

Nga Tini Aho O Te Ao Hou



THE MANY STRANDS OF CONTEMPORARY
MAORI SOCIETY



Nga Tini Aho O Te Ao Hou



The many strands of contemporary Maori society

Maori ethnicity and identity in
the Christchurch Health and
Development Study



First published in 2000 by

Te Roopu Rangahau Hauora Maori o Ngai Tahu
(The Ngai Tahu Maori Health Research Unit)
Department of Preventive and Social Medicine
University of Otago
PO Box 913
Dunedin, New Zealand.

and

The Christchurch Health and Development Study
Christchurch School of Medicine
PO Box 4345
Christchurch, New Zealand

ISBN: 0-9597989-7-8

Copyright:

Te Roopu Rangahau Hauora Maori o Ngai Tahu,
and
The Christchurch Health and Development Study,
2000.

Te Roopu Rangahau Hauora Maori o Ngai Tahu
(The Ngai Tahu Maori Health Research Unit)
A health initiative of
The Ngai Tahu Development Corporation
in partnership with
The Dunedin School of Medicine
University of Otago

This publication has been written for a New Zealand audience, both Maori and Pakeha. Since many Maori words have entered common usage, the practice of italicising them in the text has not been followed. Nor has vowel length been marked by macrons. This latter departure from linguistic practice was done to facilitate editing.

Cover: From a drawing of Elliot Tamatea Wilson-Briggs for 'He Waka Huia' by Jenny Rendall, (Kai Tahu ki Moeraki).

Nga Tini Aho O Te Ao Hou

The many strands of contemporary Maori society

Maori ethnicity and identity
in the
Christchurch Health and Development Study

John Broughton

David Fergusson

Christine Rimene

John Horwood

Andrew Sporle

Published with the support of
The Health Research Council of New Zealand

Nga Rarangi Upoko

Contents

Whakatauki	Proverb
He Kupu Taki	Foreword
Te Korero Tuatahi	Introduction
Te Ao Maori	The Maori World
Te Tikanga	The Method
Nga Hua	The Results
Te Korero	The Discussion
Te Tiriti o Waitangi	The Treaty of Waitangi
Nga Whakapuakanga	The References
Te Tapiritanga	The Appendix

Whakatauki

*No Te Ao Tawhito
ki Te Ao Hou
nga taonga tuku iho
o nga matua tipuna*

*From the old world to the new
the treasures of our ancestors
are handed down*



Te Runanga o NGAI TAHU

Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu
Level 7, Te Waipounamu House
158 Hereford Street
PO Box 13-046,
Christchurch
Phone 03 366 4344
Fax 03 365 4424

I am particularly delighted to write the foreword for this publication.

The Christchurch Health and Development Study, managed by Professor Fergusson, is a remarkable and valuable contribution to the New Zealand story. Of equal significance for Ngai Tahu, is the additional value that has been generated as a result of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed between the Ngai Tahu Maori Health Research Unit and the Christchurch Health and Development Study. Without this MOU, valuable and groundbreaking data that could provide answers for so many of our young people would be lost in the wider study. The MOU has provided the Ngai Tahu Maori Health Research Unit with access to data, enabling them to generate reports that are of specific interest to Maori. The Unit can now access data on 151 young Maori people who have been part of this longitudinal study for 21 years. Not only can that specific data be analysed, but the results can be compared against the results of the wider study of over 1000 young New Zealanders.

This report is significant for two reasons. First a Maori analysis has been made by Maori health researchers, and secondly the report is presented within a Maori framework. As such it is accessible to the Maori participants and the wider Maori community. Its value will not only be in the results generated but also in the impact of these results for so many families. We look forward to future results and reports which can only benefit our people.

No reira
Kei te tautoko a Ngai Tahu i tenei mahi whakahirahira.

Nahaku noa nā

Mark Solomon
KAIWHAKAHAERE

Te Korero Tuatahi

Introduction

Te Ao Maori (The Maori World)

Maori have lived in Aotearoa/New Zealand for some 40 generations or 1,000 years. Since the first migration periods Maori adapted to the land and the environment developing their own unique structured society based upon the institutions of whanau, hapu and iwi. Since the coming of the European to New Zealand, Maori have over the ensuing 200 years attempted to adapt to the new culture imposed upon them. This has not occurred without its problems. The most lasting issue has been the alienation of Maori from their land which occurred primarily in the latter half of the 19th century. History has shown that the consequences of this loss of an economic base were political domination, economic exploitation, and cultural alienation.

However, despite the negative impacts of our recent history, Maori have survived. Not only have Maori survived, but Maori today are continuing to assert their right to be Maori. For many Maori, this is occurring against a background of socio-economic disadvantage. One of the important contemporary issues for Maori is the fact that 80% of Maori now live in an urbanised setting. As such, many Maori may live isolated from any Maori cultural contact or participation. This is in part, the nature of this project, to examine the identification with, and participation in, aspects of contemporary Maori society by a group of young New Zealanders with Maori ancestry. The young people in question are part of the Christchurch Health and Development Study (CHDS).

The Christchurch Health and Development Study

The Christchurch Health and Development Study is a longitudinal study of a birth cohort of 1265 children who have been studied from birth to the age of 21 using data gathered from multiple sources including parental interviews, interviews with children and young people, data provided by class teachers and data from official records including hospital and police records. The database of the study comprises 40 million characters of data describing the 21 year life history of the cohort. Within the study there is a group who identify as Maori or have Maori ancestry.

Maori health research

Although Maori health research has grown enormously in recent years, this has not occurred without particular issues having to be constantly debated. One issue has been the different criteria for defining Maori such as biology, ethnic identification or ancestry. Another problem has been the recognition of variations in ethnic identification amongst those recognised as Maori¹.

Maori ethnic identification and cultural participation

The Ngai Tahu Maori Health Research Unit (NTMHRU) and the CHDS have looked at the issues of Maori ethnicity and identity by developing a comprehensive questionnaire on Maori ethnic identification and participation in Maori specific activities at age 21. Analysis of this questionnaire revealed that approximately 15% of the CHDS cohort reported being of Maori descent. Within this group there was considerable variation in both identification with Maori as a culture and participation in specific Maori activities. This approach was limited in that it provided an assessment of the ethnic identification and participation of Maori respondents at a particular age. However, it is quite possible that as the cohort gets older there may be changes in ethnic identification and participation resulting in an increasing number of cohort members identifying with Maori, and participating in specific Maori activities.

In this particular study a questionnaire for assessing Maori ethnic identification and participation in Maori specific activities was developed. The questionnaire which was done by face-to-face interviews covered such things as descent, Maori ethnic identification, participation in Maori specific activities, knowledge of Iwi heritage; knowledge and use of te reo Maori and the importance of Maori identity. In general, the aims of this questionnaire were to ascertain the extent to which those classified as Maori on the basis of either descent or self-identification could identify their Maori affiliation; participated in contemporary Maori activities; were competent in the Maori language and the degree of importance they attached to Maori identity. These aspects are recognised by Maori as an important part of "being Maori" in Te Ao Hou, contemporary New Zealand society².

Te Ao Maori

The Maori World

One of the most important but often overlooked aspects of contemporary Maori life is the remarkable increase in the Maori population over the 20th Century. The 19th Century saw a loss of over two-thirds of the entire Maori population from 150,000 Maori people in 1835³ to 42,113 in 1896. This loss in the population over that particular time has been due largely to three factors. Firstly, the impact of the introduced diseases such as measles, tuberculosis, and sexually transmitted diseases for which there was no immunity. Secondly the impact of alienation of Maori from their land which took away the economic base of the people. Maori were therefore unable to compete in a growing market economy and were reduced to poverty. And thirdly, the impact of a new culture imposed upon Maori and a removal away from traditional values, institutions and way of life. However, Maori have not only survived but the population has grown significantly since that time. At the 1996 Census⁴, over half-a-million New Zealanders (526,542) identified as Maori making up 14.5% of the total population.

An appreciation of the impact of a new culture imposed upon Maori can be gained from the writings of young Maori medical graduates. Te Rangi Hiroa (Sir Peter Buck) graduated in medicine from the University of Otago in 1905. He also completed an MD in 1910 with a thesis entitled⁵, *Medicine amongst the Maoris in ancient and modern times*. In the conclusion to that thesis, in which Buck was ever mindful of the health and socio-economic status of Maori, he wrote:

Another important factor which really comes outside the scope of this essay, is the improvement of the economic condition of the race that will lead to their settlement upon their own lands as farmers and workers. This will carry improvements in their environment and render the necessities of life more easily procurable. The effect upon the health of the people would be incalculable. They would be assisted in the war against disease and would regain the magnificent physique which is their racial heritage.

Buck was commenting upon the socio-economic determinants of health for Maori at that time. He recognised the necessity for employment and economic security, the reclamation of mana whenua and the assertion of tino rangatiratanga as being essential for the health and wellbeing of whanau, hapu and iwi Maori. Maori identification and participation in Maori specific activities was not an issue at that time. Maori survival was the important issue.

It was to be another 30 years before Maori identification and participation was discussed by the medical profession. In 1942 two young Maori medical students, Henry R. Bennett (Te Arawa) and Leonard W. Broughton (Ngati Kahungunu), at the Otago Medical School, wrote a thesis⁶ as part of their undergraduate training. Entitled, *Some psychological aspects of the Maori*, the introduction to their thesis is still regarded as a significant piece of writing on Maori health and wellbeing. The introduction to their thesis stated:

The Pakeha has been in this country a hundred years. In the time that he has been here he has tried to impose upon a primitive race of people his European civilisation. It has taken the Pakeha some hundreds of years to attain the standards of his co-called modern civilisation. He has come to Maoriland, imposed new customs, new conventions and new methods of living upon a primitive race and has expected the Maori to be his equal. This the Maori people have tried to be, but with what results? The Maori people have done exceedingly well in so short a space of time to be where they are today. They have remarkably adapted themselves to western methods but adaptation must be a slow process.

The authors made this important point:

Much has been done, much more remains to be done. The Maori of old no longer survives. In his place is a race of people who are still in a state of flux. Old beliefs persist but newer ones are displacing them. Old habits remain but new ones are being adopted. The old religion is dead, but new cults are still appearing. The old educational system has disappeared but a new system is still being evolved. The old environment has changed, but the new one is still changing.

The Maori is on the difficult, discouraging road of adaptation. In this process it is inevitable that the psychological makeup of the individual and the race must play a big part in determining its course.

The Maori Health Commission⁷ recognised the significance of these scholarly writings by young Maori medical students by noting that their comments are just as relevant today, as they were when first written. The over-arching issue for Maori throughout the last 100 years has been the retention, understanding, identification and participation in things Maori against a background of urbanisation and globalisation. Since the publication of the Report on the Department of Maori Affairs⁸ (The Hunn Report) in 1960 which opted for a policy of assimilation, there has been a growing number of publications regarding the health, educational and socio-economic status of contemporary Maori people. The most significant of these in recent years was Ka Awatea (The New Dawn)⁹ which was the 1991 report of the Ministerial Planning Group to develop recommendations regarding Government's policy directions and objectives in Maori Affairs. This report included a description of the current position of Maori in society. The last 50 years has also seen a change in the definition of Maori.

Ethnicity

The 1953 Maori Affairs Act defined Maori as “a person belonging to the aboriginal race of New Zealand; and includes a half-caste and a person intermediate in blood between half-castes and persons of pure descent from that race”. However, the Maori Affairs Amendment Act 1974 broadened the definition of a Maori person such that a "Maori" means a person of the Maori race of New Zealand and includes any descendant of such a person. What that meant was that any person of Maori descent who wished to identify as a Maori person, regardless of the degree of Maori blood, could now be defined as Maori. At the 1991 Census a person with New Zealand Maori ancestry was also recorded. The outcome of these changes was the development of three concepts on which definitions of Maori could be based¹⁰:

1. **Biological:** The concept which emphasises lines of descent and the degree of blood of different ethnic groups.
2. **Self identity:** The concept of cultural affiliation which emphasises the way people define themselves and the group to which they feel most closely related.
3. **Descent:** The concept of descent which emphasises being descended from a Maori but does not specify degrees of blood.

These differences in the classification of Maori ethnicity has lead to some difficulties in recording and comparing Maori health statistics.

Reid¹¹ describes the efforts to reconcile the situation:

In the 1986 New Zealand Census of Population and Dwellings, Statistics New Zealand moved away from a biological definition of Maori and moved towards ethnicity.

1986 Ethnicity question:

What is your ethnic origin? Tick the box or boxes which apply to you.

In the 1991 Census, two questions were asked, one which specified Maori ancestry and one based on ethnicity.

1991 Ethnicity questions:

Have you any New Zealand Maori ancestry?

Which ethnic group or groups do you belong to? Tick the box or boxes which apply to you.

Through these questions, the 1991 census described three different Maori populations:

- (i) the Maori ancestry population. The ancestry population is important, as this group has constitutional rights. An individual from this group may exercise their right to take a claim to the Waitangi Tribunal and may enrol on the Maori electoral roll.
- (ii) the Maori ethnic group (those who identified Maori as one of their ethnic origins and includes those who identified Maori as their only ethnic origin).
- (iii) Sole Maori group (those who identified Maori as their only ethnic origin).

Statistics New Zealand made a further change to the ethnicity question in the 1996 census.

1996 Ethnicity question:

Tick as many circles as you need to show which ethnic group or groups you belong to.

Harris et al comments¹² that “the Maori ethnic group and the sole Maori group have different sociodemographic profiles and therefore are likely to have different health experiences”.

Ancestry therefore, is the first objective criterion for defining ethnicity. The second criterion is participation, the fact that the membership of an ethnic group is not simply a matter of biology and ancestry, but also requires some identification with, and participation in, the culture of the ethnic group. Ethnicity classifications are no longer based on ancestry or degrees of ancestry but are based on self definition. This approach is used in the 1996 New Zealand Census in which respondents were asked to nominate all of the ethnic groups to which they belong. The advantage of this approach is that it permits respondents to nominate the full range of their ethnic affiliations.

Maori identity

A number of Maori^{13,14,15} have made the point that prior to the coming of the European to New Zealand there was not a national collective or pan-tribal grouping of Maori but a number of distinct iwi (tribal) groups. Maori identified themselves according to iwi. Membership of iwi is determined by whakapapa (genealogy).

Beyond the issue of the broad criteria that may be used to demarcate between Maori and non-Maori, there has been a growing recognition of the fact that within the Maori population, however defined, there is considerable variation in the extent of participation in traditional or contemporary Maori society. Durie¹⁶ has summarised this very well in his account of the diverse Maori realities by describing how contemporary Maori people generally, fall into at least three broad groupings:

- (i) Some Maori are linked with conservative Maori networks. They are involved in aspects of Maori society, the marae, Maori cultural groups, Maori sports clubs or Kohanga Reo. They will speak or understand some te reo Maori.
- (ii) This group will have limited association with Maori society, but for the main part are well integrated into mainstream New Zealand society. Their lifestyle may seem to be very European, but they insist that they are Maori.
- (iii) This group will not be likely to access Maori institutions nor take advantage of mainstream services. They will be isolated from both Maori and general society. Yet they will vehemently maintain that they are Maori.

The essential factor that these three groups of people have in common is that they identify as Maori. How that identity is recognised is unique to the individual. Regardless of the differences however, Maori people do acknowledge that the essential elements of Maori identity¹⁴ are whanaungatanga, (the family and kinship ties); te whenua, (the land) and te reo, (the language).

Broughton and Rimene¹⁷ extended this discussion by describing what has become known as “urban Maori”:

...many contemporary Maori people live within a framework that is referred to as “urban Maori”. This term has arisen in recent years, particularly through the development of Urban Maori Authorities such as Te Whanau o Waipareira Trust in West Auckland. But what is an “urban Maori?” The meaning differs depending upon the context in which it is used.

A precursor to “urban Maori” is the “urban marae”. There is no confusion as to the understanding of an urban marae. Following the post-war migration from papakainga, (traditional ancestral home bases in rural areas) to the cities and towns out of economic necessity, many Maori people found themselves devoid of a cultural focal point which was close at hand and readily accessible. Hence the establishment of pan-tribal marae within the new suburban communities where Maori people now found themselves living. The foundation on which these new urban marae were built may have been a church, a Maori culture club or an educational institution. What they all have in common, generally speaking, is that they are not hapu or iwi specific. They are pan-tribal. It was only a natural progression from the concept of an urban marae and an Urban Maori Authority to the concept of an “urban Maori”.

An “urban Maori” could be a Maori person who identifies very strongly with being Maori and lives in Pine Hill, Corstorphine, Flaxmere, Papakura, Henderson, Titahi Bay, Sumner or Maori Hill. That is, they live in suburban New Zealand. An “urban Maori” could also be a person of Maori descent who has grown up isolated from ancestral roots or through no fault of their own, denied access to their whakapapa, te reo Maori me nga taonga tuku iho. (Genealogy, Maori language and the treasures handed down.) An urban Maori could also be a person who identifies with and is part of an Urban Maori Authority and as such could also be recognised as being part of either of the previous two groups.

What ever the case, there are Maori people today who live within a cultural framework that is referred to as "urban Maori". Their reality may be fraught with conflict between what is essentially Maori and what is essentially modern Western...There is a wide range of experiences and identification with Te Ao Maori (The Maori World).

Durie¹⁸ also makes the important point that, "Far from being members of an homogeneous group, Maori individuals have a variety of cultural characteristics and live in a number of cultural and socio-economic realities...being Maori in the 1990's cannot be assumed to be synonymous with conservative expectations of a stereotyped cultural heritage."

Given this variation within the Maori population in terms of participation in Maori specific activities it would seem important for analyses of ethnicity to take account of these variations. In particular, official statistics and research have largely depended on a binary definition of ethnicity in which the New Zealand population is classified into Maori and non-Maori, with the implicit assumption that those classified as Maori represent an homogeneous cultural group in terms of their identification with and participation in Maori activities. Whilst such definitions may be adequate for many research and official purposes, Durie's observations on diverse Maori realities suggest there may be advantages in devising more refined methods of classification that take into account variations in ethnic identification and participation within the population of those broadly defined as Maori.

A description of Maori today

In this study, we developed a descriptive and analytical approach which attempts to reconcile these differing perspectives on the assessment of ethnicity. The general principles on which this description is based are as follows:

1. Maori descent is first used as a broad criterion to define all those individuals who are eligible to claim Maori ethnicity.
2. The population defined by Maori ancestry is further subdivided on the basis of self report into a series of groups which range from those who report no identification with Maori as a culture to those who report high identification.
3. For each of the resulting groups a profile of the extent of participation in Maori life is then developed.

The approach taken in this study synthesizes three types of information about ethnicity: ancestry, self identification, and participation in specific Maori activities, to produce a description of Maori ethnicity that encompasses a range of definitions and which also recognises the intrinsic diversity and variability within the Maori population in terms of participation in traditional and contemporary Maori society.

In this study, we apply this method of description to data gathered on a birth cohort of 151 twenty one year olds of Maori descent who were studied as part of the Christchurch Health and Development Study^{19,20}. The principal purpose of this analysis is to illustrate the ways in which information on descent, self-identification and participation in Maori specific activities can be used to construct profiles reflecting the cultural diversity amongst those of Maori descent. This research is also intended to lay the foundations for further research into the health, education and wellbeing of Maori members of the Christchurch Health and Development Study cohort.

Maori people and health

The relatively poor health status of Maori cannot only be attributed to poorer socio-economic status. Lifestyle factors and cultural factors also impact upon the health and wellbeing of Maori. It is also acknowledged that there are barriers to health services such as appropriateness, accessibility, acceptability and affordability of existing health services.

The National Health Committee²¹ noted that:

...culture should be considered separately from social determinants. For many groups, particularly ethnic groups, culture is central to their health and well being, quite apart from socio-economic factors. Our analysis and understanding of health must place culture as a central determinant and strategies to improve health in different groups must be aware of the influence of culture.

Being Maori

In 1992, a documentary was shown on Television New Zealand called *Breaking the Barrier*²² in which the television cameras were invited to film a programme about a group of young Maori and Pacific Island people who had been before the courts. This programme which was based on an island in the Hauraki Gulf was aimed at replacing anti-social behaviour and attitudes with positive feelings of self worth and esteem. During the course of this programme these young people welcomed kaumatua, Mr John Turei. During the afternoon, as the young people sat outside in the sun, Mr Turei spoke to them. His korero was a remarkable journey into what it was to understand being Maori. Part of his korero is reproduced here:

I knew who I was.
I knew my waka;
I knew my tupuna;
I knew my whakapapa.
I knew all about those things that were very,
very important to me.
Perhaps that was one thing that I had going for me,
because I knew about my genealogy.
Why it is important to know those things,
is because all of you young people,
whether you like it or not,
you have an affinity to land.
You have.

To the Pakeha the land is a commodity;
a commodity that can be bought and sold off.
To you and I, it is much more than that.

Don't you know your mountains?
Don't you know your rivers?
Don't you know your hills?

When your tupuna used to stand up and talk...
Te awe wairere nei;
Te maunga e tu nei;
Te whenua e takoto nei...
That's what the old people used to say.
They knew all about that.

Can any of you do that?
You can't, aye?
If we can take you back
to some of those things that belong to you,
you will appreciate being Maori.

This in essence is what this project is about: an insight into what being Maori means to a particular group of young New Zealanders. Being Maori may encompass three aspects: ethnicity, identity and participation.

Te Tikanga

The method

Sample

Participants in this study were members of an unselected birth cohort that has been extensively studied as part of the Christchurch Health and Development Study (CHDS). The CHDS is a longitudinal study of a sample of 1,265 children (635 males; 630 females) born in the Christchurch, New Zealand urban region over a four month period during 1977. These children have been studied at birth, 4 months, 1 year, then annually to age 16, 18 years, and again at 21 years. Data have been collected from a combination of sources, including parent interviews, teacher assessments, official records, standardized tests and interviews with cohort members.

Research partnership

The present study arose from a collaborative agreement between the Ngai Tahu Maori Health Research Unit and the Christchurch Health and Development Study. In this collaboration the CHDS agreed to provide data and work with the NTMHRU in the analysis of information on the Maori members of the CHDS cohort. The first stage in this collaborative endeavour involved the collection of data on the ethnic distribution of the CHDS cohort. In this collaboration the two groups took the following responsibilities. The NTMHRU developed a questionnaire for assessing Maori ethnic identification and participation in Maori specific activities. This questionnaire was administered on behalf of the NTMHRU by CHDS interviewers. Staff of the NTMHRU took the lead role in briefing interviewers and addressing Maori cultural issues.

Data Collection Methods

All data for this study were gathered using a structured questionnaire designed by the NTMHRU and refined by the CHDS to fit the general format of the CHDS interview. A copy of this questionnaire is in the Appendix.

The questionnaire was undertaken with the participants at age 21. At that age 1011 (79%) of the original cohort were surveyed.

In all cases, participants were interviewed in person by trained interview staff and care was taken to ensure that all participants of known Maori descent were interviewed by Maori interviewers. All interviewers for the project were briefed on the administration of questionnaires to Maori by Mrs Christine Rimene of the NTMHRU. Following the completion of interviews, all interview materials were checked for clerical accuracy by staff of the CHDS (Professor D M Fergusson, Mr L J Horwood, and Dr L Woodward).

Questionnaire Content

The questionnaire content spanned the following areas:

1. Descent:

All participants in the CHDS were asked whether, to their knowledge, they had any Maori descent. This questioning followed that used in the 1996 New Zealand Census. A total of 151 respondents reported Maori descent.

2. Maori ethnic identification:

Respondents were asked about their ethnic identification using the question from the 1996 New Zealand Census. This question asks individuals to indicate which ethnic group or groups they belonged to or identified with.

3. Participation in Maori specific activities:

Any individual disclosing either Maori descent or Maori ethnic identification was questioned further about their participation in various aspects of contemporary Maori life. This part of the questionnaire was based on a previous study of Maori ethnicity reported by Ratima et al²³. These questions were supplemented by custom written survey items to cover additional areas not addressed by this previous research. Areas of questioning included:

(i) Knowledge of Iwi heritage:

To assess the extent to which those indicating Maori descent or identification were aware of their iwi heritage, two questions were asked. First, whether the individual could name the iwi to which s/he belonged and second, whether they could name their Marae.

(ii) Participation in Maori activities:

To assess the extent to which respondents were participants in contemporary Maori activities, respondents indicating that they were of Maori descent, were asked a series of questions about their participation in a series of activities or practices that included: visiting a Marae; membership of Maori sporting or cultural organisations; membership of kapa haka (Maori cultural performance) groups; attendance at tangi and unveilings; awareness of Maori media including radio and television programmes. The areas of questioning are summarised in Table 2 in the Results section of this paper.

(iii) Language Competence:

Respondents were asked to give a self assessment of their degree of competence in the Maori language using an 8 point scale. This rates language competence on a scale from "Knows no Maori" to "Native speaker of Maori as a first language". For the purposes of analysis, this classification was reduced to the 6 point scale shown in

Table 3 of the Results. The reason for this reduction was that not all categories of the original scale elicited a response from the sample.

(iv) Importance of Maori Identity:

To assess the importance that subjects attached to Maori as a culture, two further questions were asked. The first question asked respondents to describe the extent to which they felt comfortable in Maori and non-Maori settings, whereas the second asked subjects how important it was for them to be recognised as Maori.

In general, the aims of this questioning were to ascertain the extent to which those classified as Maori on the basis of either descent or self identification could identify their Maori affiliation; participated in contemporary Maori activities; were competent in the Maori language and the degree of importance they attached to Maori identity.

Nga hua

The Results

1. Descent and Ethnic Identification

A total of 151 participants (15%) of the CHDS cohort reported that they had some Maori descent. There was considerable variation in the self-reported ethnic identification within this group:

- (i) 52 respondents (34%) reported sole Maori ethnic identification;
- (ii) 62 respondents (41%) reported Maori ethnic identification and identification with at least one other ethnic group, in most cases (95%) these respondents reported that they identified with both Maori and European cultures;
- (iii) 37 (25%) of those reporting Maori descent stated that they had no Maori ethnic identification.

To take account of this ethnic variability the group of those reporting Maori descent were classified into three broad subgroups:

- (i) Sole Maori:
Those of Maori descent who reported an exclusive Maori ethnic identification.
- (ii) Maori and other(s):
Those of Maori descent who reported Maori ethnic identification as well as identification with one or more other ethnic groups.
- (iii) Descent without identification:
Those of Maori descent who report no Maori ethnic identification.

2. Ethnic Identification and Iwi Affiliations

Following questioning about descent and ethnic identification, respondents were asked two questions about their Iwi affiliation. First, whether the individual could name the Iwi to which they were affiliated and second, whether they could name their marae. The responses to these questions are given in Table 1 which shows the percentage of the sample who could name their Iwi and Marae related to the measure of ethnic identification. The Table shows the presence of clear and consistent trends for the percentages reporting their Iwi and marae to vary with reported ethnic identification: of those reporting a sole Maori ethnic identification over 90% could name their Iwi and nearly 60% could name their marae. In contrast, amongst those reporting no Maori ethnic identification, only 62% could name their Iwi affiliations and only 16% could name their marae. Those reporting Maori and other

identification had results that lay between these extremes. The analysis shows highly significant ($p < .005$) relationships between the extent of Maori identification and the individuals' knowledge of their Iwi heritage.

Table 1: Knowledge of iwi heritage by Maori identification

	Sole Maori (N = 52)	Maori & Other Ethnic Identification (N = 62)	Maori Ancestry Without Maori Identity (N = 37)	Total Sample (N = 151)	p*
% Could name Iwi	92.3	82.3	62.2	80.8	<.005
% Could name Marae	59.6	22.6	16.2	33.8	<.001

* Based on chi squared test of independence.

3. Participation in Maori specific activities

Following questions about ethnic identification and Iwi affiliations, respondents were asked a series of questions about their degree of participation in a range of Maori specific activities. These included: attendance at marae in the last year; membership of Maori sporting and cultural performing groups; attendance at tangi and unveilings and listening to Maori radio and television programmes.

The results of this questioning are summarised in Table 2 which shows the profile of participation in Maori specific activities for the three groups. It is apparent that in common with Table 1, there is clear evidence of varying participation in Maori specific activities depending on the degree of the identification with Maori culture. Amongst those reporting an exclusive identification with Maori, rates of participation in Maori specific activities were relatively high:

- * nearly two thirds had visited a marae in the last year;
- * a quarter were currently members of a Maori cultural performing or sporting organisation;
- * nearly two thirds had belonged to kapa haka groups at some time during their lives;
- * the great majority (85%) had attended tangi or unveilings and two thirds listened to Maori radio programmes.

In contrast, amongst those reporting no Maori ethnic identification, rates of participation in Maori specific activities were low. Again as in Table 1, those reporting Maori and other identification had rates of participation in Maori specific activities that fell between the two extremes of the table. In all cases the analysis shows statistically significant ($p < .05$) relationships between Maori identification and extent of participation in aspects of Maori society.

Table 2:
Participation in Maori specific activities by Maori identification.

	Sole Maori (N = 52)	Maori & Other Ethnic Identification (N = 62)	Maori Ancestry Without Maori Identity (N = 37)	Total Sample (N = 1151)	p*
% Visited a Marae in last year	63.5	37.1	16.2	41.1	<.001
% Visited own or local Marae in last year	36.5	25.8	10.8	25.8	<.05
% Member of Maori group, organisation or sports team	25.0	12.9	2.7	14.6	<.05
% Member of Kapahaka group (last 3 years)	21.2	14.5	2.7	13.9	<.05
% Member of Kapahaka group (ever)	65.4	32.3	8.1	37.8	<.001
% Attended tangi or unveiling (ever)	84.6	64.5	35.1	64.2	<.001
% Listen to Maori language radio or TV programmes	38.5	21.0	0.0	21.9	<.001
% Listen to English language Maori radio or TV programmes	65.4	54.8	24.3	51.0	<.001

* Based on chi squared test of independence.

An important index of the degree of participation in aspects of Maori society involves language use and language competence. In the present study, respondents were asked to provide self assessments of their degree of competence in Maori language on a scale that described this competence over a range of "Knows no Maori" to "Native speaker of Maori as first language". Table 3 presents a summary of responses to these questions. In this table, respondents have been classified into 6 groups ranging from those who reported no knowledge of Maori to those claiming an advanced knowledge and fluency in the Maori language. The Table also reports on those who claimed to understand but not speak Maori.

Overall, the Table shows relatively low levels of competency in the Maori language with over two thirds of those questioned either speaking no Maori or only a few words and only 4% claiming an advanced knowledge of Maori. Nonetheless, it was also clear that the degree of Maori language competence varied with ethnic identification. Amongst those claiming a sole Maori identity:

- * 42% had a basic knowledge or better of Maori language and;
- * nearly 10% claimed an advanced knowledge of Maori language.

In contrast, amongst those not reporting Maori ethnic affiliations:

- * only 11% reported a basic knowledge or better of the Maori language.

As in previous tables, the language competencies of those claiming bicultural or multicultural ethnic affiliations fell between those of the group with sole Maori identification and no Maori identification.

Table 3: Self-reported language competence by Maori identification

	Sole Maori (N = 52)	Maori & Other Ethnic Identification (N = 62)	Maori Ancestry Without Maori Identity (N = 37)	Total Sample (N = 151)
% Knows no Maori	5.8	14.5	16.2	11.9
% Knows a few words of Maori only	50.0	58.1	73.0	58.9
% Basic knowledge of Maori	17.3	11.3	5.4	11.9
% Intermediate knowledge of Maori	15.4	9.7	2.7	9.9
% Advanced knowledge of Maori	9.6	0.0	2.7	4.0
% Can understand but does not speak Maori	1.9	6.5	0.0	3.3

p<.05, chi squared test of independence.

4. Personal Relevance/Importance of Maori Culture

The results in the preceding analysis build up a picture of a group of individuals claiming Maori descent who varied in their cultural identification, Iwi affiliations and participation in Maori specific activities from those who had little or no Maori ethnic identification, affiliation or participation to those who reported high rates of identification, affiliation and participation in Maori specific activities. These findings raise the further question of the importance of Maori identification for the respondents. To address this issue, participants were asked questions about how comfortable they felt in Maori and non-Maori settings and the importance they attached to being recognised as Maori. These results are summarised in Table 4. This Table shows:

- (i) Overall, nearly 80% reported that they were equally comfortable in non-Maori and Maori settings, with 16% reporting that they were more comfortable in non-Maori settings and only 5% reporting that they were more comfortable in Maori settings. However, interestingly the rate at which respondents reported being comfortable in both cultures varied clearly with ethnic identification: of those with a sole Maori ethnic identification over 90% reported being equally comfortable in both Maori and non-Maori cultural settings whereas only 62% of those reporting no Maori identification were equally comfortable in both settings. As was the case for previous tables, those with bicultural or multicultural identification had results that lay between these extremes.
- (ii) Overall, the sample was divided about the importance of being identified as Maori with just over half (56%) claiming that being recognised as Maori was not important to them and 44% claiming that such recognition was important. As might be expected, the extent to which recognition of being Maori was important varied with the individual's degree of ethnic identification: amongst those who were of sole Maori identification nearly 70% felt that it was important for them to be recognised as Maori whereas amongst those who reported no Maori identification, all but one claimed that it was not important to be recognised as Maori. As in previous comparisons those reporting a bicultural or multicultural identification had results that lay between these extremes, with nearly half of this group claiming that it was important for them to be recognised as Maori.

Table 4:
Confidence in Maori settings and importance of Maori recognition by Maori identification

	Sole Maori (N = 52)	Maori & Other Ethnic Identification (N = 62)	Maori Ancestry Without Maori Identity (N = 37)	Total Sample (N = 151)
<u>Cultural Comfort *</u>				
Most comfortable with Maori people and cultural settings	3.9	6.5	2.7	4.6
Most comfortable with non Maori cultural settings	5.8	14.5	35.1	16.6
Equally comfortable in Maori and non Maori cultural settings	90.4	79.0	62.2	78.8
<u>Importance of being recognised as Maori **</u>				
Very important	26.9	17.7	0.0	16.6
Important	42.3	29.0	2.7	27.2
Not very important	28.9	43.6	48.7	39.7
Unimportant	1.9	9.7	48.7	16.6

* p<.01, ** p<.0001; chi squared test of independence.

Te korero

Discussion

In this study we have used data gathered on a birth cohort of 151 young people of Maori descent who are part of the Christchurch Health and Development Study. The principal aims of this analysis were to explore and examine variations in both ethnic identification and participation in Maori specific activities amongst this cohort. The major findings of the study and their implications are reviewed below:

Comparing different approaches to describing Maori ethnicity

The data in this study provide a basis for a comparison of the assessment of ethnicity on the basis of descent and the assessment of ethnicity on the basis of self report. The two important findings are:

- (i) Of the 151 young people who reported Maori descent in the study, one-quarter reported no identification with Maori ethnicity. This finding reinforces previous concerns^{14,16} about the use of descent criteria to classify Maori ethnicity. In this study, the use of a descent criterion would have led to an over estimation of the number of the CHDS cohort who were of Maori ethnic identification. It is worth noting therefore that it is difficult to defend a method of ethnic classification which, in a quarter of cases, was inconsistent with the individual's self-reported ethnic identification. Thus, whilst descent is in the first instance a necessary criterion for classifying Maori ethnicity it is clearly not a sufficient criteria for such classification.
- (ii) It was apparent that there was further variation amongst those reporting Maori identification. Over 50% of those who reported identification with Maori ethnicity also reported identification with at least one other ethnic group.

This heterogeneity within those reporting Maori identification poses an important question: is it necessary, for research purposes at least, to distinguish between those who report a sole-Maori identification and those who report identification with more than one ethnicity? For example, the two Maori researchers in this study both declared that they had changed the way that they responded to the ethnicity questions in the 1991 and the 1996 Censii. In the 1991 Census, both ticked only one ethnicity box, ie Maori. However at the 1996 Census, both researchers ticked two boxes, Maori and Pakeha (European). The reasoning behind this change of response was because of the way the question was asked in the respective Censii.

However, Pomare et al²⁴ noted that ethnic differences in mortality between Maori and non-Maori are greater for those of sole Maori identification than for those with any Maori identification.

The value of distinguishing between those with a sole Maori identification and those with bicultural or multicultural affiliations may well depend upon the contexts in which they are used.

Maori identity and participation in Maori specific activities

To a large extent, descriptions of Maori ethnicity have rested on the assumption that variations in the individual's perceptions of their ethnic identification reflect corresponding differences in levels of participation in Maori specific activities. In this study we have tested this assumption by examining the relationships between self-reported ethnic identification and measures of participation including: knowledge of Iwi heritage; participation in Maori specific activities and competence in Maori language. These analyses provided a broad cross validation which showed that for all measures examined, increasing Maori self-identification was associated with increasing participation in Maori specific activities. At one extreme, those reporting Maori descent without Maori identity had low levels of participation in Maori specific activities and language. At the other extreme, those reporting sole-Maori identification reported the highest level of participation, with those reporting a bicultural or multicultural affiliation having results that lay between these extremes. That is, variations in self-reported ethnic identification were generally mirrored by parallel variations in participation in Maori specific activities.

Nonetheless, further examination suggested that even amongst those reporting a sole-Maori identity, levels of participation in Maori specific activities varied. On one hand, a very high proportion had reported attending a tangi or visiting a marae in the last 12 months. On the other hand for example, nearly 60% reported they knew no Maori language or only a few words. However, it is possible that the relatively low levels of participation in Maori specific activities found in this study may reflect the age of the cohort and its stage in the life cycle. In particular, Phinney²⁵ has pointed out that cultural identification of members of minority groups tend to vary over the life cycle and cultural identification is relatively weak in adolescence and young adulthood. It seems likely that for young adults, involvement in "youth culture" may divert them from participation in their culture of origin.

Applied Implications

The preceding analyses does illustrate the importance of gathering comprehensive data on ethnic identification and participation to document the variation within those classified as Maori. Although our analysis shows within the group of young people who reported Maori self-identification or ethnicity there were variations in the degree

to which they identified with and participated in Maori specific activities. If anything, these results clearly support the diverse Maori reality classifications by Durie. This is significant because as Durie²⁶ also points out, "in order to avoid classifying Maori solely according to traditional cultural knowledge and skills, or on the basis of affiliation with marae, hapu and iwi, it is necessary to emphasise the range of circumstances which not only shape cultural expression but also permit or inhibit cultural identification and practice."

Such findings clearly have implications for ongoing social and political debates about the extent to which health, education and related services for Maori should be derived from a model of mainstream services delivery or a model in which services for Maori are owned, controlled and delivered by Maori. The findings from this study clearly lead to a middle of the road position in this debate and suggest that because of the variation in ethnic identification and participation amongst those classified as Maori there is a need for a parallel variability in service provision with services for young Maori spanning a range of options that include both mainstream services and Maori community based services.

Finally, there is an important caveat that should be placed on this analysis. This caveat centres around the fact that the present analysis is based on a study of the ethnic identification and participation in Maori specific activities of a cohort of young people born in the South Island at a particular time. These sampling features means that the findings of this study may not apply to other samples of Maori living in different regions of New Zealand or born at other times. This caveat notwithstanding, it is our belief that the various issues relating to the interplay between descent, ethnic identification and participation in Maori specific activities will recur in other studies of ethnic identification in other groups of Maori.

In future analyses we hope to examine the ways in which variations in the ethnic identification and participation in Maori specific activities of this sample were related to their health, education and well being as young adults.

Te Tiriti o Waitangi

Te Tiriti o Waitangi was a contract signed between the British Crown and Maori people on 6 February 1840 which formalised the relationship between the two Treaty partners. Te Tiriti o Waitangi is regarded as the Founding Document of New Zealand which allowed Britain to establish a new colony in New Zealand. Captain William Hobson signed the Treaty on behalf of Queen Victoria and subsequently, a total of 539 Rangatira, signed on behalf of their hapu and iwi. There were three Articles to the Treaty which stated quite clearly and simply the responsibilities of the respective partners.

The first implication of the Treaty of Waitangi within this project stems from the fact that a Treaty based Memorandum of Understanding was agreed to and signed between the two research units, The Christchurch Health and Development Study and the Ngai Tahu Maori Health Research Unit. In that Memorandum of Understanding, "both Parties agree to uphold both the Articles and the Principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi in relation to health research". The Purpose this Memorandum of Understanding is to enter into a collaborative approach to specific health research projects and specifically:

The collaboration gives the Ngai Tahu Maori Health Research Unit access to the collected data and results of the Christchurch Health and Development Study.

The collaboration gives the Christchurch Health and Development Study a Maori analysis of the Maori cohort of the Study.

Article II of the Treaty guaranteed to the Maori people:

the full exclusive and undisturbed possession of their Lands and Estates Forests Fisheries and other properties which they may collectively or individually possess...

The English translation of the Maori version of Article II states that:

The Queen of England agrees to protect the Chiefs, the Subtribes and all the people of New Zealand in the unqualified exercise of their chieftainship over their lands, villages and all their treasures.

Under Article II, Maori people were guaranteed tino rangatiratanga (chieftainship) or self determination over the very things that affect them. As such, Article II guarantees to Maori the right to be Maori. What ever the right "to be Maori" actually means is for Maori to determine, however, whenever and wherever.

Nga whakapuakanga

The References

1. Reid, P and Robson, B. *Dying to be counted*. In Proceedings of Te Oru Rangahau, Maori Research and Development Conference, School of Maori Studies, Massey University. 2nd Edition, April 1999. Pages 264 - 268.
2. *What constitutes a healthy Maori?* Detailed responses from Te Ara Ahu Whakamua, Proceedings of the Maori Health Decade Hui, Te Puni Kokiri, Ministry of Maori Development, Wellington, March 1994.
3. *New Zealand Official 1990 Year Book*. 94th Edition. Wellington: Department of Statistics, 1990 (pages 157-158)
4. Census 1996
5. Buck, Te Rangi Hiroa, *Medicine amongst the Maoris in ancient and modern times*. Thesis, University of Otago, 1910.
6. Bennet, H. and Broughton, L.W. *Some psychological aspects of the Maori*. Thesis, University of Otago, 1942.
7. *Tihei Mauri Ora!* The Maori Health Commission, Wellington, October 1999
8. Hunn, J.K. *Report on Department of Maori Affairs*. Public Service Commission, Wellington, 1960.
9. *Ka Awatea*. A report of the Ministerial Planning Group to the Minister of Maori Affairs, Wellington, 1991.
10. Kilgour, R. and Keefe, V. *Kia Piki Te Ora*. The collection of Maori health statistics, Discussion paper 15. Wellington: Department of Health, Health Research Services, 1992.
11. Reid, P. and Robson, B. *Dying To Be Counted*. In Proceedings of Te Oru Rangahau, Maori Research and Development Conference, School of Maori Studies, Massey University. 2nd Edition, April 1999. Page 265.
12. Harris, R., Keefe, V., Reid, P. and Robson, B. *Impact of changes in the death registration process upon Maori mortality statistics*. Letter to the New Zealand Medical Journal, 28 January 2000, page 19.
13. Rangihau, J. *Being Maori*. In Te Ao Hurihuri, The World Moves On, Aspects of Maoritanga. Ed M. King Hicks Smith & Sons Ltd, Wellington, 1975.
14. Broughton, J. *Being Maori*. New Zealand Medical Journal, 24 November 1993, Vol 106, No. 968, p506-508.
15. Walker, R. *Being Maori*. In *Nga Tau Tohetohe Years of Anger*. Penguin Books, Auckland, 1987. Chapter 6.

16. Durie, M. *Maori health decade Hui, Te Ara Ahu Whakamua*, Te Puni Kokiri, Wellington, 1994. Page 131.
17. Rimene, C. Hassan, C. and Broughton, J. *Ukaipo: Maori women and childbirth*. Ngai Tahu Maori Health Research Unit, Department of Preventive and Social Medicine, Dunedin, 1998.
18. Durie, M.H. *Te hoe nuku roa framework. A Maori identity measure*. Journal of the Polynesian Society, 104 (4) 1995, pages 464-65.
19. Fergusson DM, Horwood LJ, Shannon FT, Lawton JM. *The Christchurch Child Development Study: A review of epidemiological findings*. Paediatric and Perinatal Epidemiology, 1989; 3: 278-301. (80; 180).
20. Horwood LJ, Fergusson DM. *Psychiatric Disorder and Treatment Seeking in a Birth Cohort of Young Adults*. Wellington: Ministry of Health, 1998.
21. National Health Committee, *The Social, cultural and economic determinants of health in New Zealand: Action to improve health*, 1998. P. 41.
22. *Breaking the Barrier*, Television New Zealand Documentary produced and directed by Bryan Norton, Living Pictures Production, 1992.
23. Ratima M. M., Potaka, U.K., Durie, M.H. and Ratima, K.H. 1993. *Acculturation and a Maori identity scale*. Te Pumanawa Hauora, TPH 93/6, Department of Maori Studies, Massey University.
24. Pomare ma, Hauora, *Maori standards of Health III, A Study of the Years 1970-1991*. Te Roopu Rangahau Hauora a Eru Pomare, Wellington School of Medicine, 1995.
25. Phinney, J. *Stages of ethnicity development in minority group adolescents*. Journal of Early Adolescents. 9 (1-2) May 1989: 34-39.
26. Durie, M.H. *Te hoe nuku roa framework. A Maori identity measure*. Journal of the Polynesian Society, 104 (4) 1995, page 469.

Nga Mihi

Acknowledgements

Both the Christchurch Health and Development Study and the Ngai Tahu Maori Health Research Unit wish to acknowledge the help and support of the following people: Lynne Pere and Robin Dibble, Maori interviewers; and Ngai Tahu whanau: Alva Kapa, Rua McCallum and Moana Tipa for tautoko (support) regarding matters of tikanga Maori and Dr Erihana Ryan and Mr Paul White of Ngai Tahu Development Corporation.

Ka nui te mihi ki a koutou katoa.

Professor David M. Fergusson
Executive Director
Christchurch Health & Development Study
Christchurch School of Medicine
PO Box 4345
Christchurch

John Broughton
Director
Ngai Tahu Maori Health Research Unit
Department of Preventive and Social Medicine
Dunedin School of Medicine
PO Box 913
Dunedin

Christine Rimene
Research Fellow
Ngai Tahu Maori Health Research Unit
Department of Preventive and Social Medicine
Dunedin School of Medicine
PO Box 913
Dunedin

John Horwood
Senior Research Fellow
Christchurch Health & Development Study
Christchurch School of Medicine
PO Box 4345
Christchurch

Te Tapiritanga

The Appendix

SECTION C: ETHNIC IDENTIFICATION

C.1 Which of the following ethnic groups do you belong to or identify with?

	Yes	No
NZ Maori	1	2
NZ European	1	2
Other European (English, Dutch, Scottish, Australian, etc)	1	2
Samoan	1	2
Tongan	1	2
Niuean	1	2
Asian	1	2
Other Specify:	1	2

Col 28

C.2 Are you of Maori descent (that is do you have a parent, grandparent, great grandparent, etc, who is of Maori ancestry).

Yes	1
No	2

IF RESPONDENT INDICATES THAT S/HE IS OF MAORI DESCENT OR ANCESTRY ASK C.3 TO C.18. OTHERWISE ENDORSE THESE ITEMS WITH 9's

C.3 Do you know the name of your iwi (tribe or tribes)?

If yes, specify:

Yes	1
No	2
NA	9

C.4 Do you know the name of your Marae? Yes

1
2
9

If yes, specify: _____

NA

Col 31

C.5 In the last year, how often would you have

Attended a Marae

Attended your Marae or a local urban Marae

No. of times	

C.6 Have you received any education in Maori culture, including language, songs, cultural practices, genealogy, etc, from any of the following sources:

	Yes	No	NA
Your parents	1	2	9
Your relatives	1	2	9
A marae	1	2	9
At preschool	1	2	9
At primary school	1	2	9
At secondary school	1	2	9
At Polytech, university, teachers' college (or similar institution)	1	2	9
At work	1	2	9
As part of a community or sports group	1	2	9
From other sources; Specify:	1	2	9

Col 40

C.7 Are you currently a member of any Maori group, Maori organisation or Maori sports team?

If yes, specify: _____

Yes

1
2
9

No

NA

C.8	Have you:	Yes	No	NA
	Belonged to a Kapahaka group in the past 3 years	1	2	9
	Ever belonged to a Kapahaka group	1	2	9

Col 48

C.9 Which of the following best describes your cultural affiliations and identifications?

I feel most comfortable with Maori people and Maori cultural settings

1

I am most comfortable with non-Maori cultural settings

2

I am equally comfortable in Maori and non-Maori cultural settings

3

NA

9

C.10 How comfortable do you feel in:

Code

Maori social surroundings	
Pakeha/European social surroundings	

Coding: 1 = very uncomfortable; 2 = uncomfortable; 3 = indifferent; 4 = comfortable; 5 = very comfortable

C.11 Which of the following statements best describes your ability in speaking Maori?

Know no Maori at all

01

Know a few words and basic greetings but not learning anything new

02

Learner of Maori at a basic level (learning new words/expressions)

03

Learner of Maori - medium level (good vocabulary, sentence construction)

04

Learner of Maori - advanced level (speaks confidently in most situations)

05

Fluent speaker of Maori learnt as a second language

06

Native speaker of Maori learnt as a first language

07

Has a good understanding of Maori but does not speak Maori

08

NA

99

Col 53

C.12 a) Have you ever been to a tangi or unveiling?

Yes	1
No	2
NA	9

IF YES TO a) ASK b). OTHERWISE ENTER 9

b) How much of the Kawa/protocol did you understand?

All or most	1
About half	2
Some	3
None	4
NA	9

C.13 How many times per week do you

	No. of times
Listen to Maori language radio or TV programmes	
Listen to English language Maori radio or TV programmes	
Read English language Maori magazines or articles on Maori issues	

C.14 How well can you understand what is said in Maori language TV or radio programmes?

Most or all of what is said	1
About half of what is said	2
Some of what is said	3
None of what is said	4
Does not listen to Maori language programmes	5
NA	9

Col 59

C.15 In the last year, how often have you met with members of your extended whanau (aunties, uncles, grandparents, cousins, etc)

No. of times

--	--

C.16 In the last year, have you met with your extended whanau (aunties, uncles, grandparents, cousins, etc) at any of the following?

	Yes	No	NA
Annual hui	1	2	9
Kohunga/kura	1	2	9
Wedding	1	2	9
Tangi/Unveiling	1	2	9
Sports	1	2	9
Kapahaka	1	2	9
Wananga	1	2	9
Other. Specify:	1	2	2

Col 6

C.17 How important is it to you to be recognised as a Maori person

Very important

1

Important

2

Not very important

3

Unimportant

4

NA

9

C.18 How satisfied are you with your knowledge of things Maori?

Very satisfied

1

Satisfied

2

Unsatisfied

3

Very unsatisfied

4

NA


9

Col 71

NGA TINI AHO O TE AO HOU



UNIVERSITY
of
OTAGO



SAPERE AUDE

Te Whare Wānanga o Otago



NGAI TAHU

front cover illustration by Jerry Kendall