knowledge of te reo me ngā tikanga allowed members to engage appropriately with one another and gain social acceptance. A close physical and spiritual bond with tribal lands further contributed to the development of identity in this era by providing the hapū with a sense of autonomy, which is linked to positive associations with an identity (Butcher, 2012). Riseborough (1999) states: ‘The fact Ngāi Tamarāwaho have maintained their identity in the Tauranga region to this day is borne out of traditional history and connection to the land, social organisation, customs, and genealogies’ (p. 8). The development of identity in wider Māori society provided further insight into the construction of Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity in the traditional era.

This chapter acts as the base classification from which subsequent changes in identity can be analysed and, thus, contributes to the intention of this research, which is to reveal how the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho has evolved from the traditional era to contemporary times. The following chapter focuses on the colonisation era and examines the impact of the social phenomenon of colonisation on the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho.
CHAPTER FOUR: THE COLONISATION ERA

In Chapter Three, the construction of Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity in the traditional era was examined in the context of various aspects of role theory, social identity theory and situated identity theory. Evidence showed that positive identity associations in this era emerged for members of Ngāi Tamarāwaho through participating in their kin group, and that knowledge of hapū language and cultural practices, and connections to their ancestral lands were influential in ensuring positive identity associations. Inherent in this research is the notion that the socio-historical context influences identity, and this chapter advances that idea by analysing hapū identity in the colonisation era. In the context of this thesis, the colonisation era commenced with the arrival of Pākehā settlers in 1814 and concluded with the establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal in 1975.

In this chapter, the theoretical approaches in Chapter Two are used to provide a conceptual basis from which to view and interpret Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity in the colonisation era. The theoretical approaches employed include role theory, in particular the application of stereotypes to traditional roles within a group; social identity theory, specifically, the comparison and evaluation of an in-group, and the influence of out-groups on an in-group; and situated identity theory, principally the branch that addresses the impact of stigma on identity. Consideration is also given to concepts associated with ethnic identity, particularly the impact of the way in which society views an ethnic group on the identity of that group. Parallels are also made with the impact of colonisation on the identities of other indigenous groups in order to illustrate trends that occur as a result of this social phenomenon. This chapter uses these aspects of the theories as a means to examine and understand dimensions of hapū identity in the colonisation era.

The analysis of Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity in the traditional era discussed in Chapter Three is the basis from which comparisons can be made with other socio-historical phases, which, when considered alongside the content of Chapter Three, reveal how the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho has evolved. This chapter is the next stage in the
process of exploring the evolution of hapū identity from the traditional era to the end of the colonisation era. This chapter begins with a descriptive account of the initial contact between tribal groups and Pākehā settlers, and the subsequent events that occurred in New Zealand as part of the colonisation process. These opening sections are designed to provide a snapshot of the socio-historical context in which Ngāi Tamarāwaho experienced the phenomenon of colonisation. The constraints of this thesis do not allow for a more detailed account and analysis of colonisation as it was for Māori in the wider society, but what is shown by the content provided is that the process and effects of colonisation were remarkably similar for Māori as they were for Ngāi Tamarāwaho and for other indigenous groups worldwide.

The major focus of this chapter is the interplay between Ngāi Tamarāwaho and the phenomenon of colonisation, and the effects this relationship had on the identity of the hapū. Detailed analysis of the events and their effect on hapū mana whenua, whakapapa and te reo me ē ngā tikanga is provided. It is intended that analysing how colonisation affected these traditional influences of identity will reveal how the identity of the hapū evolved during the colonisation era. It is important to stress that during the colonisation era, the hapū was not passively colonised but, in fact, made conscious decisions as their relationship with the phenomenon unfolded. To suggest Ngāi Tamarāwaho was unaware of their engagement with colonisation is to disempower the hapū and undermine their rangatiratanga.

4.1 The Socio-historical Context of the Colonisation Era

Following the waves of immigration from the equatorial islands of East Polynesia to New Zealand, hapū lived in isolation for approximately 400 years before the Pākehā discovery of New Zealand by Dutch explorer, Abel Tasman in 1642. Tasman’s reception was unwelcoming, and it was not until 1769 that Pākehā made landfall in New Zealand, led by Captain James Cook. They brought with them a completely foreign system that was often at odds with the existing indigenous social and economic structures, and worldview (Trask, 1999). Pākehā settlers began to arrive in New Zealand in 1814, and their numbers slowly increased in the 1820s and 1830s.
Although there were occasional skirmishes, this initial contact period was generally characterised primarily by two phenomena, specifically, economic prosperity for Māori and Pākehā alike (Houkamau, 2006; Liu et al., 1999; Petrie, 2013; Walker, 1990), and warfare (King, 2003; Liu et al, 1999; Vayda, 1970).

When Pākehā settlers arrived in New Zealand, many hapū were keen to take advantage of Pākehā skills, and trade between the two groups flourished (O'Malley, 2012). In keeping with customary practices of cementing such alliances, high-born Māori women were married to prominent Pākehā traders (Bentley, 1999; Salmond, 1993). Bishop (1998) argues that genealogical links helped to ensure the survival of tribal groups, primarily by guaranteeing continuity of tribal populations but also, as Mikaere (2011) suggests, by generating a sense of obligation to look after kin. Māori applied this notion to their initial interactions with Pākehā by using marriage and familial ties to consolidate their relationships with the new settlers. While trade secured Māori access to the new technologies the settlers brought with them, intermarriage served to strengthen these new relationships. The alliances resulted in the first infusion of Pākehā genes into tribal populations (Bentley, 1999; Swainson, 1859).

However, the introduction of the musket by Pākehā traders resulted in an outbreak of bloody warfare between tribal groups, which culminated in the Musket Wars. Ballara (1976) argues that the Musket Wars were a continuation of Māori political interactions from the late 18th century, carried out in the early 19th century but with more efficient weapons. It is estimated that the fighting escalated between 1822 and 1836 (King, 2003), and was the cause of at least 20,000 Māori deaths (Ballara, 1976). Pākehā settlers not only brought new technologies and muskets with them but also epidemics, particularly measles, which Māori had no immunity to and this further decimated tribal populations. When Cook arrived in New Zealand in 1769, he estimated the Māori population comprised approximately 100,000 people (Pool, 1991). By 1840, the populations of tribal groups had suffered due to the negative impact of the introduction of muskets and disease (Houkamau, 2006; Liu et al, 1999; Meredith, 2000; Petrie, 2013) and populations were consequently estimated to be 70,000 people (Pool, 1991). By the 1858 census, the Māori population had been
further reduced to 60,000 people. Analysts who examine the effects of colonisation on various indigenous groups globally find that, in some cases, warfare and the introduction of infectious diseases by colonising powers resulted in a decline in the populations of indigenous groups (Alfred, 2009; Moreton-Robinson, 2003; Trask, 1999). In little under one hundred years, the Māori population had suffered a 40 per cent reduction in numbers and was, consequently, outnumbered by a Pākehā majority. Disease and the Musket Wars were the primary causes of the decline.

Central to the policy of colonialism, which informs the process of colonisation, is the notion of cultural supremacy (Thiong'o, 1986; Trask, 1999), and the introduction of Christianity to indigenous communities worldwide resulted in many indigenous groups forsaking their own traditions and behaviours for those of the colonisers (Trask, 1999). A similar trend occurred in New Zealand following the arrival of the first missionaries in the Bay of Islands in 1814. Unlike the traders who were motivated solely by commercial gain, the missionaries’ intentions were to convert Māori to Christianity and what they perceived to be a more civilised way of life (Binney, 1968; Swainson, 1859). According to Ka’ai-Oldman (1988), ‘The missionaries saw themselves as the instrument by which the Maori people would be brought from the state of barbarism to civilised life’ (p. 22). Similarly, Binney (1968) discusses the aim of the missionaries and their intentions ‘specifically to transform, indeed eradicate, by their actions and words, the existing structure of Māori society’ (p. 13). Walker (1990) concurs and describes the missionaries as ‘the cutting edge of colonisation’ (p. 85), who arrived in New Zealand with ethnocentric attitudes of racial and cultural superiority (Ward, 1995). Like indigenous populations around the world, many Māori converted to Christianity and, consequently, adopted a Pākehā way of life (Petrie, 2013).

Colonisation plans were further advanced when the British Government instructed William Hobson to obtain sovereignty from the ‘natives’. This culminated in the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi⁴, which commenced in February 1840 and continued for several months (Moon, 2002). Hapū that signed the Treaty believed they would

---

retain sovereignty over their lands as well as political autonomy while, at the same time, being afforded the rights and protections equivalent to those of British citizens (Awatere, 1984). Indeed, British colonial secretary, Lord Normanby, gave lengthy instructions to Hobson, part of which states:

All dealings with the natives for their lands must be conducted on the same principles of sincerity, justice and good faith as must govern your transactions with them for the recognition of Her Majesty’s sovereignty in the Islands. Nor is that all: they must not be permitted to enter into any contracts in which they might be ignorant and unintentional authors of injuries to themselves. You will not, for example, purchase from them any territory the retention of which by them would be essential or highly conducive to their own comfort, safety, or subsistence. The acquisition of land by the Crown for the future settlement of British subjects must be confined to such districts as the natives can alienate without distress or serious inconvenience to themselves....

However, discrepancies between the wording of the English and Māori versions of the Treaty, combined with the colonising intentions of the settler Government, meant Māori political autonomy and ability to retain possession of their lands was placed under further threat (Houkamau, 2006).

As the settlers began to make serious inroads into the acquisition of Māori land, conflict between Pākehā and tribal groups became more pronounced (Liu et al, 1999; Petrie, 2013). Māori frustration over increasing land loss and Pākehā intentions to acquire more land led to the New Zealand Wars of the 1860s, the battles of which predominantly took place in Taranaki, Waikato and parts of the Bay of Plenty (King, 2003; Stenhouse, 1998). While tribal groups in these areas, often with the support of tribes from other regions, resisted Pākehā military invasion as much as possible, the New Zealand Wars resulted in Taranaki, Waikato and Bay of Plenty Māori losing most of the land that remained in their possession through confiscation (King, 2003; Riseborough, 1999). Some tribal groups, however, sided with the Crown during the New Zealand Wars and, consequently, benefitted from this decision by not only retaining their tribal lands but also by being awarded the confiscated lands of ‘rebel’ tribes (Stenhouse, 1998).

---

5 For the full brief of instructions, see Auckland University Library, General Library: Great Britain Parliamentary Papers 1840, VOL. 23. pp. 37-45
The New Zealand Wars ended in 1865, and it was in this year that the Native Lands Act was passed. The Act, which dealt with land acquisition, provided for the establishment of the Native Land Court. One of the functions of the Court was to convert traditional communal landholdings into individual titles, which allowed further settler access to Māori land by making it easier for Pākehā to purchase (Jackson, 1993). Through the various processes established under successive Native Lands Acts, as well as the creation and operation of the Native Land Court, customary Māori land tenure was slowly undermined; and McKay (2012) contends the effects of those changes on Māori were immense. Māori custom was distorted, Māori social structures were destroyed, the role of traditional tribal leaders was eroded, and Māori land was rapidly transferred out of their hands. Ballara (1998) cites the functions of the Native Land Act as bringing about the ‘greatest catalysts of change in tribal organisation in the 19th century’ (p. 260). The operations of the Native Land Court played a significant part in the colonisation process due to its role in facilitating the alienation of tribal groups from their ancestral lands and an economic base. Binney (1968) describes the Native Lands Act as an ‘act of war.’ In 1860, approximately 80 per cent of land in the North Island (23.2 million acres) was owned by Māori. By 1865, the Crown had purchased nearly 99 per cent of the South Island. By 1890, only 11.6 million acres remained in Māori hands and, by 1910, this was further reduced to 7.7 million acres (Orange, 2004). Furthermore, the little land Māori retained was often fragmented in small holdings, and was generally unproductive and poor in quality (McKay, 2012).

Indigenous commentators note that one major effect of colonisation was rendering indigenous communities economically powerless, mostly through the alienation of tribal estates (Alfred, 2009; Trask, 1999) and, by the turn of the 20th century, the more economically powerful Pākehā majority had considerable ability to influence Māori both socially and economically (Awatere, 1984). Following the loss of the majority of their ancestral lands, Māori began to seek employment as labourers for Pākehā landowners in order to ensure their economic survival (Walker, 1990). Broughton (1993) describes this change as a ‘traumatic shock’ for Māori because their economic safety depended on their ability to fit in with Pākehā.
Thiong’o (1986) warns that the colonisation process is ‘complete’ when the colonised believe in the superiority of those who are intent on colonising them and, consequently, mimic the colonisers. Freire (1993) concurs, and further adds that the more the colonised mirror the colonisers, the more stable the position of the latter becomes. The early 1900s also saw a continuation in the assimilation of Māori into a Pākehā way of life, and Māori were ‘progressively abandoning the ways of their ancestors, adopting Pākehā ones in their stead [and] becoming physically and culturally more and more like Pākehā’ (Metge, 1976, p. 6). Assimilative educational policies were facilitated by legislation, namely, the Native Schools Act, which banned the use of the Māori language in schools (Edwards, 1990; Jenkins & Matthews, 1998; Simon, 1998; Smith, 1992). Many Māori embraced Pākehā ways, believing that adopting Pākehā culture would allow them to prosper in Pākehā society (Johnston & Pihama, 1994; Simon, 1998). Such decisions illustrate that tribal groups continued to exercise their rangatiratanga. The trend of imitating colonising powers is noted by indigenous analysts as a significant effect of the colonisation of indigenous communities (Trask, 1999). The notion of in-group favouritism provides a perspective on why indigenous groups, including Māori, adopted the behaviours and traits of the colonisers. For membership of a group to have value and salience, members must view their group positively following comparison with out-groups. If they do not view their group positively, they are unlikely to conform to the roles, norms and behaviours required of that group and are, in fact, more likely to adopt behaviours of the out-group that they view more positively than their own group (Cardwell, 2000). Therefore, if Māori believed in the superiority of Pākehā, they were highly likely to abandon their own behaviours and social norms in favour of those brought by Pākehā.

Concerned that Māori were abandoning their culture and traditions for those of the Pākehā and were, indeed, a ‘dying race,’ politician and leader, Sir Apirana Ngata, established a programme in the early part of the 20th century that involved building carved meeting houses symbolic of life in the traditional era throughout New Zealand for hapū and iwi in various tribal areas (Houkamau, 2006). Liu et al (1999) write that Ngata believed these buildings and surrounding land (marae) would protect Māori from assimilation because they would serve as a common meeting place for Māori
cultural and social activities, thus contributing to the survival of tribal identity. As a result of Ngata’s venture, marae throughout New Zealand remain places in which some Māori consolidate relationships and strengthen their culture and language. However, despite the capacity of marae for protecting some aspects of Māori social life, they did not halt the colonisation process, and New Zealand was largely becoming an increasingly Pākehā cultural environment (Houkamau, 2006).

Although Māori had assimilated considerably in a cultural sense since the arrival of Pākehā settlers, up until the 1950s, the two ethnic groups remained relatively separate geographically, with Māori largely living in rural areas and Pākehā tending to reside in cities (King, 2003). Māori who remained in rural areas were better able to maintain their culture by adhering to traditional practices and participating in activities with other Māori (Biggs, 1960). However, a swift demographic rural-to-urban shift took place within Māori communities after the Second World War, which resulted in Māori identity no longer being conceived solely in a traditional tribal setting (Barcham, 1998; Emery, 2008). Ancestral lands that remained in Māori ownership were unable to support the Māori population, meaning employment had to be sought in the cities (Walker, 1990). Trask (1999) notes a similar trend for Native Hawaiians, who left the Hawaiian Islands for the United States of America in search of work. Similarly, Alfred (2009) comments on the meagre pockets of ancestral land left to Canada’s First Nations people, which resulted in an urban drift. Consequently, a contemporary feature of indigenous populations worldwide is a population that is diasporic in nature. The mass rural exodus of Māori occurred rapidly and, by the end of the 1970s, only 15 per cent of the Māori population remained in rural areas (Statistics New Zealand, 2014).

Colonisation continued to be accelerated by government policies that encouraged the abandonment by Māori of their traditional lands and customs in favour of a Pākehā urban lifestyle. Māori were encouraged to sell shares in their tribal lands and use the money for deposits on new suburban homes (Williams, 2004). Government housing policies in the 1960s saw Māori ‘pepper-potted’ into suburbia alongside Pākehā households. This trend resulted in the fragmentation of traditional whānau units, which were quickly replaced with a nuclear family structure. The lack of opportunity
for Māori to engage in their wider kin groups undermined traditional social structures. Thiong’o (1986) cites the suppression of language and cultural practices by colonising powers as a cornerstone of the colonisation process. In New Zealand, Merritt (1996) argues that, concomitant with language suppression, was the devaluing and marginalising of Māori culture and knowledge. Māori knowledge and histories were not taught in schools (Penetito, 2010), and the Native Schools Act banned the use of the Māori language in schools.

While political efforts that began in the 1970s placed the New Zealand Government under increasing pressure to address Māori demands for social, economic and cultural equality (Houkamau, 2006), changes brought about by such efforts did not occur until the 1980s or after. However, the establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal in 1975, and the 1985 amendment to the Treaty of Waitangi Act that allowed the tribunal to hear historical grievances paved the way for Māori to seek some redress for the huge losses they suffered during the colonisation era. Detailed attention is given to this in Chapter Five.

### 4.2 The Impact of Colonisation on Māori Identity

According to McCarthy (1997), ‘Māori have a long history of experiencing assimilative policies and practices which have been detrimental to the overall wellbeing of Māori, as evidenced in the language, culture and identity losses of many’ (p. 30). Indeed, several writers argue that New Zealand’s colonial history hindered optimal identity development for Māori (Awatere, 1984; Bishop, 1998; Durie, 1997; Houkamau, 2006; Walker, 1990). Lawson Te-Aho (1998) observes:

> The act of colonisation gave birth to cultural alienation because of forced assimilation into dominant cultural practices originally foreign to Māori. This caused Māori to act outside of their essential being as Māori. This created historically sourced behaviours, which have had devastating impacts on current generations of Māori (p. 219).

Among several commentators, the implicit argument is that the speed with which colonisation unfolded meant Māori were not able to fully adapt to the changes in the...
traditional influences on identity that resulted (Barcham, 1998; Durie, 1997; Hirini, 1997; Houkamau, 2006). Te Puni Kōkiri (1999) identifies that the process of colonisation fractured the relationship of Māori with mana whenua, whakapapa and te reo me ngā tikanga. Tajfel (1981) suggests that membership of a group must have value and emotional significance. Therefore, the result of the fragmentation of the relationship of Māori with mana whenua, whakapapa and te reo me ngā tikanga was that traditional tribal groups no longer provided the same degree of meaning and influence on Māori identity (Barcham, 1998; Raerino, 2007). Consequently, as Durie (1997) warns, 'Urban Māori that no longer actively participate in marae activities are at risk of losing their identity entirely' (p. 152). Some identity theorists observe that members of a group position themselves within an in-group, and in order to be accepted by other members of the in-group, the members conform to the norms and behaviours associated with that group. Dahl and Jensen (2002) note trends whereby the longer indigenous peoples live in an urban environment, the less they tend to identify with their original indigenous group, and their observation supports Durie’s warning of the impact of similar trends on Māori identity.

The preceding sections discussing the process of colonisation, as it was largely experienced by Māori, demonstrate that the influences that previously informed identity were affected by colonisation and, therefore, tribal groups became disconnected from their extended family networks, ancestral lands and traditional practices. This created an underlying sense of dislocation and discord for Māori who were faced with the challenge of adjusting to a different cultural context. The primary purpose of these sections is to establish a context that provides an enhanced understanding of the socio-historical context in which the relationship Ngāi Tamarāwaho developed with colonisation unfolded. The remainder of this chapter addresses how colonisation, specifically the alienation of lands, suppression of language and culture, and the fragmentation of kin groups, affected the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho.
4.3 The Ngāi Tamarāwaho Relationship with Colonisation

The discussions in Chapter Three showed that during the traditional era, Ngāi Tamarāwaho occupied and made full use of their ancestral lands in order to support their various kin groups and their way of life. The rest of this chapter focuses on the evolution of the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho during colonisation era. Initial discussions are centred on Ngāi Tamarāwaho’s relationship with the Church Missionary Society and with the Crown, and focus on events that led to the alienation of tribal lands, which, in turn, affected kin groups, and language and cultural practices. It is intended that this description of events highlights the socio-historical context in which the relationship between the hapū and colonisation unfolded. In these sections, the term ‘Crown’ refers to the Pākehā representatives of the British Crown. Following this, the effects of colonisation on the hapū are examined, and they include socio-economic effects as well as the impact of colonisation on whakapapa and te reo me ngā tikanga. The chapter concludes with a discussion on the changes to hapū identity in the colonisation era. Due to an overlap of many of the effects of colonisation, this era is addressed chronologically as opposed to separate sections that address land alienation, fragmentation of kin groups, and suppression of language and culture individually. The battles at Pukehinahina and Te Ranga are mentioned in brief due to constraints in the scope of this research. Accounts from participants in the early stages of this era reflect their opinions as opposed to lived experiences. Having said that, it is necessary to stress again that Māori culture is based on a sustained oral tradition of inter-generational knowledge transfer, which Ka’ai-Mahuta (2010) argues is the first example of recorded history. Mahuika (2012) concurs and claims that for indigenous peoples, including Māori, oral traditions are key to their past, present and future.

---

In the mid 1820s, the Church Missionary Society (CMS) mission schooner made several visits to Tauranga in search of provisions for the mission station in the Bay of Islands and, by 1828 missionaries were visiting the area to acquire a site for a new station in the Bay of Plenty. However, at the beginning of the 1830s after a decade of peace, the northern iwi of Ngā Puhi launched further attacks on tribal groups in Tauranga, and the decision to establish a station in the area was delayed a few years until 1834, when the Reverends William Williams and Alfred Nesbit Brown arrived with the express aim of choosing a site for their mission (Riseborough, 1999). Due to ongoing skirmishes with various tribal groups in the 1820s and early 1830s, a permanent missionary presence was welcomed by Ngāi Tamarāwaho (O’Malley, 1996). Hapū leaders agreed to the CMS establishing a mission station on Te Papa peninsula, believing the missionaries’ presence would bring education to the hapū and stability during an unsettled period (Wainwright & Feint, 2000). Missionary records of this time indicate there was great interest shown by many hapū members in learning to read and write (Woller, 2011).

In October 1838, the CMS announced that it had purchased the site of the mission station, with a further 1333 acres reported to have been purchased in 1839. With this additional purchase, the station covered virtually the whole of Te Papa back as far as Pukehinahina (Riseborough, 1999). Payment for the block comprised one calf, 40 adzes, 60 large blankets, 40 axes, 40 hoes, 40 shirts, 40 trousers, 12 spades, 100 pipes, 70 pounds of tobacco, 24 scissors, 24 razors, 24 iron planes and 100 fish hooks. The goods had a total value of approximately £100 (Stokes, 1990). However, in the Tauranga district, including at Te Papa, tribal groups were numerically dominant in the 1830s and were, therefore, still able to enforce traditional rights (Riseborough, 1999). Missionary rights to use the land were conditional upon contributions to the hapū and acceptance of hapū authority and social norms (Wainwright & Feint, 2000). The underlying right to the land remained with Ngāi Tamarāwaho, who believed that in return for the continuing presence of the missionaries, in particular Brown, the CMS was given access to land for their use and settlement (Riseborough, 1999). Indeed, Ngāi Tamarāwaho continued to occupy Te Papa after the mission station was established, as cultivating the land was included in the purchase. Tai (personal
communication, August 6, 2015) describes initial relations between Ngāi Tamarāwaho and the CMS, especially Brown, as amicable, and explains:

*He taught us the Bible... and to read and write.... He supplied the stained glass windows for our church(es] on Motuopae... and at Ahiroa up the Taumata.... We had a close relationship even to the point that some of our surnames became Brown.... When our tipuna Koikoi was baptised, he was named William Brown.*

Many hapū members converted to the Christian (Anglican) faith as a result of Brown’s ministry. The mission was built on hapū land, and the close interactions with Brown meant many members changed their names and way of life (Riseborough, 1999).

On 1 April 1840, William Hobson asked Brown ‘to procure the signatures of leading chiefs’ in the Tauranga district to the ‘treaty which had been signed at Waitangi’ (Brown, 1840 as cited in Westgate, 1991). By May 1840, Brown had collected 21 signatures from local hapū, including Ngāi Tamarāwaho (Riseborough, 1999). However, the relationship between Ngāi Tamarāwaho and Brown began to deteriorate when it became clear to the hapū that the CMS believed they had purchased the land as per Westminster law. Brown wrote in his journal for the CMS that ‘the Judea Natives would like to take back the land purchased by the CMS’ (Brown, 1863). He added that he had purchased the land to prevent it falling into the hands of a ‘grog seller... in the event of this country becoming colonised’ (Brown, 1839). In 1852, the Land Claims Commission confirmed the title of the CMS to the Te Papa block.

The loss of the valuable land with its rich soil and strategic location resulted in severe economic hardship for Ngāi Tamarāwaho. This loss was compounded in 1860 when the CMS, which had supposedly purchased the land to prevent settlers from obtaining it, leased 800 acres to a Pākehā settler, and again, in 1864, when they ‘agreed to lease the entire area, minus Brown’s house and glebe [10 acres], to the government for £200 per annum’ (O’Malley & Ward, 1993). Ngāi Tamarawaho’s relationship with the CMS was to deteriorate further when Crown troops landed in Tauranga in January 1864.
Ngāi Tamarāwaho and the Crown

One year earlier, in early 1863, Governor George Grey’s preparations for war against tribal groups in Waikato and Taranaki were complete, and Crown troops invaded Waikato later that year to crush what Grey and his ministers considered to be ‘the head and font of this great and general conspiracy against us’ (Grey, 1863 as cited in AJHR, 1863); that conspiracy being the King Movement. By means of a proclamation issued by Governor Grey on 15 July, 1863, he warned the Waikato chiefs who took up arms against Crown troops that they would ‘forfeit the right to the possession of their lands guaranteed to them by the Treaty of Waitangi’ (New Zealand Gazette, 15 July, 1863, as cited in Riseborough, 1999, p. 43). Ngāi Tamarāwaho had proclaimed their loyalty to the Māori King some years earlier and, consequently, sent ‘one third of [their] people to support the Waikato tribes in the war against Crown troops’ (Winiata, 1998 as cited in Riseborough, 1999, p. 44). A further one third of the hapū population carried munitions to the war zone, and the remaining one third stayed at home to tend the gardens. In January 1864, Crown troops landed at Te Papa, ostensibly to ‘stop the road to the Waikato’ (Wainwright & Feint, 2000, p. 14), but spent some months waiting for reinforcements, which did not arrive until 21 April, 1864 under the command of General Cameron, who had withdrawn his troops from Waikato after the battle at Orakau. Given that General Cameron and his troops did not arrive in Tauranga until after the end of the war in Waikato, Crown moves were seen as purely provocative and designed to elicit an aggressive response from local tribal groups. Riseborough (1999) states:

The government wanted land for a town... and Ngāi Tamarāwaho were in the way. It was very convenient for the government that they were King’s men, ‘rebels’ whose land could be taken in payment for their hara [wrongdoing]. But the Kingitanga [King Movement] was an excuse for war; land was the reason. And in Tauranga te rohe o Ngāi Tamarāwaho [the area of Ngāi Tamarāwaho] was the most desirable land, the most desirable location (p. 62).

Riseborough’s statement suggests the real reason the Crown sent troops to Tauranga was to secure valuable and fertile land for settlement, and the Crown used Ngāi Tamarāwaho’s support of the King Movement as an excuse to wage war on the hapū. The war had a severe impact on Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity, and this is discussed later in this chapter.
Assault on Ngāi Tamarāwaho Mana Whenua

Trask (1999) observes that most indigenous groups refer to themselves as ‘people of the land’, and they gain ‘a sense of identity [through] an attachment to place... and the natural world’ (p. 104). Various researchers note the centrality of connection to tribal lands and places to Māori identity (McCormack, 2011; Mikaere, 2011; Moeke-Pickering, 1996; Panelli et al, 2008; Pere, 1988; Walker, 1989; Ward, 1999), and discussions in Chapter Three illustrated that connection to their tribal lands and places was pivotal to Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity. On 29 April 1864, Crown troops attacked Ngāi Tamarāwaho and other hapū at Pukehinahina, commonly known as Gate Pā, and between 220 and 240 Māori warriors defeated over 1650 Crown troops (Mair & Gifford, 1937). Following this battle, Ngāi Tamarāwaho, with other tribal groups, began to entrench themselves further inland from Pukehinahina at Te Ranga which, like Pukehinahina, is also in Ngāi Tamarāwaho territory. Te Ranga, however, was an incomplete defensive position still under construction when, on 21 June 1864, it was attacked by Crown troops. Ngāi Tamarāwaho and other tribal groups were defeated and Ngāi Tamarāwaho, consequently, fled further inland to the bush area at Taumata with hapū leader, Wi Paraone Rauhea Koikoi (Tai, personal communication, August 6, 2015). As punishment for their perceived rebellion ‘the chief Paraone Koikoi [was] brought from the bush to witness the confiscation of his lands from the town of Tauranga to Mangorewa, some fifty odd thousand acres’ (Winiata, 2000, p. 8). Ngāi Tamarāwaho was labelled as ‘rebels... a name that still remains a disgrace to the hapū’ (Winiata, 2000, p. 7). On 18 May 1865, the entire Tauranga district was confiscated by Order in Council under the New Zealand Settlements Act 1863 and, after questions arose over the validity of the order, the Tauranga District Lands Act 1867 was passed retrospectively to validate the confiscation of the land (Wainwright & Feint, 2000). After the confiscations, the Crown insisted on dealing with one iwi in Tauranga, that being Ngāi Te Rangi. Ngāti Ranginui as an iwi, along with the constituent hapū groups, was effectively legislated out of existence (Kahu, personal communication, August 7, 2015). Trask (1999) comments on the profound impact legal definitions of identity have on indigenous peoples, where ‘state powers attempt to decrease [their] numbers and therefore [their] claims by merely defining [them] out of existence’ (p. 104). It took nearly a century before Ngāi Tamarāwaho was recognised as a hapū in its own right.
Following the confiscations, Ngāi Tamarāwaho was predominantly based at Taumata where Paraone Koikoi decreed they would close ranks. Nobody was to marry outside the hapū. This command is supported by analysing hapū whakapapa between 1864 and 1945. Tai (personal communication, August 6, 2015) explains, 'We can prove our history through our whakapapa, and it's crucial to explaining who we are.... I look at the whakapapa from that time; they are furiously marrying in to each other.' Bishop (1998) argues that genealogical links help to ensure the survival of the tribal group, and this example from the actions of Ngāi Tamarāwaho supports the importance of whakapapa to group survival.

In 1866, it was recommended that Ngāi Tamarāwaho be granted 80 to 100 acres at Huria because the 'old settlement of this tribe was at Judea [Huria]' (Whitaker, 1865). However, the land eventually returned to the hapū was only 42 acres, with over half of that being swamp or tidal land (Riseborough, 1999). In 1871, another recommendation was made to grant more land to the hapū after it became clear that Ngāi Tamarāwaho did not have enough land of sufficient quality to support themselves. Whitaker (n.d.) observes:

> The land set apart for them, a great part of which is swamp, is quite inadequate.... All their land with the exception of a little forest has been confiscated.... I therefore recommend that a further award of 100 acres may be made as near the present allocation as possible (as cited in Riseborough, 1999, p. 92).

Whitaker’s statement illustrates the extent to which Ngāi Tamarāwaho had been disconnected from their ancestral lands and the impact of this disconnection on the hapū, who no longer had the ability to adequately provide for themselves and to lead a prosperous life. The 100-acre block that was returned to Ngāi Tamarāwaho following Whitaker’s recommendation was granted to 'Paraone Koikoi... of Tauranga... in trust for the Ngāi Tamarāwaho tribe' (as cited in Riseborough, 1999, p. 92). This was the only block of land granted to the hapū, and it was to be held in trust for all of Ngāi Tamarāwaho rather than in the names of individual hapū members (Wainwright & Feint, 2000). However, the land carried no restrictions on alienation. Riseborough (1999) observes that ‘almost the moment the award was made, the
‘trustees’... fell victim to pressure to alienate the land’ (p. 92) and, consequently, the block was sold the following year to a Tauranga builder named David Lundon.

In 1881, Ngāi Tamarāwaho was granted 5960 acres of largely non-arable land at Taumata, which was a day trip on foot from the coastal settlement of Huria, and 468 acres at Te Ahiroa. However, the Taumata block contained rich timber reserves of rimu and totara, which were coveted by the timber companies. Most of the land was sold for the average price of three shillings per acre, and Ngāi Tamarāwaho was often forced to sell the land to pay the survey costs charged against the blocks (Evans, 1997). By the 1890s, most of the land at Taumata had been lost (Wainwright & Feint, 2000). In 1886, Motuopae Island in the Waikareao Estuary was gazetted as a native reserve for the use of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, and since the turn of the 20th century it has been used as the hapū urupa.

In total, Ngāi Tamarāwaho was given 142 acres of coastal land, approximately half of which was swamp, and 6428 acre of low quality, hilly land that was a rich source of timber but not ideal for growing food. Section 24 of the Native Land Act 1873 stated that ‘land reserved for the support and maintenance of the Natives ... shall be equal to an aggregate amount of not less than fifty acres per head for every Native man woman and child resident in the district’ (as cited in Riseborough, 1999, p. 97). The lands returned to Ngāi Tamarāwaho were extremely inadequate, meagre in quantity, poor in quality and inconveniently situated at either end of their original tribal estate. In the traditional era, the hapū moved around their lands from the coast to the inland gardens to the forests at Taumata according to their needs in different seasons (Ngatoko, 2000). Evans (1997) argues the raupatu destroyed Ngāi Tamarāwaho way of life. ‘Raupatu’ is the term given to the confiscation by the Crown of areas of Māori land during the New Zealand Wars of the 1860s. By the mid 1890s, the hapū was rendered virtually landless. Riseborough (1999) concludes that ‘this stripping of the hapū’s economic base and the cynical disregard of the people’s welfare and the future needs of the hapū was nothing short of scandalous’ (p. 97).

The experience of Ngāi Tamarāwaho bears remarkable similarities to those of indigenous peoples worldwide, where indigenous groups were confined to meagre
remnants of their traditional tribal estates. The effects of this were disastrous and reduced indigenous peoples, including Ngāi Tamarāwaho, to a grim socio-economic profile (Alfred, 2009; Moreton-Robinson, 2003; Trask, 1999). Cardwell (2000) observes that a key component associated with social identity theory is social comparison. To maintain positive group associations, members compare their in-group with out-groups. Without these comparisons, belonging to the in-group has little salience, meaning or effect (Stets & Burke, 2000). Following such comparisons, Liu et al (1999) argue that in-group favouritism occurs, which is the tendency to evaluate one’s own group more positively than other groups, and this leads to positive associations with an identity when one’s own group is viewed more favourably than those it is compared with. In considering this, it is necessary to discuss the socio-economic profile of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, and the impact this profile has on how the group is evaluated and viewed by its members. Furthermore, some theorists suggest that a negative view of an ethnic group in the wider society can lead to members of that group disassociating with the group in order to avoid stigma (Goffman, 1963; Mills, 1999; Skipper & McCaghy, 1978). The following sections discuss the profile in more detail.

The Socio-Economic Profile of Ngāi Tamarāwaho

i. Migration and the search for work
Colonisation affected mana whenua, whakapapa and te reo me ngā tikanga in a multitude of ways, and there is much overlap between the effects of this social phenomenon. Therefore, these sections are addressed chronologically as opposed to separate sections. Alfred (2009) notes that the displacement of indigenous peoples from ancestral lands greatly affected their ability to prosper and lead healthy lives. Indeed, the loss of their land and their economic base effectively destroyed Ngāi Tamarāwaho’s ability to prosper, and this created an out-migration that severely affected their traditional hapū roles and the overall group structure. Analysts suggest that a social group constructs rules of conduct that specify what is socially acceptable behaviour within that group and within the various roles (Biddle, 1986; Burt, 1982; Davies & Harre, 1990; McCall & Simmons, 1966). In turn, members of the group adopt the social conventions attached to each role and store these ideas in their minds.
(Bates & Harvey, 1975; Biddle, 1979; Zurcher, 1983). Essentially, the roles within a group provide members with a framework within which to define themselves, as well as a template for socially acceptable behaviour relevant to that social group.

Following the loss of most of their ancestral lands, many members of Ngāi Tamarāwaho sought work away from home in an attempt to adequately provide for their whānau. James Pope, an inspector of Native Schools, reported in 1891:

> The land they possess at Huria is little in quantity and poor in quality.... These Natives lead a miserable existence... at Huria, endeavouring to get some return from their ungrateful glebe, or working precariously for neighbouring Europeans; and when this fails, retiring inland and working in the bush, or wearing out their constitutions in the gum fields (as cited in Wainwright & Feint, 2000, p. 56).

Indeed, the 1901 census recorded hapū members absent at gumfields and other such localities that offered them short-term employment. This migration involved either moving the whole whānau out of the wider hapū to the area of employment, or leaving whānau to manage without their able-bodied labourers. Wainwright & Feint (2000) comment, 'The loss of land forced Ngāi Tamarāwaho to move away... to find work to survive. This accelerated the fragmentation of the hapū and the erosion of traditional leadership and social organisation’ (p. 52). The migration of predominantly the male members of the hapū to other areas in search of work meant traditional social and cultural obligations were unable to be fulfilled, or were fulfilled by those who remained at home which, consequently, changed the nature of the roles. Because roles in a group contribute to the provision of a framework for appropriate group interaction and behaviour, changes to the roles in the hapū affected the overall functioning of Ngāi Tamarāwaho. Similarly, Alfred (2009) notes the effect of the migration trend on Canada’s First Nations people, where the breakdown of social structures resulted in discord among their communities due to an inability to fulfil traditional social and cultural obligations.

The trend to move to other areas to find work continued throughout the 20th century and this ‘undermined the concept of whānau’ (Wainwright & Feint, 2000, p. 52). Traditional whānau groups consisted of extended families and comprised 30
members or more, but the emergence of the nuclear family changed traditional concepts of whānau. Moreover, colonisation and, specifically, the alienation of tribal lands, facilitated the destruction of customary tenure that eroded traditional leadership structures and social organisation, which resulted in a loss of group cohesion for the hapū (Wainwright & Feint, 2000). This trend was similar for other indigenous peoples, where the breakdown of social structures resulted in discord among communities (Alfred, 2009). The loss of land undermined Ngāi Tamarāwaho’s ability to exercise their rangatiratanga. Without land, a rangatira has no territory over which to exercise his rangatiratanga so he lacks the means to support his people and is unable to demonstrate attributes of leadership that brought mana to the hapū. Matthews (2000) explains, ‘Our people have always maintained that for a person to be of standing... you must have land.... If you have land you are somebody, if not, you are nobody’ (as cited in Wainwright & Feint, 2000, p. 51). Such observations did not bode well for positive group evaluation, which, in turn, affected the identity associations of members of the hapū. Land alienation also affected the hapū spiritually. Ngatoko (2000) explains that ‘Land loss devastated our people. What I can’t explain is what this did to our wairua (spirit). Our wairua has never recovered.’ Butcher (2012) argues that ancestral lands have a special place in indigenous cultures and are deeply intertwined in the identity of indigenous groups. Moreton-Robinson (2003) suggests that land alienation affected the spiritual wellbeing of indigenous groups and this was evident in Ngāi Tamarāwaho.

Stets and Burke (2000) argue that in order for membership of an in-group to have salience, comparisons are made with out-groups to ensure that membership of their group is preferred. Stigma affects the image of the in-group (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) and Nagel (1994) observes that members of an ethnic group will distance themselves in certain social contexts in order to avoid social stigma. Wainwright & Feint (2000) argue that fragmentation of the hapū caused by the economic pressure to migrate created a climate where the hapū became wary of outsiders. Tawa (2000) observes, ‘I think because of the confiscated land... the old people were biased against the Pākehā. [However] it wasn’t only the Pākehā that Ngāi Tamarāwaho didn’t trust, it was any outsider’ (as cited in Wainwright & Feint, 2000, p. 53). This distrust led to further marriages within the hapū, which resulted in Ngāi Tamarāwaho getting a
reputation amongst other hapū in Tauranga Moana for marrying close kin. Ana (personal communication, August 9, 2015) notes, ‘We stick with our own because we can’t trust others…. That’s why a lot of us still intermarry…. There’s a stigma out there [and] I am constantly defending my Tamarāwahotanga in the wider community.’ For Ngāi Tamarāwaho, stigma caused hapū members to close themselves off from others or, conversely, to distance themselves from the hapū.

Ngatoko (2000) believes the economic impact of the raupatu on his family has been devastating, and observes:

Of my eleven children...all [five] of my boys live in Australia. [They moved] in the late 60s and 70s because of the lack of opportunities here in Tauranga…. I had no incentives to offer them to stay, like land to build homes for their families... (p. 14).

Kahu (personal communication, August 7, 2015) concurs, ‘I saw some of our families who moved overseas in my generation... or to Tokoroa to the mill. Others went to Auckland or Wellington... and many never came back.’ Migratory trends such as these further severed connections to ancestral lands, undermined traditional social structures, and created a diasporic population that often led to hybrid or multiple identities for some members of the hapū.

Those who remained at home did not fare any better. During the Great Depression of the 1930s, conditions for Ngāi Tamarāwaho deteriorated even further. There was very little external work, except when Pākehā farmers went to Huria to hire labour. Māori across the country were expected to subsist on their land (Riseborough, 1999) but Ngāi Tamarāwaho had very little cultivable land. The rates of government assistance for Māori without employment were lower than the assistance paid to Pākehā. Roimata (personal communication, August 7, 2015) explains:

We were very poor...and badly situated because of the land confiscations. It wasn’t just the land...but it was our economic wellbeing.... We would gather the kūmara... and we would go to Pākehā to ask for clothes to dress ourselves because that’s how poor we were.
Tai (personal communication, August 6, 2015) recalls the exchange of kūmara for clothing and comments, ‘My mother came from Tuwharetoa and she used to frown on it and get embarrassed. She said we would never do that. But they didn’t have to do that!’ The stigma attached to belonging to a social group that had such low socio-economic outcomes led to negative identity associations for some hapū members, especially when they compared their membership of the in-group – namely Ngāi Tamarāwaho – to out-groups. This caused some hapū members to distance themselves or deny membership of the hapū (Ana, personal communication, August 9, 2015).

ii. Housing and basic amenities
Concomitant with the dire economic situation the hapū was faced with after the loss of their tribal lands was poor housing and a lack of basic amenities. Wainwright & Feint (2000) argue that the standard of housing at Huria was significantly below that of the general population for most of the 20th century. Roimata (personal communication, August 7, 2015) describes the housing at Huria during her childhood in the 1930s. ‘It was terrible really. The old people were still living in raupō houses. It’s hard to believe that now.’ Raupō is a plant that grows in the swamp and the reeds were used to clad and line the frame of a house. Tai (personal communication, August 6, 2015) describes his mother’s shock at the housing conditions at Huria when she married into the hapū in the 1940s. Eight adults and seven children shared a two-room house. There were holes in the walls and it leaked when it rained. Kahu (personal communication, August 7, 2015), who returned to Tauranga in 1959, lived in a house that ‘had no back wall; the back wall was a macro carpa hedge…. I wondered why are we living like this and they’re [Pākehā] living like that? Then you start to find out it’s the raupatu.’ Theorists who research the effects of colonisation on indigenous peoples cite poor standards of housing as a direct result of colonisation (Alfred, 2009; Trask, 1999). Indeed, a 1955 investigation into housing at Huria revealed that almost every house was sub-standard (Nightingale, 1996). In 1960, the Department of Māori Affairs estimated that 20 whānau at Huria, and 25 whānau at Te Rēti, a nearby hapū settlement, needed re-housing.

Long after the provision of reticulated water, paved roads and electricity were enjoyed by the general population, Ngāi Tamarāwaho continued to live in a state of
poverty and deprivation. The creek was the only water supply. In 1917, a scheme was proposed to provide a water supply to Huria at the high cost of £300. An inquiry into the conditions at Huria showed Ngāi Tamarāwaho was ‘easily the poorest natives in the District’ and ‘not in a position to contribute at all to the cost of a water supply’ (Rose, 1997). The Tauranga County Council, concerned about the difficulty they may have in collecting water rates (Riseborough, 1999), did not proceed with the scheme. By the mid-1920s, the Tauranga County Council had reticulated water to within fifteen chains of Huria but remained reluctant to extend it for the use of the hapū. The Tauranga Māori Council then stepped in and provided £75 towards the cost of having a bore sunk and, with a further £75 from the Māori Purposes Fund, the project went ahead. However, it was later found that the supply was contaminated (Nightingale, 1996; Rose, 1997). It was not until the second half of the 20th century that Huria had running water, and that came from one tap that serviced the whole community (Wainwright & Feint, 2000).

In the 1930s, the hapū at Huria had no road, electricity, heating, or drainage, and they made their ablutions in the creek (Riseborough, 1999). Winiata (2000) recalls that in the 1940s ‘no-one had a telephone or water… electricity, heating, or drainage… There were no convenient amenities for the people of Huria….’ (p. 10). The lack of heating in the houses meant hapū members were advised by medical professionals not to bathe their children every day. As a result of the cold and overcrowded conditions, members of the hapū suffered from ‘all kinds of health complaints – bronchitis, pneumonia, tuberculosis, and convulsions….’ (Tata, 2000). Alfred (2009) notes a virtually identical trend for Canada’s First Nations people, where overcrowding, lack of access to clean water and poor sanitation contributed to extremely high rates of infectious disease. He cites colonisation as the cause of this trend.

iii. Health and education
Indeed, the inevitable effects of sub-standard housing, overcrowding and a lack of modern amenities on Ngāi Tamarāwaho, was poor health, and that went hand in hand with poor educational outcomes for the hapū. For this reason, the impact of colonisation on the health and education of Ngāi Tamarāwaho is addressed together. Theorists examining ethnic identity find the more positively an ethnic group is
perceived by society, the more positively members of that ethnic group will view their identity, and the more they will value their membership of that group (Blash & Unger, 1995; Lee, 1997; Phinney, 1993). Conversely, if a group is stigmatised, members are prone to developing negative identity associations (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). This often leads to disassociation with that particular ethnic group. Due to the harsh realities of trying to survive in the emerging cash economy, Ngāi Tamarāwaho decided that part of their future survival was dependent on acquiring increased access to Pākehā knowledge (Woller, 2011). This belief was evident in indigenous groups globally, and Kirmayer and Valaskakis (2009) state: ‘That is the essence of life in the colony: assimilate and be like us or suffer the consequences’ (p. xi). In 1883, a school was opened at Huria and, according to Woller (2011), hapū members requested a Pākehā teacher so that their children could learn to read and write in English. In a memo to the Department of Education, a local government official described the school established by the hapū:

A daily school has been started [at Huria] and when I visited it yesterday 20 children were present. [They have] given up a good-sized room in a wooden house temporarily for the use of the school. I have requested the Natives form a committee, and have given them a Māori copy of the Code (16 August, 1883, BAAA 1001/345b).

In a letter to the Department of Education, the teacher at Huria noted that the hapū had its own way of electing a committee and the hapū was keen to maintain their traditional leadership structures (Woller, 2011). However, the school at Huria was quickly and continuously plagued by poor attendance, mostly due to ill health. In 1891, Ngāi Tamarāwaho requested that two small blocks of land of approximately three acres each be returned to them so they could cultivate food for the children attending school in the hope of improving their health (Riseborough, 1999). The request was denied.

The effects of the alienation of ancestral lands continued to impact on Ngāi Tamarāwaho. An ongoing trend of out-migration and poor health affected the ability of the hapū children to attend school, and in August 1893, Inspector of Native Schools, James Pope, recommended that the school be temporarily closed:
At the beginning of May, 18 of the pupils left school to help their parents work in the maize fields at Te Puke. In June, measles came; the disease was very fatal, five deaths of infants resulting. By 24th July three-fourths of the school had left the settlement along with their parents, and by the 9th of August the settlement was almost entirely forsaken. On 14th August there was not a single pupil in attendance. The rain, the measles epidemic, and the need for going far away to get food have been temporarily fatal to the school, which should now be closed (26 August, 1893, BAAA 1001/255a).

What is evident from this extract is that the loss of their economic base and the search for work away from their homes resulted in Ngāi Tamarāwaho children assisting their parents in generating an income rather than attending school. Moreover, poor living conditions and disease further inhibited the ability of the children to attend school. Trends such as out-migration, poor health, inadequate housing, and insufficient food were also noted in indigenous groups globally, and were a direct result of colonisation, in particular land loss. The school at Huria was re-opened in 1894, and the teacher noted that the children were:

Most wretchedly clad. Their poor rags do not serve for purposes of decency, much less for warmth. It goes to one’s heart to see the children shivering on cold mornings, and to hear them crying ‘too cold, too cold’. I have to allow them to warm their chilled bodies at the school fire before they can do any work…. The poverty of the Huria Natives is exceptional (Rose, 1997, p. 37).

This extract illustrates the extreme poverty of the hapū following the loss of their economic base, and the difficulty the children faced in pursuing an education when their health was so poor. Another request in 1894 for land on which to grow food was denied to the hapū (Riseborough, 1999). In 1895, the teacher at Huria reported that all but three of the school children had been ill with influenza and typhoid fever, and over the following months, there were 14 deaths at Huria, six of them school children. Again, Ngāi Tamarāwaho requested land and again the request was denied.

The ongoing problems of disease and poor health continued to impact on the ability of the children to attend school and Pope no longer supported the school remaining open.
It seems that the time to close this school has... come. The Natives are thoroughly apathetic and have little intent in the education of their children... thus there is really no prospect of even partial success here and I think the school should be closed (16 May, 1899, BAAA 1001/255a).

The school was permanently closed at the end of June 1900. A request to the Secretary of Education from the hapū to have the school re-opened was declined and, in response to further requests for the school to be re-opened, Pope stated that ‘few Māori schools have given us more trouble and less satisfaction’ (14 April, 1901, BAAA 1001/255a). Ngāi Tamarāwaho made numerous proposals to the Department of Education that a member of their own hapū be appointed as teacher but they were told that the Department ‘could not see its way to accede to their request’ (9 April, 1901, BAAA 1001/255a). The issue was closed in November 1901 when tenders were made ‘for the removal of the Native School from Judea, near Tauranga and its re-erection... on Motiti Island’ (Bay of Plenty Times, n.d.). Woller (2011) speculates that the Department of Education was frustrated by the hapū’s resistance to assimilation by maintaining their language and traditions. He cites official reports that noted ‘the Natives [of Huria] are of a low type, very Māori’ (13 August, 1891, BAAA 1001/255a). He surmises that Department officials viewed Ngāi Tamarāwaho as less civilised than other Māori communities and believes this stigma was retained by officials towards the hapū well into the 1940s when similar comments were recorded about the low educational achievements of hapū children. Assuming his deductions are correct, the stigma the Department of Education had towards Ngāi Tamarāwaho may have had a negative impact on the identity of the hapū. Indeed, some hapū members believed they would achieve improved socio-economic outcomes if they distanced themselves from the hapū. Kiwa (personal communication, August 16, 2015) states: ‘My wife... didn’t think I had good career prospects [at home] so we moved to Invercargill where I got a job.’ Kiwa and his wife still reside out of Tauranga nearly fifty years after their departure.

Following the closure of the Huria Native School, the hapū was forced to send their children to alternative schools, mostly to Te Wairoa School, Otumoetai School, or Tauranga District School, with Otumoetai School being the preferred option due to its
close proximity to Huria (Woller, 2011). Ngatoko (1998, as cited in Woller, 2011) describes his experience at Otumoetai School in the 1930s:

Although we got on well with most of our [Pākehā] schoolmates, we were always aware of the differences between us, that feeling of superiority from them, there was always a prejudice.... We slowly got used to their ways, learnt to adjust, it was a case of having to.... [The teachers] taught us all about the British Empire.... It was colonial education and it was drummed in (p. 10).

Thiong’o (1986) argues that for colonisation to be effective, the indigenous culture, including knowledge, must be undermined. Replacing traditional hapū knowledge and histories with that of the Pākehā settlers further enhanced the colonisation of Ngāi Tamarāwaho.

Thiong’o (1986) also argues that language suppression is a necessary step in the colonisation process and that, concomitant with the suppression of culture, is banning the use of indigenous languages. This leads to the re-moulding of the colonised in the image of the coloniser. Along with having to adapt to a new environment, hapū children were also faced with the exclusive use of the English language within the classroom setting. Ngatoko (1998, as cited in Woller, 2011) remembers:

We were not to speak Māori at school. If we were caught we had to stand in front of the class and get the strap. Some of the [Pākehā] kids would tell on us if we spoke Māori; we would be singled out and punished (p. 11).

Atawhai (personal communication, August 21, 2015) discusses the suppression of the native language of Ngāi Tamarāwaho:

Our grandparents were not able to speak their own tongue... and what that did was form a lost generation [and] disrupt the intergenerational transfer of knowledge. Now those people have to learn their own language when they are in their ‘60s.

Poor health continued to plague Ngāi Tamarāwaho. In 1938, Pākehā parents of children at Otumoetai School requested a separate school for hapū children because ‘so many native children... frequently arrive wet and suffer constantly from colds’ (7 April, 1938, Otumoetai School Committee Book 1927-1940). The parents also cited malnutrition, lice and tuberculosis (Wainwright & Feint, 2000). Roimata (personal
communication, August 7, 2015) recalls: ‘Having started at Otumoetai, we were transferred to the native school at Bethlehem; I wasn’t sure why at the time.’ The health of the adult population of Ngāi Tamarāwaho was no better than the children’s. Venereal disease was a problem at Huria in the 1930s, and the treatment at the time required regular treatment by a doctor. A local doctor recalled ‘a very large proportion of the Māori population had the disease, but... [I] undertook very little treatment, as the fee charged for the first visit usually brought the visits to a conclusion’ (Nightingale, 1996, p. 27). Typhoid remained a problem at Huria until the middle of the 20th century due to the lack of clean water, and access to Tauranga hospital was problematic due to the Health Board’s reluctance to treat citizens who did not pay rates (Wainwright & Feint, 2000). Alfred (2009) cites ill health as a common trend among indigenous peoples, and this trend was evident in Ngāi Tamarāwaho.

4.4 The Impact of Colonisation on Ngāi Tamarāwaho Identity

Theorists who research the effects of colonisation on the identity of indigenous peoples find that disconnection from ancestral lands, the suppression of language and culture, and the fragmentation of traditional kin groups, have an overwhelming effect on the identities of these groups. Analysis of the colonisation experience of Ngāi Tamarāwaho reveals that the confiscation of their tribal estates led to a breakdown in the traditional structure of the hapū, which affected the ability of members of the hapū to practise traditional cultural customs and speak their language. Wainwright and Feint (2000) argue that groups who lose their land to an alien culture risk losing their identity, and they attribute the change in the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho directly to colonisation and, more specifically, to the alienation of tribal lands. The Tauranga District Lands Act 1867 effectively legislated the hapū out of existence, and for decades Ngāi Tamarāwaho were mistakenly referred to as descending from Mataatua waka and belonging to the iwi of Ngāi Te Rangi (Wainwright & Feint, 2000). For some hapū members, this still occurs today, and Ana (personal communication, August 9, 2015) comments, ‘It’s so wrong.... We are not Mataatua [or Ngāi Te Rangī] and it belittles our kids’.
In the traditional era, the interactions of the hapū with out-groups influenced the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, particularly when group comparisons and positive group evaluations occurred. In the colonisation era, the in-group/out-group dynamic affected hapū identity. The denial of the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho as a hapū in their own right, that descends from Tākitimu waka and belongs to the iwi of Ngāti Ranginui, had long-lasting effects on intertribal relations in Tauranga (Wainwright & Feint, 2000). The historical suspicion and mistrust of their neighbouring iwi continued into the contemporary era, perpetuated by the Crown’s failure to recognise Ngāti Ranginui and the constituent hapū, including Ngāi Tamarāwaho. Trask (1999) comments on the effects of legal definitions of identity on indigenous peoples, which serve to further disconnect indigenous communities from their lands, culture and language, and kin groups. Imposed systems of identification had a significant effect on Ngāi Tamarāwaho, who had to fight for well over a century to have their identity recognised.

The hapū sent countless petitions to Parliament demanding justice be served for the confiscation of tribal lands and the associated economic, social and cultural effects (Riseborough, 1999). Their first petition was lodged in 1866 requesting the return of their ancestral land, and each subsequent petition reiterated this request. To provide some idea of their industry, Ngāi Tamarāwaho petitioned the Crown in 1866, 1877, 1884, 1907, 1911, 1920, 1922, 1923, 1927, 1937, seven petitions in 1944, several in 1945, 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950 and 1958 (Wainwright & Feint, 2000). The constant petitioning was a strain on their already limited resources. In order to raise funds, hapū members laboured for local farmers, pulling gorse, digging drains and picking maize, and they donated half of their meagre earnings to whoever was going to Wellington to present their petitions to parliament (Riseborough, 1999).

The notable increase in the number of petitions Ngāi Tamarāwaho filed in the 1920s was driven predominantly by hapū leader George Hall, and supported by the wider hapū. Hall wrote that unless the historical injustices were righted Ngāi Tamarāwaho would ‘remain slaves to their Pākehā brethren for all time’ (as cited in Riseborough, 1999, p. 110). He signed the petitions ‘on behalf of a people who have been reduced
to poverty and whose progress has been retarded by the erroneous confiscation of tribal lands’ (p. 116). Responses from Native Ministers and other government officials constantly addressed Ngāi Tamarāwaho as a ‘subtribe of Ngaiterangi [and that] practically the whole of the confiscated land belonged to the Ngaiterangi Tribe’ (AJHR, 1928, p. 18). Ngāi Tamarāwaho persisted in asserting their identity as a hapū in their own right belonging to the iwi of Ngāti Ranginui, with Hall petitioning for the right ‘to be heard… as distinct from, and not under the domination of Ngaiterangi’ (as cited in Riseborough, 1999, p. 113). As the Second World War drew to a close, under the leadership of Te Hare Piahana, the hapū again increased the number of petitions they filed, with seven being lodged in 1944 alone (Wainwright & Feint, 2000). However, the Native Affairs Department thwarted their quest for justice by adding a new complexity for the hapū to address when a letter from Prime Minister Walter Nash in response to Piahana’s request for him to ‘look into the question of the 1944 petitions’ (Riseborough, 1999, p. 119) proclaimed:

The real fact of the matter is that it is much to be doubted whether at the time of the confiscations Ngāti-Ranginui had any really separate identity. Ngāti-Ranginui had in previous generations been conquered by Ngaiterangi – and by the 1860's were well intermingled with Ngaiterangi – and the name Ngaiterangi was frequently used to embrace the people of the Tauranga area generally (as cited in Riseborough, 1999, p. 119).

In the same letter, Nash comments ‘[in 1864] the Tauranga Maoris… really agreed… with the Governor as to the total area to be confiscated as a penalty for their rebellion’ (p. 119). Ngāi Tamarāwaho strongly objected to being labelled as rebels, a stigma that stuck with the hapū for generations (Riseborough, 1999, Winiata, 2000). A number of identity theorists observe the negative effects membership of a stigmatised group has on identity (Goffman, 1959; Mills, 1999; Skipper & McCaghy, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1986), particularly if the stigma leads to members disassociating with the group.

Theorists suggest that the way in which others perceive a social or ethnic group has a significant impact on how members of that group perceive their identity and how valued membership of that group is (Goffman, 1959; Mills, 1999; Skipper & McCaghy, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). The industry and determination the hapū demonstrated in having their grievances addressed also meant Ngāi Tamarāwaho gained a
reputation for protest, which remains to this day. Kahu (personal communication, August 7, 2015) comments, ‘Our reputation around town is that we’re different; we have this reactionary, rebellious kind of reputation right across the Moana.’ Others concur, ‘I think Ngāi Tamarāwaho are seen as one of the flag bearers of that cause [the raupatu]…. We’ve always been at the forefront of opposition attempts to keep us down’ (Nikau, personal communication, August 23, 2015). ‘Ngāi Tamarāwaho were the ones who pushed [the raupatu]…. We were the forerunners…. A people of strength’ (Ana, personal communication, August 9, 2015). ‘Tauranga Moana wide, I think [others] see Ngāi Tamarāwaho as outspoken, in your face’ (Atawhai, personal communication, August 21, 2015). Participants believe that the view out-groups have of Ngāi Tamarāwaho impacts the way in which some hapū members associate with the identity of the hapū. However, the impact of stigma and the in-group/out-group dynamic on the individual members of Ngāi Tamarāwaho is varied with some members disassociating with the hapū. Conversely, others choose to strengthen their association with the hapū, and the example of intermarriage between hapū members shows the response to stigma and the in-group/out-group dynamic can be more complex than some theorists suggest.

Lee (1997) observes the relationship between a positive view of an ethnic group in the wider society and positive associations with the identity of that group from its members. Despite the lack of progress in having their grievances heard, the decade of the 1950s marked a turning point for Ngāi Tamarāwaho in their quest to cement their identity as a hapū in their own right in Tauranga. By this time, prominent hapū and Māori leader, Dr Maharaia Winiata, had emerged as an influential figure in Ngāi Tamarāwaho. His education, combined with his traditional Māori upbringing, was invaluable to the hapū. His appointment as a tutor for Māori Adult Education meant he was able to run classes at Huria in 1949 and 1950, and this led to the formation of the Ngāti Ranginui Historical Society, which encouraged people to learn their history and genealogy (Riseborough, 1999). In 1950, with the support of Te Hare Piahana, Winiata established a carving school at Huria and, from this, the Ranginui Academy of Māori Arts and Crafts was formed. Their aim was to build a new whare to replace

---

the existing house, which was named Te Kaponga (Tai, personal communication, August 6, 2015). This was a deliberate and strategic response to the loss of identity; and the plan to rename the wharenui Tamateapokaiwhenua after the captain of the Tākitimu waka was a conscious assertion of their mana whenua and belonging in the Tauranga region. The building of the new whare was captured by Te Ao Hou:

A new era is dawning for the people of Judea Pa. They are trying by their great undertaking to restore their lost prestige…. This wharenui will stand as a symbol of progress and great achievement, a memorial to the immortals of the seven canoes, and an appropriate meeting place for future generations' (Te Ao Hou: The New World, 1955, p. 35).

In 1952, when Winiata left for the University of Edinburgh to complete his PhD studies, the building of the whare continued under the guidance of Piahana, whom Winiata described as: ‘Learned in the genealogies, sub-tribal and tribal history and tradition and poetry of the group far above any one else… [and] defender of the good name of Ngatiranginui against Ngaiterangi’ (Winiata, 1967, p. 317). By 1956, the new whare was complete. It was opened by King Korokī on 5 May of that year and attended by many tribal groups from all over the country (Bay of Plenty Times, 5 May, 1956). These groups took the opportunity to discuss the land confiscations and, from those discussions, they passed what is now referred to as Resolution One, which reads:

On the occasion of the ceremonial opening of the ‘Tamatea-pokai-whenua’ ancestral meeting house… this representative gathering of the tribes contemplate with a deep sense of sorrow and regret the prolonged suffering… on account of the confiscation of 54,000 acres of their valuable tribal lands…. Mover: Pei Te Hurinui, Seconder: Tame Reweti’ (Souvenir Booklet, 1958, p. 37).

Several identity theorists argue that the more positively a social or ethnic group is seen by both its members and outsiders alike, the more positively members will view their identity, and the more they value their membership of that group. Moreover, comparisons of an in-group with out-groups, and positive evaluation of the in-group by its members leads to positive group associations. This, in turn, results in members of the in-group desiring acceptance by other members of that group. In order to gain acceptance, members conform to the roles, norms and behaviours of that group. For Ngāi Tamarāwaho, the resolution that was carried unanimously by those present was a public proclamation of their identity, endorsed by King Korokī and recognised by
the many tribal groups that came to pay their respects to Ngai Tamarāwaho on that
day (P. Winiata, personal communication, 23 March 2013). ‘It took Maharaia Winiata
and his uncle Te Hare Piahana to bring back the identity of the Ngai Tamarāwaho
people by the raising of the [whare]’ (Mason, 2000, p. 3). The opening of the whare
had a profound impact on the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho. Every research
participant who was interviewed by the researcher cites this event as a major turning
point in the evolution of the identity of the hapū. The more hapū members who
positively view the hapū, the more likely those members are to conform to the roles,
norms and behaviours associated with Ngāi Tamarāwaho in order to gain acceptance
from the wider group. This strengthens the hapū, both in numbers and in those
members who have positive identity associations.

A second resolution was passed during the celebrations of the opening of the new
whare at Huria by tribal groups, which called for ‘a competent tribunal [to be
established] to... inquire into... the question of the Confiscation and to grant such
compensation as befits the case’ (Souvenir Booklet, 1958, p. 43). It was not until
October 1975 that such a tribunal, the Waitangi Tribunal, was established by the
government. It was initially charged with hearing contemporary Māori claims of
breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi, making recommendations of redress, and
ensuring that future legislation was consistent with the Treaty. Claims were relatively
rare in its first decade until, in 1985, the government extended the Tribunal’s
jurisdiction to hear claims about breaches of the Treaty since 1840. This resulted in a
huge increase in the number of claims and an expansion of the Tribunal’s activities.
Ngāi Tamarāwaho filed their claim in 1997 under the file number WAI659. The details
of this claim, and the impact of the settlement process, together with other influences
in the contemporary era, are examined in detail in the following chapter of this thesis.

4.5 Summary

This chapter explored the evolution of Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity in the colonisation
era, and detailed the process of colonisation as experienced by Ngāi Tamarāwaho and
the wider Māori society alike. Evidence showed that colonisation resulted in
significant changes to the identity of the hapū. The opening sections revealed that the colonisation experience for Māori was profoundly similar to the experiences of other indigenous groups worldwide, and that the process severed attachment to ancestral lands, fragmented traditional social structures and suppressed the use of native languages and traditional cultural practices (Barcham, 1998; Bishop, 1998; Durie, 1997; Lawson Te-Aho, 1998; McCarthy, 1997). These sections described the socio-historical context in which the relationship between Ngāi Tamarāwaho and the phenomenon of colonisation developed. The major focus of this chapter was the experience of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, and this focus revealed that the hapū possessed a very similar profile to other indigenous groups around the world as a result of colonisation; namely, low educational outcomes, poor health, limited access to land, substandard housing and the lack of an economic base.

Colonisation alienated the hapū from their ancestral lands, which affected their traditional social structures due to the search for work creating migration to external areas (Wainwright & Feint, 2000). Government policies actively banning the use of the Māori language and the practice of traditional customs were consolidated by the increasingly diasporic nature of the population of the hapū. Opportunities to interact with other hapū members, to speak their language and to practise their customs presented less often as migration away from what remained of their tribal estate increased. The culminating effect of the various aspects of colonisation had a significant impact on the identity of the hapū. Before the arrival of Pākehā in New Zealand, the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho was formed in a hapū setting (Woller, 2005). However, largely due to colonisation the identity of the hapū was no longer solely constructed within the hapū community but was, instead, constructed within a multitude of settings with varying social norms and influences. The 1950s was a pivotal time for Ngāi Tamarāwaho, with the strategic building of the whare, Tamateapokaiwhenua (Riseborough, 1999; Wainwright & Feint, 2000). This raised the profile of the hapū and allowed Ngāi Tamarāwaho to assert themselves as a hapū in their own right with their own identity. The significance of the building of the whare to the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho was immense, and forms an important element of the identity of the hapū. This chapter concluded with the establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal in 1975.
The intention of this thesis is to examine how the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho has evolved from the traditional era through the colonisation era to the contemporary era. The content of this chapter, when considered alongside the discussions in Chapter Three about hapū identity in the traditional era, contributes to revealing how the identity of the hapū has evolved from pre-colonial to colonial times. Following the influence of the socio-historical context of the colonisation era, some aspects of the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho changed when compared with hapū identity in the traditional era, while other aspects remained the same. The population of the hapū was no longer concentrated solely within their ancestral lands but had become diasporic in nature. Opportunities to express te reo me nga tikanga were no longer as prevalent, and the English language and cultural practices had become more common in the hapū. The loss of most of their ancestral lands changed the day-to-day interactions of hapū members, as extended families were fragmented into smaller nuclear units. However, some aspects remained the same, and Ngāi Tamarāwaho continued to maintain that they are a hapū in their own right with the same whakapapa connections as those evident in the traditional era. The determination of the hapū in ensuring they fought to have their mana whenua recognised illustrates that this concept remained important to Ngāi Tamarāwaho, albeit their ability to exercise their mana whenua was limited. The following chapter advances the analysis of the evolution of hapū identity by examining the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho in the contemporary era.
CHAPTER FIVE: THE CONTEMPORARY ERA

In Chapter Four, the evolution of Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity was explored in the colonisation era. Attention was given to the changes brought about by the social process of colonisation to traditional influences of hapū identity, namely, mana whenua, whakapapa and te reo me ngā tikanga. Aspects of the same theoretical constructs applied in Chapter Three, specifically, role theory, social identity theory and situated identity theory were applied in Chapter Four, and the evidence showed that the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho changed in response to the socio-historical context of the colonisation era, and, more specifically, to the process of colonisation. This chapter advances that line of analysis by applying the same theoretical perspectives to hapū identity in the contemporary era. The theoretical perspectives applied in this chapter include elements of role theory, in particular, the branch that examines the expectations members of a group hold for their own behaviour and for the behaviour of others; and elements of social identity theory, specifically the in-group/out-group dynamic, and the notion of ‘dis-identifying’ with a group that is negatively viewed by society. Furthermore, the aspects of situated identity theory that are concerned with the impact of social acceptance and stigma on identity are applied in this chapter, and consideration is also given to the process of enculturation that is associated with ethnic identity.

This chapter is divided into three main sections. The first section examines the attempts by Ngāi Tamarāwaho to reconnect to their ancestral lands, and the role of the Treaty of Waitangi settlement process in re-establishing this connection. Smith (2006) contends that the Treaty settlement process is ‘one of the most transforming and reforming processes’ (p. 106) that tribal groups are currently engaged in. Therefore, there is a relatively significant focus on the process in this chapter. The second section discusses the changes in the structure of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, which are primarily brought about by the settlement process, and also addresses the impact of the urban/tribal dynamic on hapū identity. The final section explores hapū attempts to revive te reo me ngā tikanga. Examples from the wider Māori society are woven in with the specific experiences of Ngāi Tamarāwaho. It is intended that these examples
provide some insight into the dynamics in the wider society that influence the identity of the hapū, while also lending weight to the notion that socio-historical context influences identity. There are also a number of parallels made with the evolution of indigenous identity in the contemporary era. It is intended that this chapter, when considered together with Chapters Three and Four, will reveal how the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho has evolved from the traditional era to the contemporary era.

5.1 Contemporary Expressions of Mana Whenua

The Role of the Treaty Settlement Process

Researchers examining the influence of place on identity find that place is where the physical environment allows people to create and maintain expressions of identity (Butcher, 2012; Easthope, 2009; Scannell & Gifford, 2009). A number of theorists cite connection to tribal lands and places as being pivotal to Māori identity (McCormack, 2011; Mikaere, 2011; Moeke-Pickering, 1996; Panelli et al, 2008; Pere, 1988; Ward, 1999), but this connection was thwarted by colonial policies that alienated tribal groups from their lands during the colonisation era (Houkamau, 2006; Jackson, 1993; McKay, 2012; Orange, 2004; Petrie, 2013). Such observations are pertinent to explaining the ongoing demands made by Ngāi Tamarāwaho for recognition of their mana whenua, which is a primary influence on identity. Political efforts in the wider Māori community, particularly in the 1970s, placed the New Zealand government under increasing pressure to address the demands made by tribal groups (Hamer, 2004; Houkamau, 2006; Ward, 1999; Wheen & Hayward, 2012) and, in response to their efforts, the Waitangi Tribunal was established in 1975. Internationally, a similar trend was occurring in relation to indigenous groups, where their demands for recognition of their historical associations with ancestral lands were gaining wider acceptance by non-indigenous peoples, and the practice of nation states providing restitution to victims of historical injustices was becoming more prevalent (Barkan, 2001; Verdeja, 2003). Ngāi Tamarāwaho filed their claim, WAI 659\(^8\), with the Tribunal in 1997. Issues emphasised in the claim were the CMS purchase of Ngāi Tamarāwaho

\(^8\) WAI659 incorporated the previous claims, WAI42 and WAI86 that were filed in the 1980s (Waitangi Tribunal Register of Claims, 2000).
land, the New Zealand Wars, the relationship between Ngāti Ranginui and Ngāi Te Rangi, the return and subsequent alienation of tribal land following the confiscations in the 1860s, the economic and cultural loss experienced by the hapū, and the alleged failure of the Crown to provide adequate redress for twentieth-century claims. These issues, and the impact they had on the identity of the hapū, were addressed in detail in Chapter Four.

However, it must be acknowledged that the hapū, under the umbrella of Ngāti Ranginui, was awarded redress in 1981 as part of a pan-tribal claim with neighbouring iwi, Ngāi Te Rangi and Ngāti Pukenga, relating to the confiscation of Tauranga lands (Stokes, 1990). This settlement was formalised by the passing of the Tauranga Moana Māori Trust Board Act 1981 that provided for the establishment of a board to administer redress to the value of $250,000. Section 6(4) of the Act stated this sum was to be ‘accepted in full and final settlement of all claims of whatever nature arising from or out of any confiscation or acquisition by the Crown of any of the land described in the Schedule to this Act’ (as cited in Waitangi Tribunal, 2004, p. 5). However, rampant inflation quickly eroded the value of the redress (Stokes, 1990) and so the three iwi in Tauranga took the opportunity to lodge their respective claims with the Waitangi Tribunal. In 1987, Ngāi Tamarāwaho decided to withdraw from the board primarily to demonstrate their opposition to the 1981 Act. Tai (personal communication, August 6, 2015) explains that following a dispute over the proposed redevelopment of the Tauranga Town Hall, the hapū sought an injunction from the High Court to halt the proposal on the basis that the land was included in their Waitangi Tribunal claim. However, Justice Noel Anderson stated that the Tauranga Moana Māori Trust Board Act could legally prevent the hapū pursuing a claim to the town hall site. Therefore, according to Tai, Ngāi Tamarāwaho immediately decided to withdraw from the board in protest both at the restrictions the 1981 Act had placed on the hapu’s right to pursue their claims and at the meagre sum granted in the settlement. Although other hapū shared similar views on the inadequacy of the 1981 settlement, they continued to be represented on the Trust Board (Waitangi Tribunal, 2004).
Lee (1997) argues that viewing your kin group favourably results in value being placed on membership of that group. Furthermore, when comparisons are made with out-groups, and a more positive evaluation of the in-group occurs (in-group favouritism), the members of that group are more likely to have positive identity associations (Liu et al, 1999; Tajfel, 1981). Therefore, it is necessary to mention the Tauranga Moana Māori Trust Board and, specifically, the withdrawal of Ngāi Tamarāwaho from the arrangement, because this action is pertinent to the reputation the hapū has in the wider Tauranga community. Ana (personal communication, August 9, 2015) comments that the actions of the hapū regarding the Trust Board were ‘a display of leadership and protest that Ngāi Tamarāwaho are known for’, and every participant in this research believes that those traits are part of the identity of the hapū. Comments from the participants include: ‘We are known for protest; we are quite different to others in Tauranga... I go back to the Trust Board, and you saw our strength then, as well as before and after...’ (Tai, personal communication, August 7, 2015) and, ‘Other hapū say Ngāi Tamarāwaho are doing this, we’ll follow them... we’ve always been at the forefront of opposition attempts to keep us down... the Tauranga Trust Board is an example’ (Nikau, personal communication, August 23, 2015). While the participants believe the majority of the hapū are proud of their reputation for protest, Kahu notes that, ‘Before the protests nobody knew who Ngāi Tamarāwaho was... and some think I put the hapū to shame. But now people know when you talk about Huria, you are talking about Ngāi Tamarāwaho. Everyone knows who we are’ (personal communication, August 7, 2015). The pride the participants believe the hapū has in their ability to demonstrate leadership and to protest has largely resulted in the members of the hapū favourably viewing their kin group, which, in turn, means its members place value on belonging to the group. Furthermore, when hapū members compare Ngāi Tamarāwaho with other hapū in Tauranga, the value they place on belonging to Ngāi Tamarāwaho is consolidated by a more positive evaluation of their own kin group in comparison to others. It has been acknowledged that this encourages positive identity associations.

Some commentators observe a growing international trend of indigenous peoples who suffered historical injustices seeking restitution from nation states (Alfred, 2009; Barkan, 2001; Langton & Palmer, 2003; Verdeja, 2003), and the implications of
negotiating redress within a Western framework in relation to the identity of these groups (Altman, 2010; Brodeur, 1985; Trask, 1999). This same trend occurred in New Zealand. Following their withdrawal from the Trust Board, Ngāi Tamarāwaho focused their attention on progressing their claim with the Waitangi Tribunal in an attempt to have their connection with their ancestral lands recognised, and to seek redress for the confiscation of those lands. Hearings with the Waitangi Tribunal commenced in February 2000 (Waitangi Tribunal, 2004). The procedure for lodging and settling a claim under the Treaty of Waitangi Act is lengthy. Smith (2003) argues that the settlement process employed, as a tool of colonisation, the process of ‘preoccupation’, which he terms the ‘politics of distraction’. During the settlement process, rather than focusing on influences that strengthen group identity, tribal groups are often ‘responding, engaging, accounting, following and explaining’ (p. 2), and this ‘leaves little time to complain, question, or rebel.’ Smith argues this is a ‘typical strategy often used over indigenous people’ (p. 3). The result of this strategy for Ngāi Tamarāwaho is that the identity of some members of the hapū became ‘tangled up in a grievance space because their attention was given to the settlement rather than things such as te reo and tikanga’ (P. Winiata, personal communication, 23 March 2013), which numerous analysts suggest are critical to identity (Durie, 1995; Houkamau & Sibley, 2010; Karetu, 1993; Pere, 1988; Ward, 1999). Therefore, it can be argued that if Ngāi Tamarāwaho was ‘responding, engaging, accounting, following and explaining,’ rather than focusing on influences that are pivotal to their group identity, their identity would alter as a result.

A number of analysts argue that connection to ancestral lands is pivotal to tribal identity (McCormack, 2011; Mikaere, 2011; Moeke-Pickering, 1996; Panelli et al, 2008; Pere, 1988; Walker, 1989; Ward, 1999); therefore, by reaching a settlement with the Crown, Ngāi Tamarāwaho mana whenua is formally recognised. Roimata (personal communication, August 7, 2015) comments: ‘When I think of how our ancestors felt after the confiscation, compared to now [post-settlement], I feel fantastic! I feel fantastic! People know who we are.’ Roimata’s comment highlights the salience

9 For an outline of the process see http://www.justice.govt.nz/tribunals/waitangi-tribunal/the-claims-process/the-claims-process (retrieved 15 October, 2015). It must be noted that at any stage during this process, the claimants may seek to negotiate directly with the Crown via the Office of Treaty Settlements (OTS). Ngāi Tamarāwaho chose to settle their claim through the Waitangi Tribunal.
of connection to tribal lands to a positive association with an identity. Additionally, O’Regan (1997) contends that by participating in the process, claimants are hoping to ‘shift their focus away from grievances towards growth and development’ (p. 22). The redress Ngāi Tamarāwaho received as recognition of their mana whenua provides the hapū with access to an economic base, which McKay (2012) argues is ‘critical to Māori development’ (p. 2). Iorns (2008) concurs and contends that the provision of capital and resources is necessary to ‘equalise the economic and social conditions between Māori and non-Māori’ (p. 540). Furthermore, Butcher (2012) argues that a sense of autonomy is pivotal to positive identity associations. Access to an economic base creates an ability to provide for the group, thus contributing to a sense of autonomy for Ngāi Tamarāwaho. In a discussion on what the settlement means to the hapū, Tane (personal communication, August 21, 2015) comments: ‘The settlement gives us many opportunities that we didn’t have before…. Before we had to fundraise.’ Ana (personal communication, August 9, 2015) supports Tane’s comment, and adds: ‘We no longer have to be a hand-out hapū…. The settlement empowers us, and we don’t have to be reliant.’ In addition, some theorists argue that the ability to provide for the group results in mana being bestowed on the group, in particular, on its leaders (Petrie, 2013; Trask, 1999; Winiata, 1967). Economic power also leads to political power (Royal, 2007), which Trask (1999) argues is pivotal to the decolonisation of indigenous groups, including Ngāi Tamarāwaho. Nikau (personal communication, August 23, 2015) discusses the political power that Ngāi Tamarāwaho has as a result of the settlement, and observes:

*The settlement process has given us clout in terms of dealing with Councils. You have an Act to back up the demands to engage and to take into account what we as a hapū want to see happening in our city. It has recognised our mana whenua… and increased our confidence in engaging in the system.*

Therefore, based on such revelations, it can be argued that engaging in the settlement process has had a largely positive effect on the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho.

Some identity theorists contend that the more positively an ethnic group is viewed by society, the more positively its members will value their membership of that group.

---

10 The Act relating to the Ngāi Tamarāwaho settlement will be implemented following the passage of the legislation, the process of which has yet to be completed.
West (2012) observes that Māori and Pākehā, both as social identities and as ethnic groups, are often contrasted one against the other. Such observations are pertinent to the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho. The Treaty settlements require a certain level of public support, and should that support fall below a desirable level, there is a risk that the process will be abandoned (Rumble, 1999; Ward, 1999). Ward adds that the Treaty settlement process must not ‘cause new resentments between Māori and Pākehā’ (p. 33), and that Pākehā ‘can quickly become antagonistic to the whole process’ (p. 51). Meredith (1998) argues that Māori and Pākehā are regularly placed in ‘us’ and ‘them’ categories and this can have a negative impact on group identity if ‘them’ is viewed more positively than ‘us’. Moreover, it results in conflict for those who are of mixed heritage (Dahl & Jensen, 2002), and the majority, if not all, Māori in the contemporary era have mixed heritage (Durie, 1997). It is necessary to examine the impact of these revelations on contemporary hapū identity, especially when considered alongside the need to evaluate membership of a group in a positive light. Brown (2000) observes that members of ‘low-status groups’ may exhibit ‘identity-protecting’ responses to negative perceptions, which includes ‘dis-identifying’ with that group. If Ngāi Tamarāwaho is seen to be unreasonable, this could lead to a negative perception in society, which may result in negative identity associations, and members of the hapū ‘dis-identifying’ with the group. However, Ngāi Tamarāwaho persevered with the claim, despite a prevalent school of thought in Tauranga regarding the settlements that is reflected in comments like:

What a waste of taxpayers’ money. Let’s move on into the future, live and let live. It is just pulling the country down and back by still trying to live in the past. We should be living as one people after nearly two hundred years, instead of going over and over old, and in many cases, perceived grievances (SunLive, 21 June 2012).

Many of the participants are aware of this school of thought in the wider Tauranga community. In response to such sentiments, Tane (personal communication, August 21, 2015) states: ‘We are not here to be liked by everybody. We are here to get the job done.’ Ana (personal communication, August 9, 2015) adds: ‘There’s a stigma out there but it’s whether or not you allow it to define you.’ While the settlement provided Ngāi Tamarāwaho with access to an economic base, which contributes to the restoration
of the autonomy of the hapū, the negative views that exist about the settlement process in the wider society may lead to some members of Ngāi Tamarāwaho ‘dis-identifying’ with their hapū. While this is not the case among the research participants, it has been acknowledged that their views do not represent the views of every hapū member. Therefore, some members may disassociate themselves from the hapū due to antagonism over the Treaty settlements.

Connection to tribal lands supports a positive association with identity (Butcher, 2012; McCormack, 2011; Mikaere, 2011; Moeke-Pickering, 1996; Panelli et al, 2008; Pere, 1988; Ward, 1999). On June 21, 2012, at the sacred battle site of Te Ranga, 148 years to the day after the battle took place, Ngāi Tamarāwaho, as part of Ngā Hapū o Ngāti Ranginui, signed a Deed of Settlement with the Crown, which provided redress in recognition of historical breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi. The settlement package of Ngāi Tamarāwaho totalled $10 million and comprised cash, property, shares in various joint venture companies with other tribal groups in Tauranga, and the promise of the establishment of relationships with key local authorities in the region (Ngā Hapū o Ngāti Ranginui Ratification Information Booklet, 2012). The Crown also apologised for the injustices committed against the hapū. Reflecting on the settlements in general, Mikaere (1997) notes: ‘Māori are expected to settle for an extremely small percentage of the true value of what was taken in breach of the Treaty’ (p. 449), and this applied to Ngāi Tamarāwaho. While the settlement the hapū reached recognised the mana whenua of Ngāi Tamarāwaho over their tribal lands, a very small proportion of the land taken by the Crown was returned to the hapū (Nikau, personal communication, August 23, 2015) and monetary redress was offered in its place. Kiwa (personal communication, August 16, 2015) argues:

_This is not a fair and final settlement. A fair and final settlement is... what both parties consider to be fair and final. But the negotiators settle under duress, and what will happen is you'll get another generation look at it and they'll say 'that is not fair, why did they settle?' but they won't understand what actually happened at the time and why we settled._

Similarly, Ana (personal communication, August 9, 2015) notes: _The settlement is a pittance, it's nothing.... I hope our settlement money doesn't define us.... Raupatu has made us who we are but I don't want the settlement to make us who we are._ However,
Nikau (personal communication, August 23, 2015) has a different view of the settlement package, and states:

_As a hapū, we need to be about future proofing the settlement, and providing a perpetual foundation that allows the hapū to do what we want to do.... That’s what the money was meant for in the first place – improving the lot of our people in all ways._

Some theorists argue that the restoration of tribal mana and autonomy is crucial to positive identity associations (Bourassa & Strong, 2002; Butcher, 2012; Houkamou, 2006). In light of this, it can be concluded that the Treaty settlement process has a largely positive impact on the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho insofar as that the hapū has access to an economic base, albeit less than what some deem to be fair, and that contributes to the restoration of hapū autonomy.

In addition to providing financial and commercial redress, the settlements also provide cultural redress, which can include changing place names to reflect tribal associations with an area, or establishing co-governance arrangements over rivers, lakes, mountains or harbours (Hickey, 2006). Cultural redress also acknowledges spiritual connection to lands and places, which some theorists argue is central to identity (Alfred, 2009; Moreton-Robinson, 2003; Trask, 1999). The Ngāi Tamarāwaho settlement vested sites of cultural and spiritual significance, such as Te Rī o Tamarāwaho, in the hapū. Furthermore, Ngāi Tamarāwaho, under the mantle of Ngāti Ranginui, is part of the Tauranga Moana Iwi Collective (TMIC), which consists of the three main iwi in the region; namely, Ngāti Ranginui, Ngāi Te Rangi and Ngāti Pukenga. Due to a shared connection between the iwi and significant landmarks in Tauranga, such as Mauao and the Moana (Tauranga Harbour and its surrounding water), the iwi united at a pan-tribal level to seek recognition of such historical connections (Ngā Hapū o Ngāti Ranginui Ratification Information Booklet, 2012). This relationship is discussed in more detail later in the chapter. A prominent feature of the TMIC settlement is that following the vesting of the historic title to Mauao in the three iwi, the Tauranga City Council agreed to joint administration of Mauao, thus formally recognising the mana whenua of the collective tribal groups, including Ngāi Tamarāwaho, over this pan-tribal landmark. Additionally, a similar co-governance
arrangement has been made in relation to the management of the Moana, parts of which Roimata (personal communication, August 7, 2015) believes lie at the heart of Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity. It must be acknowledged that external to the Treaty settlement process, the Te Ranga battle site was returned to Ngāi Tamarāwaho in 1995, and the land title is now held in the names of the hapū leaders during the battle, specifically Koikoi and Matatu, to prevent it from ever being alienated (Wainwright & Feint, 2000). Te Ranga is a particularly sacred site to the hapū, and the return of the battle site recognises the spiritual connection the hapū has to the land. Trask (1999) argues that the connection of indigenous peoples to their lands and waters is more than a physical connection, and the cultural redress component of both the hapū and pan-tribal settlements recognises the spiritual connection Ngāi Tamarāwaho and the wider Tauranga tribal groups have to their tribal lands and waterways, as does the return of the Te Ranga battle site to Ngāi Tamarāwaho. Ward (1999) supports Trask’s sentiment by adding that cultural redress contributes to restoring ‘the mana and rangatiratanga’ tribal groups gain from their traditional lands, the restoration of which contributes to positive identity associations (Bourassa & Strong, 2002; Butcher, 2012; Houkamou, 2006). The attempts by Ngāi Tamarāwaho to reconnect to their traditional lands in the contemporary era, primarily via the Treaty settlement process, have been largely successful. Recognition of Ngāi Tamarāwaho mana whenua is important to the hapū, and thus significant efforts were made to have their mana whenua recognised, and to deter its erosion in the future. The mana whenua of the hapū has been officially recognised and, while the lands were not returned to them by way of a vested interest title, the redress they received in lieu of title to their ancestral lands can go some way to restoring tribal autonomy, which a number of theorists contend will contribute to positive identity associations. However, while the work to have their mana whenua recognised has been ongoing for decades, the results of this work have only recently come to fruition. The passage of time is needed to reaffirm the physical connection to their ancestral lands for the next generation.
5.2 Contemporary Expressions of Whakapapa

This section examines the structure of Ngāi Tamarāwaho in the contemporary era. First, the challenges associated with defining contemporary tribal groups for the purpose of settlement are discussed, and, second, the implications this has for Ngāi Tamarāwaho, are addressed. Consideration is also given to the impact of the urban/tribal dynamic on the identity of the hapū, and this section concludes by examining the impact of corporate structures on the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho. It is intended that this section will reveal how the structure of the hapū has changed over time, and the extent to which group affiliation in the contemporary era influences the identity of the hapū.

*State Definitions of Ngāi Tamarāwaho*

In the traditional era, Ngāi Tamarāwaho was an autonomous kin group that played a central role in promoting group identity, language and culture (Woller, 2005). They had numerous interactions with neighbouring hapū that primarily served to strengthen their position and ensure their survival. Such interactions included intermarriage and unity in times of warfare (Winiata, 1967). However, during the colonisation era, the hapū was fragmented to such an extent (Wainwright & Feint, 2000) that its structure and operation is markedly different in contemporary times. The Treaty settlement process has influenced the identity of the hapū both in a positive and negative way, and brought to light existing alliances and new structures. Trask (1999) notes the impact of state definitions on indigenous kin groups globally, and writes, ‘Who we believe ourselves to be is often not what the colonial legal system defines us to be….’ (p. 104). Joseph (2012) supports Trask’s observations, and warns that state definitions of indigenous groups ‘strip them of their identity and consequently of their land and resources’ (p. 153). He adds that through the Treaty settlement process, ‘Māori have had systems of identity, governance and representation imposed upon them’ (p. 154), which affected the traditional structure and identity of these kin groups.

During the settlement of claims, the Crown prefers to negotiate with what the Office of Treaty Settlements (OTS) refers to as ‘large natural groups’ (Office of Treaty
Settlements [OTS], 2002), specifically, an iwi, or a cluster of hapū with a significant population and a large distinctive claim area. Their primary reasons for this are it is cost-efficient, easier to deal with overlapping interests, and allows the Crown to offer a wider range of redress, which the Crown believes results in more needs being met (Joseph, 2012). However, the Crown’s preference to negotiate with iwi rather than hapū fails to acknowledge the role of hapū as autonomous entities in their own right who had legitimate individual grievances that may not be felt by the wider iwi. Ngāi Tamarāwaho had the ‘dubious distinction of being the hardest hit, and the worst affected by the raupatu’ (Wainwright & Feint, 2000, p. 6); therefore, the hapū sought to have their claim settled in a manner that recognises their experiences separate from those of other hapū and the wider iwi. Trask (1999) also notes: ‘We are constantly in struggle with government agencies and, sometimes, with our own people’ (p. 104). In their attempt to assert their own identity, Ngāi Tamarāwaho also encountered difficulties with members of their wider kin group. Tai (personal communication, August 6, 2015) recalls: ‘Our biggest enemy wasn’t the Crown…. The hard part was dealing with ourselves because not everyone in [Ngāti] Ranginui suffered the same. The [confiscation of the] 50,000-acre block landed on our shoulders.’ The hapū did not want their identity to be engulfed by the wider tribal structure.

Ward, however, conversely contends that in order for the settlement process to operate cohesively, definitions of kin groups and claimants had to be made. The Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975 states that ‘any Māori’ could bring a claim to the Tribunal (Joseph, 2012). However, as Ward (1999) points out, historical injustices largely occurred within a group setting where Māori possessed land as members of an iwi or hapū, rather than to individuals on their own. Furthermore, Māori protested the injustices collectively as part of their respective tribal groups or, in some instances, on a pan-Māori basis (Moon, 2015). Ward believes that the provision that ‘any Māori’ could lodge a claim means that any existing tribal authorities and structures could be bypassed and the Crown would be left to address a profusion of unrelated or competing claims that lack a common view. This could also lead to division and further fragmentation in kin groups where there is no requirement to present a united front. In addition to this, Ward argues that hearing Treaty claims at a hapū or even whānau level slows direct negotiation and Tribunal hearings, which, in turn,
slows the transfer of assets to kin groups who remain largely deprived of an economic base. He also notes that central pooling of assets maximises the economic leverage of the tribal groups.

However, Ngāi Tamarāwaho successfully persevered in having their identity as a hapū recognised and their grievances addressed at a hapū level. The Crown acknowledged the vastly different experiences of loss due to Crown breaches of the Treaty among the constituent hapū of Ngāti Ranginui and agreed to a ‘hapū centric’ settlement, which was a first in the settlement process (Ngāti Ranginui Iwi, 2011). However, while Ngāi Tamarāwaho negotiated directly with the Crown via hapū-mandated negotiators (Ngā Hapū o Ngāti Ranginui Ratification Information Booklet, 2012), the Crown required the eight hapū of Ngāti Ranginui to form a collective post settlement governance entity (PSGE) for the return of assets. Te Roopu Whakamana o ngā Hapū o Ngāti Ranginui was mandated in 2008, charged with finalising the Deed of Settlement on behalf of the eight constituent hapū and receiving the settlement assets, which were then passed on to the respective hapū following the establishment of a hapū PSGE. Atawhai (personal communication, August 21, 2015) does not respond well to the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho being submerged in an iwi structure. She comments:

_The settlement has already affected us when we concede four per cent of the 50,000 acres that we lost to other hapū. They didn't lose what we lost, and they got four per cent off the blood of our tupuna. They should get back in their patch and deal with their own affairs…. I question ourselves though. Why didn't we have the things in place?_

Identity theorists analysing role theory, social identity theory and situated identity theory concur that social acceptance is at the core of these respective theories (Davies & Harre, 1990; Ethier & Deaux, 1994; Houkamau, 2006; McCall & Simmons, 1966; Tajfel, 1981; Woodward, 2000). Reflecting on the pressure Ngāi Tamarāwaho felt to agree to the collective PSGE and the complex dynamics that existed between the eight hapū, Tai (personal communication, August 6, 2015) comments:

_If we came into it with a hard nose approach, where everything in the 50,000 acre block is ours, the whole system would break down. I still say today if we were not at that table, nothing would've been done. The settlement had to be a Ngāti Ranginui_
thing in the end even though we pushed to have a hapū-centric settlement…. We had to give away a lot... and that was the hardest part.

He adds that the majority of the other hapū wanted to negotiate collectively and Ngāi Tamarāwaho felt pressure to agree to this. This lends weight to the notion that social acceptance impacts on identity insofar as that, according to Tai, Ngāi Tamarāwaho agreed to a collective PSGE that does not fully recognise their own identity at a hapū level because of pressure to remain accepted by the other hapū during the settlement process.

However, Ward (1999) suggests that negotiating with the Crown is ‘precisely the kind of struggle that overarching iwi structures exist for’ (p. 59). Indeed, in the traditional era, Ngāi Tamarāwaho united with constituent hapū and even other iwi, particularly during times of warfare (Stokes, 1990), and it can be argued the struggle Ngāi Tamarāwaho faced to have their mana whenua recognised by the Crown is a modern-day fight that warrants the joining of constituent Ngāti Ranginui hapū at an iwi level. In the wider society, tribal groups united at a pan-Māori level to increase their political power during the 1970s. Moon (2015) recalls that Ngā Tamatoa, an activist group that opposed racism and advocated for greater Māori rights, largely disregarded tribal politics and established a national framework for protest. The strength gained through numbers meant that the group achieved greater political influence. While some may argue that the Crown’s insistence on Ngāi Tamarāwaho participating in the settlement process at an iwi level is detrimental to the identity of the hapū, it can be argued that uniting at this level is a modern-day demonstration of a traditional aspect of the operation of Ngāi Tamarāwaho and, therefore, does not compromise the identity of the hapū.

Lee (1997) argues that viewing your kin group favourably results in value being placed on membership of that group. In the contemporary era, some may suggest that the Treaty claims process has been influential in the re-emergence of Ngāi Tamarāwaho as a hapū in its own right. The identities of many hapū were engulfed by nineteenth century anthropologists and government administrators who insisted on dealing with Māori at an iwi level (Ballara, 1998; Bourassa & Strong, 2002; Himona, 2013; Rangihau, 1992; Winiata, 1967; Woller, 2005), but the recognition
provided to hapū like Ngāi Tamarāwaho contributes to the revitalisation of the dynamics of society in the traditional era where the hapū was the main kin group. Ngāi Tamarāwaho did not want their identity submerged in an iwi structure, or to have reparations from the Crown retained and managed at an iwi level. Indeed, Ward (1999) notes: ‘The tendency, always present in Māori society, for constituent hapū to reassert their identity….’ (p. 60). In addition to reasserting hapū identity, Royal (2007) observes that hapū research into their own respective oral traditions to support their claims is the source of renewed pride and local strength. Smith (2006) notes that the Treaty settlement process has led to a ‘revival of participation and re-connection’ with members to their respective kin groups, and this lends weight to Lee’s (1997) argument that positive evaluation of a group results in value being placed on membership of that group as well as a positive association with the identity of the group. Research conducted in 2007 shows that the significance of tribal identity in the wider society was becoming increasingly more important, with 75 per cent of Māori agreeing that tribal identity is important to them, compared with fewer than 50 per cent in 2004 (Emery, 2008). Following the conclusion of their Waitangi Tribunal hearings, Ngāi Tamarāwaho began to compile a beneficiary role in order to identify who will benefit from the settlement (Wainwright & Feint, 2000). Moon (2015) contends that self-identification is critical in defining contemporary identity, and it can be argued that the request for hapū members to openly identify (or not) with Ngāi Tamarāwaho influences the identity of the hapū. The Treaty settlement process is the most influential factor determining kinship groups in the contemporary era, and will continue to influence the hapū especially in relation to economic benefits.

*The Corporatisation of Ngāi Tamarāwaho*

Identity theorists analysing influences on both Māori and indigenous identity cite kin groups as pivotal to identity (Barlow, 1991; Maaka, 1994; Moreton-Robinson, 2003; Morris, 1989; Rangihau, 1992; Trask, 1999; Walker, 1996), and it has been acknowledged that state definitions of kin groups compromise these groups and, consequently, alter the influence they have on identity. The Treaty settlement process influences kin groups not only during the negotiating and settling of claims but also in the post-settlement phase. Before the Crown transfers settlement assets to tribal
groups, there is a requirement that these groups establish a ‘suitable governance entity’ (Guide to Treaty of Waitangi Claims, 2002, p. 15) that is ‘acceptable, representative, transparent, and accountable’ (p. 55), and ensures that ‘any assets or resources will be managed and administered within a proper legal structure’ (Crown Proposals, 1994, p. 13). In response to such requirements, Ngāi Tamarāwaho established the Ngāi Tamarāwaho Tribal Authority Trust, which comprises seven members who administer the settlement assets on behalf of the hapū. The members must be from the hapū. Nikau (personal communication, August 23, 2015) comments:

_I don’t think there is any great issue working with a structure that the Crown gave us, or with the entity and how it was structured under the Deed…. It hasn’t changed who we are - it would be sad if that happened - it’s just affecting how we deal with our affairs._

However, Kiwa (personal communication, August 16, 2015) argues that ‘the government has corporatised us’ and adds:

_Under Westminster law, iwi and hapū are not recognised as a structure. For the government to release any money, they require us to create a structure under Westminster law, and we all run along because we want that money. Nobody has stood up and said, ‘Oh you agree that you’ve done wrong? OK, just give us our money’. Why should we create any structure?_

Joseph (2012) argues that the Crown’s pressure on tribal groups to codify into ‘large natural groupings’ and establish tribal and, in some cases, pan-tribal associations in a form that is consistent with Crown notions of organisation, representation and governance, has a significant impact on the identity of tribal groups, where tribal structures are at risk of being replaced by governance entities. Mikaere (1997) suggests that the settlement process, specifically the establishment of Crown-determined governance entities, has an underlying philosophy of assimilation, and Joseph (2012) concurs by arguing that tribal governance entities ‘meet government-driven agendas… to achieve devolution, mainstreaming and other neoliberal agendas’ (p. 161-162). Mikaere (1997) adds that ‘corporatised’ tribal groups are ‘rewarded’, and that ‘this form of neo-assimilation, while less overt than earlier policies, still has a devastating effect on Māori…[who] need to be mindful of excess corporatisation to the detriment of tribal culture and identity’ (p. 451). Atawhai (personal
communication, August 21, 2015) believes the ‘settlement process has put a wedge through the heart of our people’ and argues that the hapū has been partly corporatised. She cites the emergence of factions within the hapū who are there only for themselves as evidence of this, while also noting that many hapū members are there for the good of the hapū. In response to such concerns regarding the corporatisation of the hapū, Kiwa (personal communication, August 16, 2015) advocates for the inclusion of tikanga into the Ngāi Tamarāwaho entity, and comments: ‘Within the entity, there needs to be some creative thinking based on tikanga…. Our tupuna (ancestors) have fantastic knowledge – bring it back!’ A number of theorists comment on the salience of tikanga to identity (Durie, 1997; Marsden & Henare, 1992; Pere, 1988; Rangihau, 1992; West, 2012), and it can be argued that by incorporating tikanga into the operation of the new entity, it will contribute to maintaining the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho. Similarly, Nikau (personal communication, August 23, 2015) proposes:

> It [the entity] needs to be a mix of the old and the new. For me, there are things that need technical minds turned to them that we shouldn’t expect of our kaumatua now. In saying that, it goes back to where the mana of the hapū sits, and for me it sits with the kaumatua…. They uphold our tikanga…. We are struggling with the balance at the moment.

Durie (1998) notes the impact of corporate structures on the identity of tribal groups in Alaska, and Altman (2010) observes the same trend for groups in Australia. Joseph (2012) warns that tribal groups are at risk of being replaced by the governance entities, stating: ‘It is important to remember that the entity and its subsidiaries represent the tribe, they do not replace it…. Identity precedes representation, not the other way round’ (p. 162). Indeed, Nikau (personal communication, August 23, 2015) warns: ‘We mustn’t let the hapū be replaced by the governance entity. We must remember the entity acts on behalf of the hapū, but it isn’t the hapū.’ The Crown’s demand that Ngāi Tamarāwaho establish a Western governance entity has encouraged the hapū to consider their identity, and the influences that ensure it is maintained. Ngāi Tamarāwaho also plays a role in expressing whakapapa independent of government requirements of a corporate structure, with the building of the new whare being one such example, the effects of which continue to influence hapū identity in the contemporary era.
Theorists who analyse role theory explain that occupants of roles within a group hold expectations for their own behaviour and for that of others (Biddle, 1986; Burt, 1982; Davies & Harre, 1990; McCall & Simmons, 1966). Participants in this research acknowledge the change in the operation of the hapū from the traditional era where, ‘There was a small group who made decisions and what they said was what happened’ (Nikau, personal communication, August 23, 2015). Tane (personal communication, August 21, 2015) explains: ‘Modern life has changed the way the hapū operates,’ and Ana (personal communication, August 9, 2015) agrees, and points out: ‘There isn’t as many of us on the dole anymore who can be at the marae all the time to fill the roles. We also don’t stop working at 50 anymore.’ Tane (personal communication, August 21, 2015) observes the impact of modern life on the roles within the hapū, and points out:

Traditionally, our roles were like the whare (meeting house): you have a carving done by a man, then a tukutuku panel done by a woman. Men and women worked together, and you got picked for certain roles often based on whakapapa and who was of the tuakana (senior) line…. Those lines don’t play the same role now…. Someone might be at work so while they have the mana, they’re not here and someone has to do it. We all do the work together.

Therefore, it can be argued that if the roles within the group change, this will affect group behaviour and what is determined to be socially acceptable. For example, if standards of behaviour change, this may lead to stigma being applied to the group, which can affect identity. Some theorists analysing situated identity theory contend that an individual will avoid social disapproval or rejection by denying membership of a stigmatised group (Goffman, 1963; Mills, 1999; Skipper & McCaghy, 1978). Nikau (personal communication, August 23, 2015) comments on the change in roles within the hapū, and observes:

You have the kohanga, the sports club, the Huria Trust, the women’s committee, the settlement entity playing a role, with different people who have their own roles in each of those groups, all with different thoughts about who should be dealing with what…. That’s what causes the greatest challenge for us…. Determining the hapū structure is long overdue.

Similarly, Ana (personal communication, August 9, 2015) notes: ‘People don’t feel connected to everything as a whole…. They are either marae whānau or [sports] club
whānau or don’t feel connected to any of it, despite their blood connection…. I think the hapū identity is very fragmented.’ Atawhai (personal communication, August 21, 2015) observes: ‘The hapū isn’t a collective cohesive machine like when I was a child....’

In response to sentiments such as those expressed by Nikau, Ana and Atawhai, Ngāi Tamarāwaho held a hui ā-hapū (hapū meeting) on August 27, 2015, to determine the structure and operation of the hapū and its various entities moving forward. The following post was displayed on the hapū Facebook page on August 28, 2015:

At the hui-ā-hapū held last night a unanimous resolution was passed by the hapū members present to establish Te Mana O Ngāi Tamarāwaho Inc Society. The new incorporation will provide a central organisation able to fully represent Ngāi Tamarāwaho interests. The need for such an organisation has become obvious in recent times with the hapū being involved in so many different activities across the rohe, which do not fit comfortably within the roles of our current organisations or are activities that those organisations believe they are unable to undertake. The resolution is subject to ratification at a further hui-ā-hapū to be held immediately following the NTTAT [Ngāi Tamarāwaho Tribal Authority Trust] AGM hui on 13 September.

It is hoped that the overarching entity will strengthen the unity of the hapū. Therefore, it can be argued that an awareness of changes in the structure and operation of the hapū has resulted in Ngāi Tamarāwaho exercising their autonomy, albeit within the constraints of a largely Western system, and implementing a structure that works for them in the contemporary era in an attempt to combat fragmentation of the kin group. Trask (1999) contends that, ‘who we are is determined by our connection... to our families’ (p. xi). Therefore, a united kin group is more likely to result in positive associations with the identity of the hapū. Atawhai agrees, and states: ‘We need to work together for the common good, and allow people to come back and share’ (personal communication, August 21, 2015). Nikau adds: ‘We need to move forward together.... I want unity. When push comes to shove, it’s there though’ (personal communication, August 23, 2015).

Identity theorists analysing social identity theory suggest that the interactions a group has with other groups influences their identity (Burke & Reitzes, 1991; Houkamau, 2006; Moloney & Walker, 2007; Tajfel, 1981). In the traditional era, Ngāi Tamarāwaho was united by way of their relationship with external groups (Winiata, 1967) and the same sense of unity is also prevalent in the contemporary
era. The hapū has formed numerous alliances with other tribal groups in Tauranga, often based on shared historical connections to landmarks, which include the Te Papa Joint Venture entity with constituent Ngāti Ranginui hapū and Ngāi Te Rangi, the Otamataha Trust with Ngāti Tapu, and a joint venture with neighbouring hapū Ngāi Te Ahi and Ngāti Ruahine, and neighbouring iwi Tapuika and Ngāti Rangiwewehi for part ownership and shareholding in the Puwhenua forest (Nikau, personal communication, August 23, 2015). However, such contemporary alliances are not limited to those of a commercial nature. Atawhai (personal communication, August 21, 2015) notes that, ‘Ngāi Tamarāwaho has strong comradeship with Hangarau, Wairoa, and Pirirakau, and we have some reciprocal events where we awhi (help) one another.’ Furthermore, during the colonisation era, Ngāi Tamarāwaho formed an alliance with the Kingitanga (King Movement), which is still going strong in the contemporary era, and which every participant cites as paramount to the identity of the hapū. Roimata (personal communication, August 7, 2015) observes:

We are one of three marae to hold the poukai11 of the Kingitanga outside of Tainui... and it has helped people to know who we are. We attend other happenings of Tainui... and people know we are Ngāi Tamarāwaho of Ngāti Ranginui of the waka Tākitimu.

Other comments from participants include: ‘We’re the Kingitanga hapū here in Tauranga’ (Kahu, personal communication, August 7, 2015). ‘It’s a source of pride to have the poukai for our people, and others look upon it in a good way’ (Tai, personal communication, August 6, 2015), ‘Having the poukai has a positive influence on our identity, and Tainui are a huge source of support too’ (Nikau, personal communication, August 23, 2015), and ‘the connection with the King Movement... has strengthened us’ (Atawhai, personal communication, August 21, 2015). Some theorists argue that if a group looks favourably upon themselves, they are more likely to have positive identity associations, which are consolidated when their group is evaluated higher than other groups following group comparison (Cardwell, 2000; Liu et al, 1999; Stets

---

11 The first poukai was held at Whatiwhatihoe in March 1885. It was a way of looking after and feeding people driven from their homeland after the war in Waikato in 1863. Contemporary poukai have become a way for tribal groups to feast together, grieve together for those recently passed away, disseminate news of relevance, bring people’s concerns to the attention of the Kingitanga leadership, and collect financial contributions to the Kingitanga and the host marae (Van Meijl, 2009). Huria has held the poukai annually since 1958.
& Burke, 2000). In considering this, interactions with out-groups and, specifically, the alliance with the Kingitanga, have a positive influence on the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho.

The Urban/Tribal Dynamic

Another contemporary influence on Ngāi Tamarāwaho whakapapa is the urban/tribal dynamic. Dahl and Jensen (2002) find that there are trends whereby the longer indigenous peoples live in an urban environment, the less they tend to identify with their original indigenous group. They also observe trends of urban-based pan-tribal mobilisation among indigenous peoples who have lost their connection with the traditional group, and Kishigami (2002) recognises these emerging, hybrid groups as valid sites of belonging. Like social identity theorists, analysts examining situated identity theory believe an individual seeks approval from others and, therefore, acts in a certain way in order to be socially accepted (Alexander & Lauderdale, 1977; Alexander & Wiley, 1981; Goffman, 1959) and, consequently, adopts a situated identity that will result in social acceptance. Furthermore, because an urban setting is often heavily influenced by non-indigenous cultures, a merging of cultures is occurring (Bhabha, 1994), and it can be argued that, in order to gain social acceptance in these settings, tribal members adopt a fusion of cultural traits that are more likely to elicit social acceptance. This had led to changes in the identities of tribal members who reside in urban settings as they respond to the different social context.

To illustrate the urban-tribal dynamic as it exists in the wider society, this discussion will focus on the Treaty of Waitangi (Fisheries Claim) Settlement Act 1992, commonly referred to as the Sealord deal, in which 20 per cent of the Total Allowable Commercial Catch (TACC) of all Quota Management System (QMS) current and future stocks were transferred to Māori, together with funding to purchase a half share in the Sealord Group (Ministry for Primary Industries, 2015). While the Sealord deal provides for the recognition of Māori customary fishing rights, the Crown’s role in the distribution of the quota led to conflict between Māori kin groups, specifically, urban Māori authorities and traditional tribal groups. The Crown wrote into the Act that it was for the benefit of ‘all Māori’ while, at the same time, stating that quota should be distributed through iwi, entities that Ward (1999) notes are ‘far from being clearly
defined’ (p. 49). The Crown then opted out of the distribution discussions and passed the responsibility for allocation to the Māori Fisheries Commission, a body that Ward observes comprises ‘representatives of iwi that had been defined in the nineteenth century, including many with large coastlines’ (p. 50). Urban Māori groups, which comprise Māori who no longer have a strong connection with their ancestral tribal group, were concerned that they would not be allocated a fair share, if any, of the fisheries quota, and sought a distribution model that recognised them as a modern-day tribal group and legitimate site of belonging (Ward, 1999).

The Waitangi Tribunal’s ‘Te Whānau o Waipareira Report’, which was released in 1998, found that this particular urban authority is ‘iwi-like’ in nature, and the urban groups used this finding in support of their quest for recognition in the distribution of the fisheries quota. However, the High Court found that in the context of the Treaty Of Waitangi (Fisheries Claim) Settlement Act 1992, ‘iwi’ meant ‘traditional iwi’ (Paterson, 1998), despite no evidence that suggests that hapū and iwi were fixed entities traditionally. Furthermore, section 3 of the Māori Fisheries Act 2004 is a ‘legislative prescription of what the ‘tribe’ is to be in a commercial fisheries context and, with limited exceptions, does not allow for any evolution or change of ‘iwi’ group identification’ (Joseph, 2012, p. 159). Joseph concludes that the state defined what a ‘Māori tribe’ is despite this ‘legislative decree’ not necessarily representing the way in which tribal groups want to be identified. Trask (1999) supports such a sentiment, and observes:

If we are tribal, the colonial power defines us so as to minimise the powers of the tribe. If we are not tribal, the colonial power uses our self-definition against us by claiming that we are not indigenous because we are not tribal (p. 104).

Urban Māori groups continue to maintain that they represent new and genuine Māori communities whose members are entitled to a share of the fishing quota but who do not wish to secure their quota rights through membership of a traditional tribal group (Joseph, 2012; Ward, 1999). Conversely, traditional tribal groups tend to question the legitimacy of these new, hybrid groups whose group identity may be different from that of their own (Dahl & Jensen, 2002).
The Sealord deal highlights the tensions that can exist between those who reside in urban centres and those who remain in traditional areas. Analysis of this dynamic is pertinent to identity in the contemporary era because urbanisation has had an impact on the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho and created a diasporic population. A significant proportion of the hapū resides in other urban centres or overseas. Ana (personal communication, August 9, 2015) comments:

Without a doubt urbanisation has affected our hapū identity because of that need to go and source income for your whānau... and it’s hard when they [those who moved away] want to come back and it isn’t as open-armed as they hoped. Some people who stayed at home have a ‘you do as I say’ attitude.

However, she adds: ‘On the other hand, many who moved away still know our tikanga even if they didn’t grow up here. I’m more concerned about the ones who are here and don’t set foot on the marae.’ Atawhai (personal communication, August 21, 2015) supports the centrality of the marae to the identity of the hapū, arguing, ‘I go back to why it [the marae] was erected by Maharaia and Te Hare. It was about revitalising the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho.... We need to allow people to come back and to share.’

The diasporic nature of the hapū population has implications on the identity of the hapū when considered alongside mana whenua and whakapapa. The challenge lies in ensuring those who live away remain connected to the group, while still maintaining connections to traditional lands and kin groups as paramount to identity. It begs the question: ‘Do members have to reside in traditional tribal areas to feel connected to ancestral lands and kin groups?’ while also eliciting a bigger question regarding the contemporary influences on identity. Many analysts argue the role of tribal engagement and connection to ancestral lands are paramount in forming a secure identity (Crofts; Melbourne; O’Regan; Parata, as cited in Barcham, 1998), while others contend that traditional tribal structures could not have functioned unchanged in a modern world and that, in order to achieve cultural continuity and a secure identity, it is essential to recognise the existence of hybrid or multiple sites of belonging to different places and groups (Barcham, 1998; Dahl & Jensen, 2002; Kishigami, 2002; Maaka, 1994). The urban/tribal dynamic highlights the impact of social acceptance on identity, and the act of adopting a situated identity in order to gain acceptance by the wider group.
5.3 Contemporary Expressions of Te Reo me ngā Tikanga

This section examines attempts by Ngāi Tamarāwaho to revitalise te reo me ngā tikanga, which a number of analysts contend is critical to the identity of the hapū (Durie, 1995; Houkamau & Sibley, 2010; Karetu, 1993; Pere, 1988; Ward, 1999). Identity theorists analysing ethnic identity suggest that by learning their native language and cultural practices – a social process known as enculturation – members of a group are more likely to have a positive view of their ethnic identity and, consequently, value their membership of that group (Tucker, 1999; Zimmerman et al., 1992). They are also better able to deflect or overcome negative stereotypes about their ethnic group that may be presented to them in the wider society (Emshoff, Avery, Raduka, Anderson & Calvert, 1996; Lee, 1997). Traditionally, te reo me ngā tikanga was central to the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho but the prevalence of the use of te reo me ngā tikanga diminished following colonisation (Merritt, 1996; Penetito, 2010). Atawhai (personal communication, August 21, 2015) observes: ‘Our grandparents were punished for speaking their own tongue, and now many do not have the reo.’ Joseph (2012) encourages tribal groups to ensure their cultural identity is given attention, arguing that culture is critical in maintaining a group’s distinct identity. Supporting this, a number of commentators argue that te reo Māori is as fundamental to Māori identity as material resources are to economic recovery (Durie, 1995; Houkamau & Sibley, 2010; Karetu, 1993; Pere, 1988; Ward, 1999). Ngāi Tamarāwaho was allocated $500,000 in their Treaty settlement to contribute to ongoing linguistic and cultural revitalisation (Ngā Hapū o Ngāti Ranginui settlement ratification booklet, 2012) and, in response to the decline in the use of te reo Māori, the hapū established various language revitalisation programmes. These include ‘Ka tangi te tītī, ka tangi te kākā’, which was implemented through Huria marae and teaches te reo Māori to members of the hapū. Atawhai (personal communication, August 21, 2015) comments:

*It [ka tangi te tītī, ka tangi te kākā] was started with the sole purpose of our hapū relearning te reo. That was a huge need for us.... It was an awesome feeling to see so many hapū members successfully come out, and 63 per cent are now engaged in higher learning.*
Tane (personal communication, August 21, 2015) is involved in teaching whāikōrero (oratory) to young men who show an interest in learning and he observes that te reo Māori is now far more accessible to the current generations than when he was a young man. He hopes that teaching whāikōrero will help the younger generations learn about the roles of men on the marae and he advocates for ‘a similar programme that teaches young women how to perform a karanga (ceremonial call)’. Tane also observes the revitalisation of hapū place names in local areas, and notes that ‘signage with our names are all over the place, and it has a positive influence on our identity.’

Kiwa (personal communication, August 16, 2015) acknowledges the centrality of te reo Māori to the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, and remarks:

> How can we maintain the survival of our hapū for the next 1000 years? We need to have te reo... and we need to continue to pass it down. We cannot leave it to chance but we must plan it.

The various programmes implemented by the hapū contribute to the survival of te reo Māori and this has a positive influence on identity associations by encouraging hapū members to value their membership of the group.

Alongside te reo Māori, tikanga are also seen as central to hapū identity. Kiwa (personal communication, August 16, 2015) hopes Ngāi Tamarāwaho ensures their tikanga are incorporated into the operation of the hapū, and argues: ‘Our tupuna have fantastic knowledge – bring it back!’ However, some commentators argue that the incorporation of tikanga into Western systems and frameworks undermines tribal customs and practices (Jackson, 1992; Mikaere, 2011; Poananga, 1998). Mikaere (2011) argues that the fusion of tikanga with Western practices has ‘had the effect of reducing tikanga to a near-empty shell’ (p. 268). She points out that in the traditional era, tikanga regulated kin groups and the conduct of their members, but in the contemporary era, tikanga ‘hovers at the margins of mainstream society... accorded significance only insofar as Crown law is prepared to humour us [tribal groups] by incorporating carefully chosen and defined aspects of tikanga into its own legislative framework’ (p. 268). Freire (1993) warns: ‘All domination involves invasion – at times physical and overt, at times camouflaged, with the invader assuming the role of a helping friend’ (p. 153), with the Crown, in this instance, being the ‘helping friend’.
Indeed, Tane (personal communication, August 21, 2015) observes: ‘Our tikanga are compromised…. For us to be doing it the way of the old people is a struggle, and we have to try hard to stay close to the tikanga.’ Monture-Angus (1995) encourages the rejection of Western frameworks that are fused with tikanga, no matter how bicultural they appear. However, the act of rejecting a system that regulates the society of New Zealand as a whole, to which Ngāi Tamarāwaho also belong, and living solely according to tikanga that have been largely carried over from a previous era raises the issue of what is realistic. While Mikaere (2011) notes that, ‘today’s idealism might well be tomorrow’s reality’ (p. 273), the general consensus in the contemporary era is to work towards harmonious relations between Māori and Pākehā rather than operating as separate societies (Ward, 1999). Royal (2007) encourages tribal groups to view opportunities to implement tikanga in the contemporary era as a way to bring their own creative diversity to a particular forum, thus creating a truly bicultural space in which both Treaty partners operate. Furthermore, the suggestion to adhere to tikanga as it was in traditional times does not allow for the evolution of customary practices. Atawhai (personal communication, August 21, 2015) notes: ‘For me, tikanga can change, and it does change, as long as the kawa (marae protocol) doesn’t change. Tikanga, though, sometimes needs to change.’ Kahu (personal communication, August 7, 2015) remarks: ‘The question lies around what is our tikanga.’ In order to find some answers to Kahu’s question and to understand and accept the evolution of cultural practices, Atawhai (personal communication, August 21, 2015) suggests that each generation in Ngāi Tamarāwaho share their recollections of tikanga as it was applied in different times and in various contexts. This way, the hapū can collectively decide on the role of tikanga in the contemporary era and, consequently, the extent to which it influences the identity of the hapū.

A number of theorists contend that social acceptance has a significant impact on identity, and that the more positively a group is viewed by society, the more likely its members are going to value belonging to that group (Ethier & Deaux, 1994; Goffman, 1959; Lee, 1997; Mills, 1999; Stryker, 1968, 1980, 1987; Woodward, 2000). In the wider society, various key milestones have been achieved that have contributed to a reconnection and revival of te reo me ngā tikanga, while, at the same time, raising the
status of Māori as an ethnic group, and increasing the likelihood of members of that ethnic group gaining social acceptance. The establishment of initiatives in the education, health, broadcasting and legal sectors not only reaffirm the value of Māori language and culture among tribal groups, but also allow for Pākehā recognition of the value of Māori cultural distinctiveness (Awatere, 1996; Houkamau, 2006; Metge, 1995; Royal, 2007). These initiatives include the establishment of bilingual and Māori medium education systems where children can learn in an environment that celebrates the use of te reo Māori from kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori through to wharekura and whare wānanga, and an increase in Māori health providers to meet the needs of tribal groups. In the broadcasting sector, New Zealand's first indigenous television channel, Māori Television, went to air in 2004. Smith and Abel (2008) observe that the arrival of Māori Television signalled a new era in New Zealand broadcast culture and argue that the channel’s programmes provide alternative viewing to the monocultural offerings of other channels, thereby encouraging the wider society to consider Māori viewpoints. Finally, in the legal sector, marae justice initiatives, whereby the Youth Court sits at various marae around the country, have seen various tribal groups regain some control of traditional tikanga in relation to dispensing justice. The marae justice initiative has been embraced by Ngāi Tamarāwaho, and Tane (personal communication, August 21, 2015) explains: ‘We are now conducting juvenile court hearings at the marae, where we can implement our tikanga.’

Such initiatives contribute to positive identity associations for members of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, albeit they have been implemented in the wider society, in that they lead to a shift in how Māori language and cultural practices are viewed in the wider society by both Māori and Pākehā alike (Awatere, 1996; Houkamau, 2006). This fosters the value attached to being Māori, which leads to increasingly more Māori, including members of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, showing pride in their identity by embracing their language and culture (Metge, 1995). Nikau (personal communication, August 23, 2015) remarks: ‘The renaissance has given the younger ones more confidence... to advocate for their rights. In the past, you were just seen as a radical but with the renaissance, it’s becoming more normal to be Māori.’ Similarly, Royal (2007) observes that ‘now that I speak the Māori language... and am able to
participate and at times lead initiatives within my iwi, I find myself less anxious and concerned to defend my Māori identity’ (p. 4). Such comments validate the influence of enculturation and the centrality of language to positive identity associations, and also support the notion that socio-historical influences play a part in shaping identity, insofar as that the nationwide revival of the Māori language and culture influenced associations with the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho and that of other tribal groups. Furthermore, increased scholarship in the wider society generated a body of knowledge that suggests current Māori social problems were caused by the influence of socio-historical injustices rather than Māori inadequacies (Liu, Wilson, McClure & Higgins, 1999). As Tajfel and Turner (1986) argue, the more positively an ethnic group is viewed, the more likely the members of that group are going to positively view both their identity and their membership of the group. The increasingly positive view of Māori in wider society contributes to the increase in the number of Māori learning their language and cultural practices, and supports the importance of enculturation to a positive association with an identity. Ana (personal communication, August 9, 2015) reinforces this notion during a discussion on revitalising te reo me ngā tikanga by noting, ‘I needed to know who I was,’ thus lending weight to the salience of te reo me ngā tikanga to identity.

However, while the establishment of such initiatives in recent decades are ongoing and significant (Metge, 1995), the effects of the cultural and linguistic renaissance have not reached every member of Ngāi Tamarāwaho. Statistics New Zealand do not collect data that refer to Ngāi Tamarāwaho specifically, but 2013 census data that pertain to Ngāti Ranginui reveal that only 31.3 per cent of the population of the iwi can hold a conversation in te reo Māori about everyday things (Statistics New Zealand, 2013) Ana (personal communication, August 9, 2015) points out: ‘My whānau has grown up with our tikanga but is it important to them? No. A lot of them couldn’t care less.’ The return of some tribal lands to Ngāi Tamarāwaho contributes to the restoration of tribal autonomy and provides an economic base, but not all members of the hapū hold the Treaty settlement process in a positive light. As Kiwa (personal communication, August 16, 2015) argues, ‘This is not a fair and final settlement.’ Furthermore, while tribal identity and connection to kin groups is generally becoming more important, the 2013 census indicates that approximately
48 per cent of the total population of Ngāti Ranginui live in urban centres away from their traditional tribal lands (Statistics New Zealand, 2013). Again, data were not available to reveal the specific proportion of the population of Ngāi Tamarāwaho who reside out of their traditional tribal area, but the statistics for Ngāti Ranginui provide some insight into the extent that tribal groups in Tauranga have responded to urbanisation. This hapū trend is equivalent to that which exists in the wider society, whereby 84 per cent of Māori live in urban areas. This means second, third and fourth generation Māori have been, and continue to be, born in towns and cities, with many having little or no contact with their tribal group or, indeed, knowledge of which group they belong to (Emery, 2008; Raerino, 2007; Smith, 2006). Members who reside in urban settings may also adopt hybridised cultural practices in order to gain social acceptance. In light of such revelations, is it realistic to think that traditional influences on the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho will remain unchanged in the contemporary era?

Identity analysts examining situated identity theory contend that members of a group disassociate with a group that is prone to stigma in order to avoid being negatively stereotypes by others (Goffman, 1963; Mills, 1999; Skipper & McCaghy, 1978). Smith (2006) discusses the impact of negative stereotypes perpetuated in the wider society on Māori identity, which result in some Māori denying personal recognition of their identity (Durie, 2003; Johnston & Pihama, 1995; Walker, 1990). Dewes (1975 as cited in Houkamau, 2006) states:

If I were to believe what I read and hear about Māori... I would see myself as a glue sniffing, shoplifting, pot-smoking, tattooed street kid whose parents were ripping off the Department of Social Welfare or, alternatively, calling upon Māoridom or the Government to ratify the Treaty of Waitangi. My future would also be mapped out for me. No school qualifications, no prospects, no motivation, no interests (outside of gangs), and no money (p. 53).

Dewes' observation highlights the negative stereotypes that exist about Māori in the wider society, which may result in some Māori disassociating themselves from their ethnic identity in order to avoid being stereotyped according to Dewes’ description. Such stereotypes may also affect members of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, who are also Māori by ethnicity. Some identity theorists argue that social acceptance is at the core of
identity (Ethier & Deaux, 1994; Goffman, 1959; Mills, 1999; Stryker, 1968, 1980, 1987; Woodward, 2000) and an individual is more likely to associate with an identity and value their membership of a group that is viewed favourably by society, in order to avoid social ridicule and rejection. Some participants are aware of the stigma that exists about Ngāi Tamarāwaho outside the hapū, and it has an effect on some participants, which lends weight to the notion that stigma can affect identity. Kahu (personal communication, August 7, 2015) remarks: ‘I try and say I don’t care how other see me but that’s not really true.’ Ana (personal communication, August 9, 2015) comments: ‘I am constantly defending my Tamarāwahotanga in the wider community. Those stigmas are placed on you and I have to say ‘so what? And not worry about the negative stereotypes’. In addition, according to Stryker and Statham (1985), the more people who expect an individual to behave in a certain kind of way, the more likely that individual is to adopt the behaviour associated with those assumptions or stereotypes. In light of this, Ana’s observations about some of the stereotypes that exist about Ngāi Tamarāwaho in wider society do not bode well for positive identity associations. Research by Houkamau (2006), indeed, finds that acute awareness among many Māori of the social stigma attached to their ethnic group like that described by Dewes does not augur well for group identity.

Furthermore, the impact of the colonial idea of measuring identity by blood quantum has resulted in some members of Ngāi Tamarāwaho feeling ‘not Māori enough’, with others feeling their urban or Pākehā upbringing denies them the right to embrace their identity as they wish to. Ana (personal communication, August 9, 2015) comments: ‘If you’re unsure of what’s what [on the marae] it can be a bit daunting.’ Trask (1999) notes a similar trend for Native Hawaiians, and states: ‘If we are of mixed bloodlines, we are often not indigenous enough…’ (p. 104). Moreover, Dahl and Jensen (2002) find that indigenous peoples who live in urban settings are often ‘looked down upon’ by those who live in tribal areas, and are not treated as ‘truly indigenous’. This may be more pronounced for indigenous peoples with mixed heritage, which every member of Ngāi Tamarāwaho has. Such a division does not augur well for a united kin group and this, in turn, may have a negative effect on the identity of the hapū.
5.4 Summary

This chapter examined the evolution of hapū identity in the contemporary era. The findings showed that the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho has continued to evolve in response to the socio-historical context of the contemporary era, particularly to influences associated with the Treaty settlement process. The first section addressed hapū attempts to reconnect to ancestral lands, and the evidence indicated that the Treaty settlement process has been influential in facilitating the connection (Smith, 2006; Ward, 1999). The settlement process has had a largely positive impact on the identity associations of members of Ngāi Tamarāwaho by providing the hapū with access to an economic base, which, in turn, has led to a sense of autonomy that theorists contend contributes to positive identity associations. Furthermore, the spiritual connection of Ngāi Tamarāwaho to their ancestral lands has been recognised during the settlement process, and commentators argue that the spiritual connection of tribal groups to ancestral lands is pivotal to their identity.

The second section examined changes to the structure and operation of the hapū and how these changes have impacted on the identity of the hapū in the contemporary era. State attempts to define Ngāi Tamarāwaho have proven to be challenging for the hapū, who successfully persevered to have their identity as a hapū recognised. The interactions of Ngāi Tamarāwaho with out-groups were examined and, while stigma may have impacted on the identity associations of some members of the hapū, the largely positive evaluation of Ngāi Tamarāwaho by its members following comparison with out-groups has contributed to positive identity associations for those members. However, challenges to the identity of the hapū in this era include the potential for corporatisation of Ngāi Tamarāwaho by way of the PSGE and the diasporic nature of the hapū following the trend of out-migration that occurred in the colonisation era. The scattered population of the hapū has created the potential for tension between those members who reside in urban centres away from traditional lands and those members who remain in traditional tribal areas. These challenges require careful and considered navigation as the hapū plans for its future.
The final section discussed the revitalisation of Ngāi Tamarāwaho language and cultural practices. Programmes run by Ngāi Tamarāwaho, predominantly at the hapū marae, have contributed to positive identity associations for members of the hapū, and support the notion that enculturation plays a pivotal role in ensuring members of a group positively identify with that group (Tucker, 1999; Zimmerman et al., 1992). This chapter also focused on the socio-historical context of the contemporary era in the wider society. The impact of both the achievement of key milestones and the challenges that remain in the wider society for Māori groups on the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, illustrate the importance of considering the socio-historical context and its impact on identity.

The research question central to this thesis is, 'How has the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho evolved from pre-colonial to post-colonial times?' This chapter contributed to answering the research question by analysing the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho in the contemporary era. Following the influence of the socio-historical context of the contemporary era, aspects of the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho changed, while other aspects remained the same. A migratory trend away from ancestral lands has resulted in multiple sites of belonging for some hapū members, and this trend limits the opportunities to express te reo me ngā tikanga within the traditional hapū setting, which has affected the level that this concept influences the identity of the hapū. The impact of the Treaty settlement process highlights the ongoing centrality of whakapapa to the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho while at the same time the structures brought about by the settlement process must be viewed as a consolidation of the activities associated with the process rather than as a structure that expresses whakapapa. The recognition of Ngāi Tamarāwaho mana whenua illustrates that the hapū remained resilient in ensuring their ability to express their mana whenua be restored. When considered with Chapters Three and Four, the evolution of hapū identity from the traditional era to the contemporary era is revealed. The following chapter concludes the thesis by considering the research question alongside the findings of this chapter, and the findings of Chapters Three and Four.
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION

The intention of this thesis was to explore the evolution of hapū identity from the traditional era to the contemporary era. Drawing on elements of role theory, social identity theory and situated identity theory, which were analysed in Chapter Two, the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho was examined in each socio-historical phase. Chapter Three addressed identity in the traditional era, Chapter Four investigated identity in the colonisation era, and Chapter Five considered identity in the contemporary era. Together, Chapters Three, Four and Five form a timeline of analysis, which indicates how the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho has evolved during these periods. The timeline also demonstrates the impact of the socio-historical contexts of each era on the identity of the hapū. This chapter considers these findings, and draws conclusions relating to how the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho has evolved from the traditional era to the contemporary era. This chapter also explains how this thesis has made a unique contribution to the body of knowledge associated with identity and suggests areas for further research based on what this thesis has illustrated.

Inherent in this thesis is the notion that identity is socially constructed by participation in a group, and that at the core of identity is social acceptance. In the traditional era, the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho was formed within a hapū setting in an environment free from the influence of non-Māori aspects and phenomena. Influences associated with the concepts of mana whenua, whakapapa and te reo me ngā tikanga ensured members of Ngāi Tamarāwaho had positive associations with their group identity. A connection to ancestral lands provided Ngāi Tamarāwaho with both physical and spiritual nourishment, and the symbiotic relationship between the hapū and their lands was illustrated by their stories that tell of their profound connection to specific places, which has been immortalised by the names they gave to these sites of significance. Ngāi Tamarāwaho demonstrated their mana whenua by looking after their lands, which, in turn, looked after them, thus signifying the importance of mana whenua to the identity of the hapū. Within their kin group, the intricate web of familial connections produced mutually beneficial relationships between members of the hapū that were based on responsibility and reciprocity.
Interactions within the hapū and alliances with neighbouring tribal groups, particularly during times of warfare, contributed to the survival of Ngāi Tamarāwaho and illustrate the centrality of whakapapa to the identity of the hapū. Social acceptance is at the core of positive associations with an identity, and knowledge of language and cultural practices contributed to hapū members gaining social acceptance from the wider group by providing a clear and functional framework for group interaction and engagement. Hapū members were aware of what constituted socially acceptable behaviour. Furthermore, language and cultural practices acted as both a tool for practical communication and a means by which the hapū was regulated. The combination of these factors demonstrates the significance of te reo me ngā tikanga to the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho.

Analysis of the interplay between Ngāi Tamarāwaho and the social phenomenon of colonisation revealed that colonisation had a significant impact on the identity of the hapū, largely due to changes in the ability of the hapū to connect with the concepts of mana whenua, whakapapa and te reo me ngā tikanga. The process of colonisation altered the connection of Ngāi Tamarāwaho to their ancestral lands, fragmented the traditional structure of the hapū and the way in which it operated, and inhibited the use of language and cultural practices. While it has often been suggested that colonisation ‘happened to’ indigenous groups around the world, this notion implies that these groups were powerless, unaware, passive, and lacked an understanding of what was occurring around them. It is therefore, important to stress that while Ngāi Tamarāwaho did not ‘invite’ many of the phenomena associated with colonisation, such as a low socio-economic status caused by loss of an economic base, loss of language and cultural practices, and fragmentation to the identity of the hapū, the hapū did make conscious decisions in response to colonisation that demonstrated, as best as possible in the socio-historical context of this era, their rangatiratanga. Such decisions included the choice by many whānau not to teach their children te reo Māori but, rather, they decided that proficiency in English was a better option for their future; or some hapū members chose to move away from the traditional tribal area of Ngāi Tamarāwaho in the hope of achieving better socio-economic outcomes elsewhere.
However, the alienation of tribal lands, the suppression of language, in particular, and the trend of out-migration that fragmented the hapū by creating a diasporic population that limited opportunities to utilise cultural practices meant that colonisation did have a significant impact on the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho. Traditional influences on identity were no longer as profound, and the scattering of the population of Ngāi Tamarāwaho meant that the identity of the hapū was no longer solely constructed in a single setting. For some members of the hapū, their identity was influenced by varying social norms, particularly if they associated with multiple or hybrid sites of belonging as a result of out-migration. However, evident in the narratives of every research participant is recognition of the actions of protest by Ngāi Tamarāwaho at the injustices they faced as a result of colonisation. The hapū gained a sense of pride through the efforts and resilience of those members of Ngāi Tamarāwaho who fought tirelessly to ensure the identity of the hapū was not altered beyond recognition. Every participant cited the building of the wharenui, Tamateapokaiwhenua, as playing a central role in the assertion of their identity as a hapū, and this contributed to the restoration of positive identity associations for the members of Ngāi Tamarāwaho following the devastation caused by colonisation.

In the contemporary era, the Treaty settlement process has been influential in recognising the mana whenua of Ngāi Tamarāwaho and assisting the hapū to reconnect to their ancestral lands by the returning of some land as restitution for the Crown’s actions in facilitating the alienation of Ngāi Tamarāwaho lands. Where land was unable to be returned to the hapū, financial redress was given, which provides the hapū with access to a larger economic base. Theorists observe that access to an economic base contributes to a sense of autonomy for tribal groups, which is associated with positive associations with identity. While the diasporic population of the hapū in the contemporary era has changed the operation and structure of the hapū, whakapapa remains central to the members of Ngāi Tamarāwaho as a unifying tool regardless of where hapū members reside. The structure of the hapū has also been influenced by the settlement process, primarily through the Crown requirement that Ngāi Tamarāwaho establish a Western governance entity to receive settlement assets. However, the hapū made some conscious decisions regarding its operation and structure in the contemporary era in order to ensure the settlement entity does
not replace the hapū itself. Programmes facilitating the revitalisation of te reo me ngā tikanga have been influential in maintaining the identity of the hapū, and the determination of Ngāi Tamarāwaho in ensuring the key cultural concepts associated with te reo me ngā tikanga do not lapse, illustrate the importance the hapū places on this influence of identity.

At the core of role theory, social identity theory and situated identity theory is the notion that identity is constructed via membership of a group and influenced by the social interactions that occur both within the group between its members, and with external groups. Identity theorists argue that social acceptance is critical to identity. Drawing on aspects of the theoretical perspectives provided a lens through which to interpret the changes that occurred in Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity during the traditional, colonisation and contemporary eras. The salience of exposure to the social norms and interactions of a group on the identity of its members was reinforced, as was the influence of social acceptance in determining behaviour. In the context of Māori identity, the key concepts of mana whenua, whakapapa, and te reo me ngā tikanga were identified as being central to the construction of identity, and exploring changes in these concepts revealed the extent to which they have influenced the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, and the place the concepts hold in relation to the identity of the hapū in the future.

The exploration of the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho in the traditional, colonisation and contemporary eras also revealed that the socio-historical contexts of these eras played a significant role in shaping the identity of the hapū. The monocultural nature of the traditional era meant Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity was informed solely by influences that were Māori. During the colonisation era, the events related to the social phenomenon of colonisation resulted in changes to the influences of identity, which saw the identity of the hapū evolve from its appearance in the traditional era. The Treaty settlement process and the increased value attached to being Māori in the wider society resulted in further changes to the identity of the hapū in the contemporary era. The constant evolution of Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity, often in response to the events or nature of the various eras, reveals the salience of socio-historical context to identity. In considering such a revelation it is unreasonable to
expect that the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho would have remained unchanged from traditional times in the face of such external influences and pressures. When the contemporary identity of the hapū is compared to hapū identity in the traditional era and, when considering the significant changes that have occurred in the wider society from the traditional era to the contemporary era, it is also unreasonable to expect Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity will remain unchanged in the future. Furthermore, it is unrealistic, and even dangerous, to think Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity can be remoulded in the contemporary era to resemble how it was in the traditional era. Given the constant evolution of Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity during these historical phases, why would the identity of the hapū stop evolving as Ngāi Tamarāwaho moves into the future? To suggest that the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho ought to remain as it was would stifle its growth and ability to adapt in the ever-changing modern world.

Indigenous groups in resurgence tend towards neo-traditionalism in various forms, but it can be argued that the notion of neo-traditionalism could be neo-colonial in itself. Reconstructing traditional identity in the contemporary era, and using this neo-traditional identity as a base reference against which to determine group membership and social acceptance, would curb the continuous evolving nature of hapū identity, and Ngāi Tamarāwaho would limit the opportunities for participation and belonging for members who do not meet the criteria associated with neo-traditional identity markers.

In considering the findings put forward in the previous paragraph, the opportunities for further research in this area are immense. A key influence on tribal groups in the contemporary era is the Treaty settlement process and, as these groups move from negotiating their settlements to implementing their settlements, it is timely to explore the status of their most significant resource, that is, their people. The restitution provided to tribal groups as redress for historical Treaty breaches creates exciting opportunities for these groups in the future, but engaged people are required to ensure their visions become a reality. Therefore, there is a need to consider how the members of these tribal groups associate with their tribal identity and, to what extent they are engaged with their hapū or iwi. In a discussion on indigenous identity, Moon (2015) observes that being indigenous for some is simply ‘ticking a category on a census form’ and, for others, it means to portray ‘as many traits that are perceived as
indigenous as possible’ (p. 35). Applying this notion to an exploration of the identity associations of members of a particular hapū or iwi will reveal the level of cultural engagement of those members and the health of their most crucial resource, their people. In the post-settlement context of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, it is hoped that the hapū will consider the implications of the cultural engagement of its members, and plan accordingly for a future in which their most significant resource flourishes as Ngāi Tamarāwaho, no matter how far and wide that resource may now be spread.

This research contributes to a wide body of knowledge that relates to identity, indigenous identity, Māori identity, and the identity of a specific hapū, in this instance Ngāi Tamarāwaho. However, the model constructed in this research to analyse identity can be applied in the context of other iwi and hapū in New Zealand to analyse the evolution of their respective identities. Most importantly though, this research is for Ngāi Tamarāwaho, and is a celebration of the resilience of the hapū in navigating their way through the socio-historical contexts addressed in this thesis to emerge as they have in the contemporary era with a hope-filled future ahead. This thesis also contributes to the expanding archive of Ngāi Tamarāwaho tribal knowledge recorded in written form, and offers a unique perspective of dimensions of the hapū that has not been previously documented in this manner. In the wider context of Māori identity and indigenous identity, parallels can be drawn with the findings of this thesis and other tribal groups in Māori society, and with indigenous groups globally, that enhance the understanding of how the identities of those other groups have responded to similar experiences they may share with Ngāi Tamarāwaho. In considering the concept of identity in general, research for this thesis highlighted that this concept is highly subjective and open to interpretation, depending on both the position of the researcher making the assessments and the influences chosen as salient to the construction of identity. In this way, this thesis encourages researchers exploring identity to consider the subjective nature of identity and to reflect on this idea when making deductions about the identity they are exploring.

West (2012) argues that contemporary Māori identity is ‘emergent and constantly shifting’ (p. 27), and the same description can be applied to the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho. Some analysts argue that affiliation to a kin group, connection to
ancestral lands, and language and cultural practices are imperative to the development of positive identity associations with a tribal group and, conversely, others are convinced that changes to the aforementioned traditional influences on identity are a natural and necessary response to the modern world. Tane (personal communication, August 21, 2015) notes: ‘Modern life has changed the roles and the tikanga and the way the hapū operates.’ and Roimata (personal communication, August 7, 2015) concurs: ‘We are different from when I was a child [in the 1930s]. Economics is going to change us whether you like it or not.’ It is, in fact, necessary to draw from both sides of the identity dichotomy. It is important to acknowledge the significance of whakapapa, mana whenua and te reo me ngā tikanga, as cited by numerous commentators, as being the cornerstones of identity (Karetu, 1990; Rangihau, 1992; Walker, 1989). Colonisation, however, fragmented Ngāi Tamarāwaho and led to a diasporic population, and this resulted in the development of a modern hapū identity. The participants in this research summarised the complexity of the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho with comments that include: ‘We are still pretty much the same because traits don’t change overnight nor generations’ (Tai, personal communication, August 6, 2015), ‘I think we have changed in a big way’ (Tane, personal communication, August 21, 2015), ‘We are the same and we’re different…. I think we’ve become hybrid’ (Kahu, personal communication, August 7, 2015) and, ‘I think we’re the same in that there’s still generation after generation occurring. What makes us different is what our identity looks like to each whānau’ (Atawhai, personal communication, August 21, 2015). As a complex and multi-faceted construct, contemporary hapū identity is shaped according to individual experiences of being Ngāi Tamarāwaho, which can be markedly different from the experience of being Ngāi Tamarāwaho in the traditional era. Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity is, indeed, emergent and constantly shifting, which are necessary traits to ensure the survival of the hapū in the future.

The opening paragraph of this thesis outlined the intention of this research, which was to examine the evolution of Ngāi Tamarāwaho identity from the traditional era to the contemporary era. Research showed that the identity of the hapū has changed during these historical phases in response to the socio-historical context of each era.
However, in addition to this revelation, this thesis has told a story about human resilience and endurance. As Kahu (personal communication, August 7, 2015) observes: ‘Human beings are very resilient; you can subject them to all kinds of things but they’ll find a level and they’ll survive. And we have done exactly that.’ Ngāi Tamarāwaho has endured poverty, hardship and, indeed, their very existence was questioned, but as Tai (personal communication, August 6, 2015) notes: ‘We are still here.’ The Ngāi Tamarāwaho history of protest has ensured their voice remains heard, and the hapū remains connected to the lands that were prophesied for them generations ago. Kiwa (personal communication, August 16, 2015) states: ‘Ngāi Tamarāwaho are the keepers of the prophecy. It’s part of who we are, and why we are here, and why we need to survive. When you look at where we come from, look at our whakapapa, we have no option except to be brilliant.’ And that is the hope for Ngāi Tamarāwaho in the future.
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## Glossary


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Māori</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ariki</td>
<td>Paramount chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hapū</td>
<td>Kinship group, clan, tribe, sub-tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwi</td>
<td>Extended kinship group, tribe, group of descendants from a common ancestor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitiakitanga</td>
<td>Guardianship, stewardship, trusteeship, trustee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karakia</td>
<td>Incantation, ritual chant, chant, intoned incantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karanga</td>
<td>Formal call, ceremonial call, welcome call, call - a ceremonial call of welcome to visitors onto a marae, or equivalent venue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaumatua</td>
<td>Elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaupapa-ā-hapū</td>
<td>Tribal ideology, tribal-centred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaupapa Māori</td>
<td>Māori ideology, Māori-centred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawa</td>
<td>Marae protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingitanga</td>
<td>King Movement - a movement which developed in the 1850s, culminating in the anointing of Pōtatau Te Wherowhero as King. Established to stop the loss of land to the colonists, to maintain law and order, and to promote traditional values and culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokowai</td>
<td>Red ochre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana</td>
<td>Prestige, authority, control, power, influence, status, spiritual power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana Whenua</td>
<td>Territorial rights, power from the land, authority over land or territory, jurisdiction over land or territory, power associated with possession and occupation of tribal land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maunga</td>
<td>Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauri</td>
<td>Life principle, vital essence, special nature, a material symbol of a life principle, source of emotions, the essential quality and vitality of a being or entity. Also used for a physical object, individual, ecosystem or social group in which this essence is located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pā</td>
<td>Fortified village, fort, stockade, screen, blockade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papatūānuku</td>
<td>Earth, Earth mother and wife of Ranginui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pōwhiri</td>
<td>Invitation, rituals of encounter, welcome ceremony on a marae, welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangatira</td>
<td>Chief (male or female), chieftain, chieftainess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangatiratanga</td>
<td>Chieftainship, right to exercise authority, chiefly autonomy, chiefly authority, ownership, leadership of a social group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranginui</td>
<td>Father of the sky and husband of Papatūānuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohe</td>
<td>Boundary, district, region, territory, area, border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taniwha</td>
<td>Water spirit, water creature, powerful creature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Ao Mārama</td>
<td>The world of light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Pō</td>
<td>The world of darkness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teina</td>
<td>Younger brother (of a male), younger sister (of a female), cousin (of the same gender) of a junior line, junior relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikanga</td>
<td>Correct procedure, custom, habit, lore, method, manner, rule, way, code, practice, convention, protocol - the customary system of values and practices that have developed over time and are deeply embedded in the social context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tohunga</td>
<td>Skilled person, chosen expert, priest, healer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuakana</td>
<td>Elder brother (of a male), elder sister (of a female), cousin (of the same gender) of a more senior branch of the family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tūpuna</td>
<td>Ancestors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urupa</td>
<td>Burial ground, cemetery, graveyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utu</td>
<td>Revenge, cost, price, payment, reciprocity - an important concept concerned with the maintenance of balance and harmony in relationships between individuals and groups and order within Māori society, whether through gift exchange or as a result of hostilities between groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waka</td>
<td>Canoe, vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wairua</td>
<td>Spirit, soul - spirit of a person which exists beyond death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wānanga</td>
<td>Tribal knowledge, lore, learning - important traditional cultural, religious, historical, genealogical and philosophical knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whāikōrero</td>
<td>Oratory, oration, formal speech-making, address, speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakapapa</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakatauki</td>
<td>Proverb, significant saying, formulaic saying, cryptic saying, aphorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whānau</td>
<td>Extended family, family group, a familiar term of address to a number of people - the primary economic unit of traditional Māori society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whare</td>
<td>House, building, residence, dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenua</td>
<td>Land, territory, domain, placenta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Participant information sheet

Project title: Te Whanaketanga o Ngāi Tamarāwaho: The evolution of hapū identity

Project supervisor: Professor Paul Moon
Researcher: Melissa Derby

Date information sheet produced: 17 June 2015

Ko Tākitimu te waka
Ko Mauao te maunga
Ko Tauranga te moana
Ko Ngāti Ranginui te iwi
Ko Ngāi Tamarāwaho te hapū
Ko Huria te marae
Ko Te Hare Piahana raua ko Pekerangi Kohu ōku kaumatua
Ko May Derby tōku kuia
Ko Melissa Hemaima Derby ahau

My name is Melissa Derby and I am a Master of Arts student at Auckland University of Technology (AUT). I extend an invitation for you to take part in this research project. Your participation is purely voluntary and would be greatly appreciated. Should you wish not to take part, or withdraw at any time, this will not reflect on you in any way.

What is the purpose of this research?

The purpose of this research is to examine the hapū (sub-tribe) of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, and the changing nature of its identity from the traditional era, prior to the arrival of Pākehā, through to the present day. Attention will be focused on the impact of three specific socio-historical processes on hapū identity, namely colonisation, urbanisation, and detribalisation.
I am interested in listening to your stories and experiences to determine how the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho has evolved over time, particularly in response to colonisation, urbanisation, and detribalisation. The reason for this research is to provide a contemporary snapshot of the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, and the changes it has undergone over time to arrive at its present state. The research will also form part of an expanding archive of tribal history and knowledge.

The questions asked in this research will explore areas such as your views on how the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho is formed, the impact of the socio-historical processes on the identity of Ngāi Tamarāwaho, and how you feel the identity of the hapū has changed over time. The interview questions are attached to this information sheet.

How was I chosen for this research?

You have been identified through my personal networks as someone who could provide a valuable contribution to this research project.

What will happen in this research?

I will individually interview you for approximately one hour. Ideally these interviews will take place at the hapū marae. If this is not convenient then a different location will be agreed upon. During this interview, I will ask some guiding questions. A recorder will be used to record the discussion during the interviews and I will also take notes. After the interview, I will transcribe our conversation, and you will receive a copy of your transcript to amend or delete anything you wish before I use the information to report on the findings.

What are the discomforts and risks?

The research project is extremely low risk. However, you may withdraw from this research at any stage.

How will these discomforts and risks be alleviated?

This is not applicable as the research project is low risk.

What are the benefits?

The hapū have recently settled historical grievances resulting from breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi, and are now moving to an era of growth and development. As Ngāi Tamarāwaho continues to evolve, it is timely to capture the evolution of the identity of the hapū to date to assist with planning for the future. The research will also form part of an expanding archive of hapū knowledge and history, and your
stories will be offered to the hapū for future generations to reference. This research will also assist me in completing a Masters degree.

**How will my privacy be protected?**

You will be given a pseudonym to ensure confidentiality, and your responses will be confidential to me. Consent forms, audiotapes, and transcripts will be retained at AUT University in a locked cupboard. On completion of this research and after a period of six years, the data and documentation will be offered back to you. If you do not want the recording, the data and documentation will be destroyed.

**What are the costs of participating in this research?**

I will travel to Tauranga from Auckland to conduct the research at our hapū marae. You will be asked to travel to the marae from your home in Tauranga. A total time commitment of approximately one hour is the only other cost to you.

**What opportunity do I have to consider this invitation?**

Participation in this research is entirely voluntary. You will be given a week to consider the invitation, then I will make contact to establish if you would like to participate in this research.

**How do I agree to participate in this research?**

In order to agree to participate in this research project you need to complete and sign the attached consent form.

**Will I receive feedback on the results of this research?**

Upon request, I will provide you with transcripts of the interviews. At the conclusion of the interviews, you will be provided with a summary of my interpretations and understandings.

**What do I do if I have concerns about this research?**

Any concerns regarding the nature of this project should be notified in the first instance to the Project Supervisor:
Professor Paul Moon
Professor of History
AUT University
Private Bag 92-006
AUCKLAND
Phone: (09) 921-9999 extn. 6838

Concerns regarding the conduct of the research should be notified to the Executive Secretary of AUTEC, Kate O’Connor, ethics@aut.ac.nz, 921 9999 extn 6038.

The researcher’s contact details are:

Melissa Derby
0212964606
melissaderby@hotmail.com

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 15 July 2015
AUTEC reference number 15/176
APPENDIX 1

He whakamārama mā te kaiwhakauru

Take rangahau: Te Whanaketanga o Ngāi Tamarāwaho: The evolution of hapū identity

Kaitohutohu: Professor Paul Moon
Kairangahau: Melissa Derby

Te rā i puta ai tēnei pepa whakamārama: 17 Pipiri 2015

Ko Tākitimu te waka
Ko Mauao te maunga
Ko Tauranga te moana
Ko Ngāti Ranginui te iwi
Ko Ngāi Tamarāwaho te hapū
Ko Huria te marae
Ko Te Hare Piahana raua ko Pekerangi Kohu ōku kaumatua
Ko May Derby tōku kuia
Ko Melissa Hemaima Derby ahau

Tēnā koe. Ko Melissa Derby tōku ingoa. He ākonga ahau e whai ana i te Tohu Paerua ki Te Wānanga Aronui o Tāmaki-makau-rau (AUT). He tono tēnei kia uru mai koe ki tēnei kaupapa rangahau. Kei a koe te tikanga mena ka uru mai, kāore rānei. Nō reira, mena kāore koe i te whakaae ki tēnei tono, kei te hiahia rānei ki te puta i mua noa atu i te mutunga o ngā uiuinga, kāore he paku whiunga ka utaina ki runga i a koe.
He aha te whāinga o tēnei rangahau?

Kei te pīrangi au ki te uiui i te hapū o Ngāi Tamarāwaho, e pā ana ki te whanaketanga o te tuakiri mai i ngā rā o mua ki ēnei rā. Kei te hiahia au ki te whakarongo ki āu kōrero, ki ēou wheako whaiaro kia puta mai ai tētehi āhua o muri nei.

Nā te aha koe i whiriwhiria ai mō tēnei tono?

Kua tohua koe hei kaikōrero mō tēnei kaupapa rangahau nō te mea kei a koe ētahi kōrero hei täpiri atu, hei āwhina atu i tēnei kaupapa rangahau.

He aha ngā whakaritenga o tēnei rangahau?

Ka whakaritea ētahi uiuinga takitahi. He uiuinga kanohi ki te kanohi ēnei ka tū ki te marae o Tamateapokaiwhkea, ā, kōtahi hāora pea te roa. Māku tonu ēnei uiui e whakahaere, ā, māku hoki ngā kōrero me ngā whakaaro e tuhituhi.

Ka whakamahia he mihini hopu reo kia tōtika te mau o ngā kōrero. Tērā pea ka tuhia hoki e au ētahi pitopito kōrero. I muri mai o tērā, ka tāria ngā raraunga, ka tuhia ngā kitenga ki tētahi pūrongo tuhinga roa. Tērā pea ka tāia ngā kōrero, ā, ka puta ki te ao whānui.

He aha pea ngā raruraru, ngā āwangawanga ka puta ake?

Ka whakahaerehia ngā uiuinga me ngā mahi rangahau i raro i ngā tikanga o te hapū. Nō reira, ki ōku nei whakaaro, karekau he raruraru, he āwangawanga. Mena kāore e āta tau tō mauri ki ētahi o ngā pātai ka whakaaetia te noho wahangū. Ka taea hoki e koe te wehe atu i tēnei mahi rangahau.

Me pēhea te whakatikatika i ēnei raruraru, āwangawanga?

N/A

He aha ngā hua?

Nō kō tonu nei te hapū ka whakatau i tana kokoraho mō te taha ki Te Tiriti o Waitangi, ā, kei te titiro whakamua ināianei te hapū. Nā konā anō a Ngāi Tamarāwaho i tahuri atu ki te kapo i ētahi kōrero mō te whanaketanga haere o tōna āhua, o tōna tuakiri, e tika ai te haere whakamua o te hapū. Mā ēnei uiuinga e taea ai e au te tuhinga roa te whakaoti, ā, ka tutuki ai aku mahi mō te Tohu Paerua. Nō reira, e kore e mutu ngā mīhi ki ngā kaitau toko o tēnei mahi rangahau. He tika te kōrero e ki ana, ‘Mā te huruhuru ka rere te manu’.
Me pēhea tūmataiti e tiakina ai?

Ka noho tapu āu kōrero i ngā wā katoa, kāore ērā kōrero e puta ake ki ētahi atu. Ka whakamahia he ingoa kē mōu. Ko au anake ka mōhio nā wai ngā kōrero. Hei te mutunga o tēnei rangahau ka tiakina ki roto i tētehi rua e raka ana. Ka puritia mō te ono tau, kātahi ka whakahokia ngā kōrero ki a koe, whakangaromia rānei au a mea katoa.

He aha te utu mō te whakauru mai ki roto i tēneki rangahau?

Ka haere au ki Tauranga ki te kōrero ki a koe ki te marae o Tamateapokaiwhenua. Me tūtaki tāua ki te marae. Kōtahi haora pea te roanga o te uiuinga. Māu anō tō haere atu ki te marae e pikau, kia tae rawa ki te marae. Atu i tēnei kāore he utu he utu ki a koe.

He pēhea te roa hei whakatau i taku whakauru mai, kāore rānei?

Ka whakaritea tētahi wā i te wiki kōtahi e heke mai nei ki te tuku mai i te puka whakaae kua waitohungia e koe mehe hē a koe te whakauru mai ki tēnei kaupapa rangahau.

Me pēhea te whakauru mai ki tēnei kaupapa rangahau?

Ki te pīrangi koe ki te whakauru mai ki roto i tēnei kaupapa rangahau, me waitohu e koe te puka whakaae.

Ka whakamōhio mai i ngā hua o te rangahau inā ka oti?

Ae.

Mehemea he āwangawanga nōku e pā ana ki tēnei rangahau, me aha au?

Mehemea he māharahara ōu e pā ana ki te āhua o tēnei rangahau me whakamōhio atu ki te Kaitohutohu o tēnei kaupapa rangahau:

Professor Paul Moon
Professor of History
AUT University
Private Bag 92-006
AUCKLAND
Phone: (09) 921-9999 extn. 6838
Mehemea he māharahara ōu e pā ana ki te whakahaere o tēnei rangahau me whakamōhio atu ki te Kaiwhakahaere Matua, AUTEC: Kate O’Connor, ethics@aut.ac.nz, 921 9999 ext 6038.
Kairangahau:

Melissa Derby
0212964606
melissaderby@hotmail.com
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Interview form

Project title: Te Whanaketanga o Ngāi Tamarāwaho: The evolution of hapū identity

Project supervisor: Professor Paul Moon
Researcher: Melissa Derby

The following questions are a guide only to prompt discussion.

I am interested in your perceptions, thoughts, feelings, beliefs, experiences, and opinions. There is no right or wrong answer.

- Do you think the different roles/structure of the hapū have/has changed over time? If so, how?
- Do you think the way you see yourself as a hapū member and the way other people see you are the same or different? Please explain.
- Do you think there is or has been stigma attached to being a member of the hapū? If so, did this change the way you acted or thought of your hapū?
- Do you think the identity of the hapū has changed over time? If so, how?
- Did you feel the effects of colonisation as a hapū member? If so, how?
- Did you feel the effects of urbanisation as a hapū member? If so, how?
- Did you feel the effects of detribalisation as a hapū member? If so, how?

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 15 July 2015
AUTEC reference number 15/176
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Consent form

Project title: Te Whanaketanga o Ngāi Tamarāwaho: The evolution of hapū identity

*Project supervisor: Professor Paul Moon*
*Researcher: Melissa Derby*

- I have read and understood the information provided about this research project in the Information Sheet dated 17 June 2015
- I have had an opportunity to ask questions and to have them answered
- I understand that notes will be taken during the interviews and that they will also be recorded and transcribed. A written transcript of the audio-recording interviews will be given to participants
- I understand that I may withdraw myself, or any information that I have provided for this project at any time prior to completion of data collection, without being disadvantaged in any way
- If I withdraw, I understand that all relevant information including tapes and transcripts, or parts thereof, will be destroyed
- I agree to take part in this research
- I wish to receive a copy of the report from the research (please tick one):
  - Yes □
  - No □
- I wish for my tape and transcript to be given back to me (please tick one):
  - Yes □
  - No □

Participant’s signature
...........................................................................................................................................................................

Participant’s name
...........................................................................................................................................................................

Date
...........................................................................................................................................................................

*Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 15 July 2015*
*AUTEC reference number 15/176*
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Puka whakaae

Take rangahau: Te Whanaketanga o Ngāi Tamarāwaho: The evolution of hapū identity

Kaitohutohu: Professor Paul Moon
Kairangahau: Melissa Derby

- Kua pānui, kua mārama hoki ki a au ngā kaupapa mō tēnei rangahau i whakamāramatia i runga i te pepa whakamārama mō te kaiwhakauru, 17 Pipiri 2015
- Kua utua katoatia āku pātai
- E mārama ana ka hopukina ngā kōrero, kātahi ka patopato. Ka whakaae ahau kia hopukina, kia tuhia hoki aku kōrero ki te mihini mō tēnei kaupapa rangahau.
- E mārama ana ka tāea ngā kōrero te aukati i mua noa atu i te otinga o te uiuitanga, ka mutu, kāore au e hāmenetia.
- E mārama ana, ki te kore au e whakaae, ka whakakorenga ngā pārongo katoa tae atu ki te ripene me ngā kōrero i tāia, ā, ka whakahokia mai rānei ki ahau.
- E mārama ana hoki kei ahau te mana kia: (porohitahia te kōrero tika)
  - tono atu kia tukuna mai ki a au tētehi kape o te ripene me te pūrongo Āe □
  - Kāo □
  - tono atu kia homai tētehi kape o te pūrongo whakarā popototanga Āe □
  - Kāo □

Waitohu ........................................................................................................................................................................

Ingoa ....................................................................................................................................................................................................

Te rā ..........................................................................................................................................................................................................

Nā te Komiti Tikanga Matatika o Te Wānanga Aronui o Tāmaki Makau Rau i te rā 15/07/2015, AUTEC Nama Tohu 15/176