Abstract: A previous study by Nikora, Guerin, Rua & Te Awekotuku (2004) of the social consequences of Tūhoe moving to the Waikato region found employment and a tertiary education to be the primary motivators. Tūhoe ‘movers’ remained in contact with those who remain in Te Urewera and retained a wish to return to their tribal homelands if presented with work opportunities or upon retirement. Through 29 intensive conversational interviews conducted by Tūhoe community researchers with Tūhoe people we explored the social consequences of migration upon those who had remained ‘at home’. Most participants recognised and strongly supported ‘movers’ to better themselves and find successful futures but hoped that they would one day return. An emerging theme was an apparent age-distribution gap of people between about 20 and 50 years of age in the Tūhoe homelands. This is concerning for a number of reasons. The ‘age gap’ may potentially bring about a) a lack of good role-models for younger children; b) a lack of people to help out with heavy work; c) a gap in people to sustain traditional teaching models for children, and d) a lack of qualified people in trades and professions. The age gap also means that a whole middle-aged group that in other communities might be contributing funds for capital expenditures are not present in the community.
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Introduction

Māori have been migrating for centuries, but in the last 100 years there has been increased migration due to the changing nature of Māori social organisation. The advent of colonisation and westernisation has meant vast changes in lifestyle, and most importantly, the ‘need’ for employment and education to survive. This has created a huge outflow of Māori from traditional homelands to cities and educational centres and to overseas destinations (Butterworth, 1991; Davey & Kearns, 1994; Grace, Ramsden, & Dennis, 2001; Hamer, 2007; Kawharu, 1968; Metge, 1964; Nikora, 2007; Nikora, Guerin, Rua, & Te Awekotuku, 2004; Pearson, 1988; Scott & Kearns, 2000; Waitangi Tribunal, 1998). In the 1980s, however, there was some migration back to rural areas, although little is known in the literature about the size or effects of this (Pearson, 1988; Scott & Kearns, 2000).

Despite the returning home of some Māori, migration away has continued (Hamer, 2007), primarily by younger people seeking education and work opportunities. What is still not known, however, is the effect of such migrations, especially the social consequences. There are likely to be effects on the people moving away from homelands, on the people who remain with many of the youth gone, and also on other Māori iwi (tribes) whose homelands have been settled by those migrating. Little is known about these issues.

Our larger research intention, therefore, is to discover more about such social consequences, by looking at one case study, of those Tūhoe who have migrated to the Waikato region and their families who have stayed behind. In this paper we report on the social effects identified by those who stay behind in the Tūhoe takiwa (tribal region).
The Tūhoe takiwa is a region that for statistical purposes has been based on the Whakatane and Wairoa local government districts (Statistics New Zealand, 2003). It provides the closest approximation to the traditional tribal boundaries of the Tūhoe iwi that geographically mostly incorporate the Te Urewera Ranges. In 2001, 29,256 people (5% of the total Māori population) reported belonging to Tūhoe. Most Tūhoe (81%) reported living outside their iwi takiwa, with 35% of all Tūhoe in the Bay of Plenty region, 17% in the Auckland region, 11% in the Wellington region, and 10% in the Waikato region. Statistical analysis of the 2001 Census data shows that those residing in the Tūhoe takiwa are more educationally and economically disadvantaged than the overall Māori population and than Tūhoe living away. Those within the takiwa were more likely than those living outside to: a) speak te reo Māori (55% vs 39%); b) have a lower formal qualification (52% vs 59%); c) have no post-school qualification (23% vs 19%); d) to be unemployed (29% vs 20%); and e) have a lower median annual income (men = $11,800 vs $19,900; women = $11,100 vs $12,900). A statistic of particular concern to us in this study is the movement of Tūhoe into and out of the Tūhoe takiwa. Statistics New Zealand (2003) reports a net loss of 159 people between the 1996 and 2001 censuses. Most of this change is attributed to people younger than 34 years, moving out of the district, particularly for the 15-24 year range. This result begs the question – what is being drained out of the Tūhoe takiwa and why?

Tūhoe ki Waikato (Tūhoe living in the Waikato region)

In our previous study (Nikora et al., 2004) we outlined some of the history and people of Tūhoe and of their Te Urewera homelands. About 10% live in the Waikato region, which is predominantly Tainui, and have moved there for employment and a tertiary education primarily. Interviews found that those moving into the Waikato missed their homes and the people and made regular visits back. They set themselves up through whānau links and Tūhoe sports and haka groups in the Waikato. Some reported feeling stronger in their Tūhoe identity after moving and most reported noticing changes in either themselves or those remaining back home. Most wanted to return but could not because there was no employment or way of making a living. Most said they wanted to retire to Te Urewera.

Voices from Te Urewera

The present study explored the impact of migration upon those who had remained in Te Urewera. With the assistance of Tūhoe community researchers we interviewed 29 people who were still residing in Te Urewera, whose whānau members had moved to the Waikato. We wished in this case to document and explore the perspectives of those who remain in Te Urewera, what they see as the advantages and disadvantages of migrating, how the migration has affected the community for better and for worse, and what those who move away can contribute to the community.

Methods

Five Tūhoe ki Waikato community researchers were employed as the primary interviewers in this study. They completed conversational interviews with 29 people of Tūhoe descent who were currently living in Te Urewera whose whānau members had moved to the Waikato. This latter group had been previously interviewed as participants in the Nikora et al. (2004) study. A semi-structured interview schedule was used however, because the interviewers were from the community, there were subtle mixes of ethnographic and narrative enquiry. The research proposal was examined and approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Waikato Psychology Department, and was discussed with a number of key Tūhoe living in the
Waikato region beforehand. The interviews were conducted during January and February 2005.

The main areas explored in the interviews were: the different groups who stay in Te Urewera; the advantages and disadvantages of staying; changes that have occurred in the community with people leaving; why Tūhoe move away from Te Urewera; advantages and disadvantages of leaving to those left behind; why some Tūhoe have chosen to move to the Waikato and their experiences; hopes for those who move away from Te Urewera; the positive and negative changes in whānau who move away; reasons why the home people would like them to return; and how both the home people and those away contribute back to their home community.

**Participants**

There were 22 females (76%) and 7 males (24%) interviewed, and most have lived continuously in Te Urewera for more than 15 years. Twenty participants shared their age with us. The average age was 43 years and the majority of participants resided in Ruatoki, south of Whakatane, in households with an average of 5.11 people. Fifteen participants (52%) were native speakers of Māori, and 21 (72%) felt comfortable speaking Māori. Interviews were therefore conducted in either Māori or English or both where preferred.

**Results**

The informal interviews discussed the topic questions and issues in different sequences depending upon how the conversations were proceeding, but here we will summarise the discussions under headings grouped by the main questions. The sample could not be representative of the population, but the aim was to use qualitative methods to obtain a range of richly descriptive responses from which we could glean a deeper understanding of the issues related to this topic.

**Who are the different groups who stay in Te Urewera?**

Participants reported on the sorts of people who remain and have not left Te Urewera. They were said to be those who might not speak English well, and are shy to move away. As Tangi told us: “I think it’s basically to do with, they feel secure here. It’s a safety net for them, maybe for some there’s no confidence, they don’t want to step outside that safety net” (Tangi). Others were competent bush people and seasonal workers, and preferred to stay in the country. Te Mauri points to the preference for and greater options for pursuing subsistence activities saying that “…in terms of the ones I know it’s the bush, that’s what they’re into…they’d rather be with their dogs and their horses”. There were also married couples who stayed because of cheap housing or rentals and the overall lower cost of living particularly for “…a family who doesn’t really have much. Living back home, well you can basically live on a hundred dollars because you’re on your own whenua (land). You can build your own whare. You can live in your homestead because people have moved away” (Marewa). Compared to living in the cities, Maaka noted that “…financially it’s easier because in the cities you more or less have got to have a job to live in the city” referencing what Marewa and Te Mauri have already noted as the lower cost of living.

Some participants felt that a country lifestyle was less stressful and more beneficial for children.

...he rahi no ngā huarahi o te kainga, te haere ki te ngahere, te mahi kai, te awa ki te kaukau, ana he pai tonu, kāre he awangawanga te noho i te kainga. Pai ana mo ngā tamariki, me ngā mea o te kainga, te haere ki te awa ki te kaukau, kei konei ngā uri. Rahi tonu ngā mea mo ngā tamariki, maku tonu, te mahi kai, te eke hoio, ngā mea katoa, kāre ngā tamariki o te taone (Emma).
Translation:

At home there are lots of choices – going to the bush, growing kai, swimming in the river, good things! There are no worries at home. It’s healthy for children; the relations are there, and there are lots of things to do – growing kai, riding horses, all sorts of things the town kids don’t have (Emma).

Te Urewera was seen as a good place for some families “and moving out of the valley (for them) may not coincide with the values they hold, the values of being brought up on your marae, being close to your marae, being close to your whenua” (Marewa). Likewise, it was noted that people return to settle for these values and benefits, that is, to learn te reo and tikanga. “People choose to stay in Te Urewera because of their heritage and because this is one place they can call home. Children and rangatahi choose to stay because of their whānau and also for their grandparents so they can teach them their protocol” (April).

Participants generally thought that children were the most advantaged, as they grow up with te reo and tikanga, thus ensuring a “firm foundation” for their lives and a place in the community. There were also kaumatua (elders) who retire to, or remain in, Te Urewera. All those that we spoke to held kaumatua in high regard for the knowledge, wisdom, experience and security they provide in leading and guiding the community through cultural rituals, customs and protocols. “That’s why they [kaumatua] stay here, because they have a role to play” (Harry). It was also acknowledged that they too need support and people remain to care for them and to contribute to the community. “[X’s] father’s here, so he won’t move. There is that sense of responsibility to look after your own, you know, your elders’ (Tangi).

What this indicates, then, is that participants thought there was a demographic gap in the population from about 18-20 years old through to about 45-50 years as Miria observed: “You see the younger ones that you have left in the community, then you leave and when you come back they’re the kaumatua of the community”. If these things are true, there are a number of implications for social policy, community development, maintaining tikanga, role modelling for children, and overall community income. We are pursuing elsewhere the demographic breakdown of people residing in Te Urewera and these observations will be further investigated in that work. It is best summed up by the following:

Me titiro tātau ki ngā tamariki, me ngā rangatahi. Ka noho i reira nā te mea he tamariki tonu, te nuinga o ngā rangatahi kei te kura tonu, kei reira ngā whānau. Ko te hunga pakeke ake, wahine, tāne, te nuinga ano peā nā te mea i pakeke ake i reira, kore mahi hei haerenga, kua noho ki te kainga. Ka titiro tātau ki ngā mea, ki ngā kapara, te hunga kua moe tāne, kua moe wahine, whai tamariki, rangatahi. Karekau he waahi hei haerenga, kāre he mahi. Te hunga takakau, he āhua pērā ano peā. Ėtahi wā, ētahi whānau ka pakeke haere ka mutu te kura, kua noho ki te kainga he kore huarahi hei whai ma rātau, kia puta ai ki waho ki te kimi mahi. Engari ki te haere mai ētahi o ngā whānau, ka haere ki waho ana kua waimarie wētahi. Ko ngā pakeke māmā whai tamariki, karekau he hoa, āhua pērā ano, kia noho ki te kainga, nā te mea kei reira te nuinga o te whānau hai avwi ia rātau, hei whakapakeke i ngā tamariki, ētahi wā ano peā kua haere kua puta ki waho kua hoki mai ano ki te kainga he kore kītea he mahi. Ngā kuia me ngā koroua, kua eke ra i te taumata, kua pakeke, he āhua rahi tonu nā mea kua hoki mai ki te wā kainga, whakatū whare mo rātau, kua noho ngā paepae ngā mea hoki mai, noho tonu ai ki te kainga. Kua hoki nā te mea koira te wā kainga, ka kuia, ka koroua haere kua hoki mai. (Ngā mahara ki te kainga, ka whakahoki ia koe.) Nō reira koira pea ētahi kāre au e mōhio he aha i tua atu i wērā. Āhua penei te mea nei, ka hoki ki te kainga kei reira ra te whānau hei avwi ia rātau, ahakou he aha ngā piki me ngā heke, nā te mea kei reira hei tautoko, hei avwi i a rātau (Waiairani).
Translation:

Look at the children, and the young people. They remain there because they are still young and at school, and their families are there. Most of the adults who grow up there have no work to go to, so they just stay home. Get married, have children. Everyone’s like that. Sometimes, in some families, they grow up, finish school, and if they can’t find work there, then they go out and look for a job. Others may have children, but are single, and they stay home because the family is there to support them and the children growing up. Sometimes they go out, then come back if they can’t find a job. Elderly people reach retirement, and come home, build a house, sit on the paepae, and settle back into the community. They come back to the place of their beginning; remembering home brings about the yearning for it. That’s about it, really. And they come home to the family, to be embraced again. Despite any difficulties, the support and the embracing are there for them (Waiarani).

What are the advantages of staying?

Many advantages were given by participants for staying rather than leaving for education or employment. Most pointed to the strong cultural base for staying, being naturally immersed in the language, values, and tikanga, all actively practiced within Te Urewera. This provided a strong sense of identity and belonging, and was said by some that ‘stayers’ did not need to spend time ‘searching for themselves’. Most stayers also spent time working at the marae, with ‘mahi Māori’ reinforcing their identity and sense of worth.

Kia mau tonu ia rātau o rātau tikanga, me tō rātau reo” (Hinekiri).

Koinei tā ratau wa kainga. Nga marae, nga tikanga, nga kawa hoki o Tūhoe. Ka u tāua Tūhoe tanga ki roto i o ratau hinengaro… Ko nga tikanga hoki, te reo, ko te reo he mea nui. Whānaungatanga, te tiaki te manaaki i te tangata, wera mea katoa (Bella).

Translation:

They hold fast to their customs and their language (Hinekiri).

It’s about being at home. The marae, the customs, the protocol of being Tūhoe. That being essentially Tūhoe is deep within one’s mind; it’s the customs, too. And the language, which is the main concern. And being related to each other, and looking after people; all those things (Bella).

On a more practical note, many pointed to the easy lifestyle, with bush, horses, and the river, which were seen as good environments for both children and for general health. They were also able to provide whānau support, after school care, and help for community members. Some also mentioned the sense of pride in “keeping the home fires burning” for those who had to move away.

Single parents probably get more support back in Ruatoki than they would anywhere else, because there is a strong family structure (Hana).

For single people with children I reckon the accommodation is cheaper, it’s cheaper to bring your kids up here if you’re a single parent (John).

I found it easier to live, clothe my children because of the cost of living. It was cheaper and I had help, whānau support (April).

It always boils down to the dollar - ‘mēna he moni wa ratau’ [trans: if they have money] (Hera).
What are the disadvantages of staying?
A number of limitations were given, many of which are common in other research, such as limited employment and education opportunities, and limited access to health, postal, banking and other services (Kearns & Joseph, 1997). Lack of employment opportunities also meant a very common dependence on welfare benefits, and the risk of getting used to it.

No work, nothing here for our rangatahi, nothing here for our single people, no opportunities, nothing at all (Carol).

In Ruatoki, you’ve got haka, after that its booze, that’s the life we’ve got here, it’s like a state. They’re living on the state, they’re on benefits, and they’re getting used to it, and they need to get out of here to get away and get a job (Reginald).

It was also pointed out that there was little real diversity of choice in education in either Māori or English, and there was isolation, with no public transport, no shops, and no petrol station in the area for about 30 kilometres.

...having no petrol station here, that’s been a big disadvantage because now we have to travel further to get petrol...I think there’s been a big change with both the people and the community because of the loss of the petrol station, if you need to travel to get your petrol you need to have your car registered and warranted. Some of our people don’t have it. Some of them don’t have the money (April).

The point made by April refers to a lack of access to important resources. Getting petrol for the car is more than ‘filling up’. Vehicles support individual independence and also facilitate connectedness between whanau and communities within and outside of Te Urewera. This extra financial burden sometimes results in the driving of unregistered and unwarranted vehicles at the risk of incurring road transport fines and penalties by having to drive to Whakatane for petrol.

Others pointed out that ‘disadvantages’ were often related to the context and as Marewa observes: “I guess it depends on what scheme you buy into, if you buy into the Pakeha perspective of being successful, to accumulate wealth in the way of assets and monetary form then yes I think people are at a disadvantage at home”. It was also mentioned that shyness with outsiders, especially Pakeha, was a disadvantage in many ways, and that “…everybody knows your business in the community, that’s a disadvantage aye, you can’t go and do this… that’s a disadvantage of staying in Ruatoki, everybody knows your business” (Miria).

What changes have occurred in the community with people leaving?
Participants were able to voice a number of positive changes for ‘movers’ who leave the community. Foremost was that this led stayers, through exposure to movers who were entering into new settings, to become more aware of their rights to health, education and social services. “The community as a whole is really still the same…because people do go out and get educated and bring positive things into the community” (Maaka). They also pointed out that when movers returned, they were sometimes considered “middle-class relations” who eventually return and buy back land blocks, that is, land earlier confiscated for colonial settlement. These same people returning would also bring a “taste of what’s out there”, bring back new and interesting experiences, and bring an awareness and knowledge of the dramatic changes in schooling, tertiary and polytechnic education, and politics. This could lead to more opportunities for all.

On the negative side, it was reported that in Te Urewera values have changed. Participants observed that there was less respect for elders, young people have less discipline, and that people are less communal and more individualistic. Reginald told us: “…there’s no discipline these days, doesn’t matter if they stay here or out in the cities. They’ve lost that
whānaungatanga, our kids today, they talk back to their mothers and fathers, nannies”. They felt that children have experienced a loss of ‘whānaungatanga’ with fewer older people around, and that there are more gangs, booze, and dope around with fewer older people present to regulate and monitor what is happening.

Ka kite tātau ko ngā hua e puta mai nei, i ēra tu noho, kua noho wā tātau tamariki ki te inu pia, te kai i ngā tarutaru, wērā momo kai, kua ngaro te ahuatanga ki te titiro whakamua, whakawhanui ake wā rātau whakaaro, ki te whai i ngā mea e tika ana, te whakapakari ake ia rātau (Waiarani).

Translation:
We’ve noticed some consequences of staying here. Our children drink alcohol, smoke cannabis and that sort of stuff, and they lose their sense of perspective. They become limited; they loose track of what is right, of what would make them mature (Waiarani).

Some of the value changes have also brought less sustainability and resource sharing between fewer and fewer people.

How the community operates, you see change there. Where there used to be more communal based activities, like growing gardens, if there was something happening in the community, people would actually go and help, whereas now it’s more like, individual. So, instead of an iwi within an iwi, say like Ruatoki, then you break it down to hapu, its more hapu, and even sometimes it’s down to whānau. So whānau are doing their own thing (Harry).

The effects of these negative changes has meant some participants don’t want their family members to return, “Like I always say, this is a nice place to bring up kids, till they’re 18, you send them away, and a nice place to bring them back to retire. Between 18 and retiring, nah, I don’t want them back” (Carol).

Why do Tūhoe move away from Te Urewera?
The previous interviews conducted with those who had moved away from Te Urewera (Nikora et al, 2004) confirmed earlier research that employment and education were key reasons for moving (Butterworth, 1991). When those remaining were asked why Tūhoe move from Te Urewera, they produced the same two key reasons but with a difference. Most participants, like Barney, talked about moving away, whether for education, employment or other reasons, as a move for betterment or improvement, often saying that the person had gone “to better themselves”. Frequently, comments were about how the younger ones move away for better jobs, for better education, and for better opportunities. As we will see, this helps us make sense of one ironic finding. It is that those remaining at home, often struggling financially and in other ways will support those who have moved to the city. It is a way of supporting the younger ones to “better” their future. The other major reason given for people moving away was to be with family, since many had older siblings who had already moved. It made sense to be with family.

The social consequences for those left behind
Asking about the effects on those staying produced some unexpected answers covering both advantages and disadvantages. For the advantages, it was reported that moving away meant more room for those remaining, and less crowded accommodation.

 Ko te painga pea ko te nuinga hoki o ngā kāinga he tata e whitū, e waru te whānau kai roto i te whare kōtahi, ē, koirā pea tētahi o ngā painga, kua āhua tokoiti ngā tāngata ka mahue iho ki roto i te whare (Muriel).
Most of the houses at home have seven or eight people living in the one house, so when someone leaves, it means that there is more room (Muriel).

The implications of this are important when one considers the negative health consequences of overcrowding (Waldegrave, 2006). There was less stress on whānau with fewer people, and some reported being free from domineering older siblings (who had moved), or for parents, being free of their children who had grown into adults. Others gained roles to represent whānau in the community and elsewhere in roles left vacant. The notion of ‘vacancy’ is an important one but so too is that of ‘vacancy filled’ suggesting a vibrancy and continuity of households, whānau, community and all that that entails.

The most often reported disadvantage was mokemoke or acute loneliness. Some expressed this as a deep sense of loss, “It’s like a death. Losing people.”

When someone leaves home it’s like a death. When you have a death on your marae you might lose a kaumatua and basically they’ve taken with them the tikanga that they know, you feel a great loss...It’s like a tangihanga when they leave because you see them, you’re happy and then they leave again. The community changes because they start losing people” (Marewa).

Related to this is the perceived erosion of tribal identity as a consequence of moving away.

I’ve heard lots of talk about the children and the relations living in town. It’s said that some of them don’t even know their own...where they are from, what their tribal connections are...they should send their children home, so they can meet with their relatives here in the wa kainga (Barney).

Some concerns were more concrete like the immediate disadvantage of loss of work help and social support, as well as a financial strain of supporting students who had gone to the Waikato. Others mentioned the high telephone bills from frequent long distance calls.

About moving to the Waikato

Over time, many people from Te Urewera have chosen to move to the Waikato rather than Auckland or Wellington. For those interviewed, Waikato is seen very positively, it is beautiful and feels safe, and is described as a land of opportunities: jobs and tertiary education. The main attraction, of course, is that it is close to Te Urewera, being just under three hours away.

Kei reira ngā mahi, e āhei ana rātau ki te mahi [trans: there is work there that they are able to do] (Barney).

...he pai ake ki a au te neke ki reira he āhua pā tata mai, he āhua pā tata mai te kāinga [trans: It’s better to shift there because it is close, close to home] (Muriel).

Others commented that Hamilton is not too big like cosmopolitan Auckland but also not too small like some farming towns or nearby Tauranga or Rotorua. The iwi of Tainui were seen to practice and have similar cultural values to Tūhoe, which was good, and they considered Tainui iwi welcoming.
There’s a very strong Tūhoe community there and they’re very close knit...We actually recommend to our taiohi and our youth that they go to the Waikato because we know that they’ll be looked after (Atawhai).

There were also a few who commented more sceptically that there was nothing particularly about the Waikato or Hamilton, that Hamilton was ‘just’ another city where there were opportunities. One replied that “Anywhere is better (than Te Urewera); you just have to make it happen” (April).

**How did whānau members experience moving to the Waikato?**

On the whole, those remaining in Te Urewera gave similar stories about the process of moving to those who had moved. They reported that there were concerns about safety, about adjusting to a new place and new people, and about not finding a good place to stay or not having enough money.

*Can you afford to live there, are you sure you want to be going there right now, have you got a place to live in, have you budgeted your money, can you really afford the place and power, all your expenses. Can you feed yourself and your baby, and your boyfriend? Have you thought about it! (Miria).*

They similarly reported that the shift was made easier by whānau members already there in most cases.

*There’s some that’s already been in Waikato and the new ones that go there, they’ve got somebody to help them along and that in the Waikato (Anita).*

A difference from our earlier study (Nikora et al., 2004) was that while some participants similarly reported that the decision to move away took a lot of time and thought, some of those back home observed the move as sudden. People unexpectedly up and leave. In a few cases this was reversed and the person was said to be forced out with the best intentions in mind, for example, Tariana told us “I kicked my son out of my house so he could go and get educated and get a job!” The suddenness of some decisions might reflect reluctance on the part of the mover to make their intentions known so that those remaining would not be upset or try to stop them. The forcing out was usually either so the persons got out and “bettered” themselves or to make more space and accommodation for others who were growing up or to mark the end of parental obligations and responsibilities. It is likely that further inquiry will reveal that the suddenness is actually the culmination of a longer process of change, and merely looks sudden to outsiders.

**Hopes for those who moved away from Te Urewera?**

The main hope given by those remaining for those who moved away was that eventually they would come home. Some expected their whānau to move away for a long time, others did not. They wanted them to stay in regular contact, and to return for whānau crises like tangihanga (death rituals) or for Ahurei (the biennial tribal festival) and other special occasions. They also wanted them to retire to be near the marae, and contribute to the community. But they realized that they could only return if there were jobs, and jobs were the main reason why they would not return.

While wanting them to return, they also reported that while they were away they wanted them to do the best they could, to succeed, and to be happy. They wanted them to acquire skills, develop potential, and to take advantage of opportunities as noted by one participant of his son. Joseph hoped “…that he [his son] completes his farrier course, gets an apprenticeship, that’s supposed to be 3 years but the people he works with, his boss reckons he’ll be able to cut it down to 2 years”. They hoped people would return home with those skills and resources to share. Some reported on those they thought would not return at all. The reasons given for
this were if they married someone from some other iwi or of some other ethnicity, were too well paid where they were, and if their lifestyle had changed and they now thought it too laid back in the country whereas they had learned to like the fast life (i.e. city life). There was an opinion that coming home held little attraction for leavers. “I still don’t think there’s enough opportunities…I don’t think they can make a difference at this stage” (Atawhai). The overall theme was also that if they stayed away too long, then they would find it hard to fit back in again.

**What are the changes in whānau who move away?**

When asked about how those who moved away changed, there were both positive and negative changes mentioned. The *positive changes* were that they became more confident, more educated, more independent, better dressed, and more open-minded. For the *negative changes*, it was reported that they come back with “city folk syndrome”. “Being in the city they have gone and changed their ways of living…like being up their noses or being really picky about their foods” (Tiniwai). They may also tell the locals what to do, do not help at marae, do not like to get their hands dirty, think they are better than others, and are considered “whakaputa mohio” or “know it alls”. Anita commented that: “some of them…they bring their big shot thinking from the town back into the valley but we still put them in their place”

Having said this, however, a lot reported that their whānau members had not changed and they were the same people who had left. In the same vein, most reported that even if they had “city folk syndrome” they would still be considered Tūhoe because they have Tūhoe blood, and they have Tūhoe whakapapa; they remain connected to the place, and the people.

While not explicitly stated, from how the participants ‘talk’ about whānau members, they seem to have two different groups in mind – those who are close whānau like children and siblings who have not changed, and those who are perhaps not so closely related, like cousins and other extended whānau and hapu members who are described as having ‘city folk syndrome’.

**Contributions made to relationships while away**

Stayers saw their relationships with movers as a reciprocal one, with both sides contributing. Stayers provided strong whānau support to those away and supported them in “whatever they do”. They saw themselves as keepers of cultural knowledge and, as we saw earlier (Nikora et al., 2004), as “keeping the fires lit”. They ensure those away have a place to stay whenever they return, and they also saw themselves as filling in roles and attending events that the others could not return for.

Of special interest was that they reported covering the costs of phone calls, and providing funds to children or siblings who had moved away to pursue education, and even to some of those who had employment away. This has a certain irony.

*Well for those of us that are hunters we fill the (leavers) freezers up” (Joseph).*

*One of the main ones is that we actually supply some food from home, stuff like that they can’t grow there like kamokamo, kumara (Tiniwai).*

Despite the poverty in Te Urewera, there appeared to be a constant stream of remittances from Te Urewera to the Waikato to support whānau there (Fleming, Taiapa, & Pasikale, 1997; Taiapa, 1994) the expectation that this help would be reciprocated in the future. The contribution made by movers is more sporadic and an aspiration to be realised in the longer-term. In the short-term, movers were expected to help others from Te Urewera to move and set up in the Waikato, which made life easier for everyone including those back home. Stayers hoped that movers will return and share their knowledge, contacts, money, educational resources, and skills, and to provide whānau support in later years.
Discussion and Implications

The interviews with those remaining in Te Urewera showed many similarities to the interviews with those who moved (Nikora et al, 2004). In particular, the main stated reasons for going were clearly employment and education. They thought that those who went away, although still remaining Tūhoe, had changed even though they hoped that they would return at least in retirement. Beyond this, there were some themes that were much more prominent than for our earlier interviews with those who moved away (Nikora et al, 2004). We highlight some of these below.

Outflowing support

A common theme through the interviews was the strong role played by those remaining in Te Urewera in supporting those who move away. This includes comments about keeping the home fires burning, about being the ones to maintain cultural traditions, keeping a place open for those who visit or move back again, and remittances sent to students (especially) to help them financially. These were prominent themes in the present interviews but not when talking to those who had moved out. While appreciative of the people back home, those who had moved made little mention of any material support they were given.

The remittances sent to those who have moved out raise interesting questions of the informal movement of money in these communities. Those who were employed in the earlier interviews (Nikora et al., 2004) did not mention sending money to help out those back home, and it might only return to the community through fundraising activities, donations for bigger projects such as re-building marae, or through koha (Fleming, Taiapa, & Pasikale, 1997). This is worth investigating further to see how future generations might contribute to sustaining takiwa communities.

What is being drained out of the community?

A concerning theme is that of a perceived age-distribution gap between about 20 and 50 years. If true, we have mentioned several likely effects of this including a lack of good role-models for younger children, a lack of people to help out with heavy work, a gap in people to sustain traditional teaching models for children, and a lack of qualified people in trades and professions. This is worth pursuing further. The age gap also means that a whole middle-aged group that in other communities might be contributing funds for capital expenditures, which the younger and older folk cannot do, are not present in the community and might have weaker links to help out. This implies that the question of informal money flows is even more important to pursue. This will also involve questions not taken up in the present interviews about land use and home ownership in the region.

It is important to stress that most of the participants in this study came from the Ruatoki valley in Te Urewera. Tūhoe extends across many valleys including Ruatahuna, Waimana, Waiohau and Waikaremoana. Further investigation of the experiences of Tūhoe in these other settings is needed to draw an accurate picture of Tūhoe generally.

Tūhoe currently await the outcome of the Waitangi Tribunal’s recommendations to Government about their historical grievances. This study highlights issues that need to be factored into tribal, local and central policy development if the future for Tūhoe and their advancement is to be progressed.
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