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Two roads diverged in a wood, and I—
I took the one less traveled by,
And that has made all the difference.

from *The Road Not Taken*, by Robert Frost (1916)
Introduction – why look at heterogeneity?

- Shavit, Kolumbus and Ellison (2016):
  “Attributing heterogeneity to something implies attributing an *integration* of mutual interactions among different entities that all belong to the same *collective*, whereas attributing diversity to a collection of objects or entities entails neither interactions nor a common collective”.
Introduction – why look at heterogeneity?

- Frideres (2014):
  “Aboriginal people, like others, are not homogenous ethnic groups. There is no single set of Aboriginal cultural practices that one can say represents Aboriginalness”. 
Introduction – why look at Māori heterogeneity?

- Within policy and planning, Māori are either treated as a homogenous group or only mana whenua are engaged formally.
- Non-mana whenua also have legitimate rights and interests. (e.g. Independent Māori Statutory Board, Auckland).
- How are those interests met when there isn’t a basic understanding of the composition of these groups?
Research questions

- How is heterogeneity conceptualised in the indigenous literature? How is it different to diversity? How is it used in relation to Indigenous people and Māori specifically?
- Using iwi census data, what does Māori heterogeneity in the regions look like?
- Spatially, does the mana whenua population cluster around remaining/returned Māori land and marae?
- Can rates of social capital be mapped for Māori sub-populations across regions?
- How can a better understanding of Māori heterogeneity in the regions inform tribal development, policy and planning?
Some thoughts on Indigenous data and exploring the recognition space

- Taylor (2008, p. 116) calls for a “recognition space” where policy makers and indigenous people can seek to build meaningful engagement and measurement through indigenised social statistics.
Exploring Māori heterogeneity in the regions

- **Mana Whenua**
  - (traditional inhabitants)

- **Mātāwaka**
  - (non-traditional inhabitants)

- **Taunga Hou**
  - (Primarily connected to the social and physical environment)

- **Taura Here**
  - (Retain connections to hapu/iwi)
Exploring the heterogeneity of Māori in the regions

Person of Māori descent living within case study area

- No/Missing
- Yes

Non-Māori living in case study area

Iwi identification?

- Mana whenua descent
  - Māori ethnicity?
    - Yes: Identifies as Mana Whenua
    - No:
      - Taura Here descent
        - Māori ethnicity?
          - Yes: Mātāwaka
          - No:
            - Taura Here
            - Taunga Hou
      - Māori descent not indicated*
        - Māori ethnicity?
          - Yes: Taura Here
          - No:
            - Taunga Hou

* Defined by Statistics New Zealand as “Nga Holahola o te Whitaun”
Methods for understanding Māori heterogeneity

- Customised iwi data for 2013 census period requested by Census Area Unit (CAU).
- Data request based around the framework and classification introduced earlier.
- Other data sets for these groupings were also obtained (including data relating to smoking, occupation, education, volunteering).
Methods for understanding Māori heterogeneity

- Population counts of mana whenua, taura here and taunga hou, as a percentage of the total Māori population for 108 CAUs were calculated.
- ESRI’s ArcMap 10.6 GIS software was used to display the distribution of regional Māori by these categories.
- GIS was also used to explore different population thresholds and to determine if there was clustering of mana whenua populations around marae and Māori land.
Methods for understanding Māori heterogeneity

- Data based on responses to two questions from the 2013 Census about unpaid activities was used as a proxy for social capital.
- Response rates for each group were calculated for all 108 CAUs. Single factor analysis of variance (ANOVA) was then performed to compare response rates among mana whenua, taura here and taunga hou groups.
Study sites
Summary of preliminary findings

- High variance in the rates of Māori who identify as mana whenua, taura here and taunga hou across towns (varying from 69% mana whenua in Te Kuiti to 76% taura here in Te Puke).
- Spatial analysis showed higher mana whenua counts in areas that were in close proximity to marae and Māori land.
- Using response rates to two questions about unpaid activity outside the home as a proxy measure of social capital, mana whenua have significantly higher rates of social capital across the towns studied than other groups (post-hoc testing found a significant difference between groups ($p < 0.001$)).
- High taura here counts seem related to factors such as industry and employment.
Preliminary findings: Pōkeno

Community welcomes Pōkeno's first supermarket

Natalie Polley - 13/27, May 30 2019

Woolworths NZ has asked for consent to construct a Countdown supermarket in Pōkeno.

- 27% of Māori in Pōkeno identified as mana whenua
- Taura here and taunga hou comprised 48% and 25% respectively
Preliminary findings: Huntly

- 57% of Māori in Huntly identified as mana whenua
- Taura here and taunga hou comprised 28% and 15% respectively
Preliminary findings: Ōtorohanga

Sweet home Ōtorohanga, where the house values increase 33.6 per cent

63% of Māori in Ōtorohanga identified as mana whenua

Taura here and taunga hou comprised 23% and 14% respectively
Preliminary findings: Tokoroa

- 11% of Māori in Tokoroa identified as mana whenua
- Taura here and taunga hou comprised 73% and 16% respectively
Preliminary findings: Te Puke

- 11% of Māori in Te Puke identified as mana whenua
- Taura here and taunga hou comprised 76% and 13% respectively
Implications

• At a central government level, understanding and measuring Māori wellbeing is a priority and this research contributes to a more nuanced and detailed understanding of wellbeing through its focus on the spatial distribution of different Māori population groups.

• It also gives a measure of social capital across these groups and has the potential to look at health and social factors.
Implications

• Local government typically have primary relationships with local iwi or mana whenua groups (e.g. resource management)

• However, mātāwaka (both taura here and taunga hou) also have a range of rights and interests in regional development and planning.

• A lack of representation of mātāwaka interests in local government may be due to a lack of recognition of mātāwaka as a distinct group and a paucity of information about mātāwaka populations.
Implications

- Research showing the spatial distribution of the Māori population can support a range of different Māori groups and organisations representing mana whenua and mātāwaka interests.

- Iwi and hapū will also have a better understanding of the spatial distribution of mana whenua in their region and potentially in the future be able to understand the extent to which mana whenua return home.
Future work

- Research about the spatial relationships between volunteering, qualification, occupation, labour, income and health data by mana whenua, taura here and taunga hou groups.
- Qualitative analysis of social capital component to further understand and ground the current quantitative findings (i.e. why do mana whenua have higher rates of volunteering?)
- Further analysis of the spatial relationships between mana whenua and marae and Māori land in larger cities (e.g. gentrification in Tauranga).
Future work