

---

# **Te Hau Mihi Ata Mātauranga Māori and Science – Cross Cultural Dialogue**

---

Dr Robert Joseph  
Pro-Vice Chancellor Māori Office,  
University of Waikato,  
Hamilton  
New Zealand

November 2008

*Wānanga is my tradition as much as mātauranga.  
Creativity is my tradition as much as knowledge.  
- Royal 2006*

## **Contents**

Introduction.....	3
Method .....	4
Literature Review.....	4
i) Impact of Western Science on Māori Values .....	5
ii) Robust Relationships.....	8
iii) Constructive Conversations.....	11
iv) Cross Cultural Dialogue .....	15
A) Cross Cultural Dialogue Conceptually.....	15
B) Cross Cultural Dialogue Examples .....	19
Summary .....	61
References.....	63

# Te Hau Mihi Ata Mātauranga Māori and Science – Cross Cultural Dialogue

Dr Robert Joseph  
[rjoseph@waikato.ac.nz](mailto:rjoseph@waikato.ac.nz)

November 2008

*The truth revealed in dialogue is an impetus to action; a true idea is a principle of action. This is why genuine dialogue leads to a change of attitude.*<sup>1</sup>

## **Introduction**

The Te Hau Mihi Ata Mātauranga Māori and Science research project (the research project) will explore ways to link mātauranga Māori and western science. The purpose of the research project is to open a new creative knowledge space to unleash innovative thinking and cross-cultural connection that is unique to New Zealand which can be a source of untapped economic, social, environmental and cultural potential. The historic marginalisation of alternative value and knowledge systems has prevented quality engagement and dialogue between these two knowledge systems in New Zealand. The research project will develop, inter alia, a new inter-cultural dialogue process between Māori educated in western-based science and experts in mātauranga Māori.

The interface between these two knowledge systems will be explored through a series of facilitated exchanges to describe the nature of the knowledge gap between mātauranga Māori and western science and will focus on novel biotechnologies as a case study that clearly demonstrates a divergence of views and where transformational thinking has the potential to deliver innovation.

The aim of the research project is to demonstrate the power of the indigenous world view, when bridged to western science, to create innovative technologies, shape the future of science directions, and thus promote the recognition, vitalisation and continued evolution of mātauranga Māori. The objective of the research project is to develop a new group process and tools for dialogue between knowledge systems to facilitate the engagement of mātauranga Māori with science.

The research project will focus on biotechnology in order to build on the contributions of previous research in this science area.<sup>2</sup> Of particular interest to many Māori is the

---

<sup>1</sup> Mitias, M and Al-Jasmi, A 'Intercultural Dialogue' in *Dialogue and Universalism* (Vol. 3, No. 4, 2004) 143-161 at 144.

<sup>2</sup> Durie, M, 'Mana Tangata: Culture, Custom and Transgenic Research' (Essay for the Bioethics Council, online at [www.bioethics.org.nz/publications/himan-genes-reflections-jan04](http://www.bioethics.org.nz/publications/himan-genes-reflections-jan04)) (Accessed September 2007); Mead, A & Tomas, N, 'The Convention on Biological Diversity: Are Human Genes Biological Resources?' in *New Zealand Environmental Law Reporter* (July, 1995) at 127-132; Roberts, M, 'Walking Backwards into the Future: Māori views of genetically modified organisms' in *Inaugural Journal of the World Indigenous Nations Higher Education Consortium (WINHEC)* (2005); Royal, C, 'Te Kaimanga: Towards a new vision for Mātauranga Māori.' Online at [www.mkta.co.nz](http://www.mkta.co.nz) (Accessed September 2007); Tipene-Matua, B 'Having honest conversations about the impact of new technologies on Indigenous people's knowledge and values' (Conference paper, Mātauranga Taketake: Traditional Knowledge Conference, June 2006); and Te Momo, F 'Exposing Diversity: Uncovering common scientific values between biotechnology, Indigenous knowledge and Western knowledge' in *International Journal on Technology, Knowledge and Society* (Vol. 1, No. 6, 2005).

development of practical ways to facilitate in-depth dialogue to explore opportunities for research at the interface between mātauranga Māori and science which has a uniquely New Zealand innovation potential.

This paper will provide some insights from some of the literature that is currently available on various processes for negotiating a shared knowledge space for mātauranga Māori and western science.

## **Method**

The objective of the research project is to, inter alia, develop over time a reliable process by which two distinct systems of knowledge might meet and connect in an effective, respectful and productive manner. The research project provides a means by which established and new innovative tools can be created that effect constructive dialogue between mātauranga Māori and empirical science. A new dialogue process is needed and it requires a willingness to devise, adapt and consider a number of processes towards effective dialogue. This paper provides a preliminary review of relevant literature pertinent to the research project. The literature provided has been selected for the ‘Mauri Holders’ (mātauranga Māori experts and Māori scientists) to review so as to provide context for a discussion around processes for negotiating a shared knowledge space where mātauranga Māori and science can constructively engage, share and critique each other to build bridges not barriers in the following key areas (though not exhaustive) of the research project:

- The Impact of Science on Māori Values;
- Relationships;
- Constructive Conversations; and
- Cross Cultural Dialogue.

## **Literature Review**

Constructing knowledge is an important feature of maintaining the vitality of a culture as (cultural) knowledge must constantly expand and evolve to deal with new environments and situations. As cultural knowledge systems come into contact with each other and interact, the cross-cultural contact creates a stimulus for knowledge exchange and knowledge growth. Knowledge growth has an important role in improving the ability of the knowledge system to create understanding and enhancing the power of the knowledge system to create meaning. As Smith noted: ‘The resilience of a cultural knowledge system is dependent on its ability to respond to transformation and change, to adapt and explain new phenomena in a way that retains a sense of resonance and coherence with the existing philosophies and psychologies of their own knowledge system.’<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Smith, L, Hudson, M, Hemi, M, ‘Draft Te Hau Mihi Ata Paper, (Unpublished Paper, University of Waikato, Hamilton, 2008) at 1.

## **i) Impact of Western Science on Māori Values**

- 1) Durie, M, 'Understanding Health and Illness: Research at the Interface Between Science and Indigenous Knowledge' in *International Journal of Epidemiology* (Vol. 33, No. 5, 2004) at 1138-1143:

Durie provides some interesting context for research at the interface of science and Indigenous knowledge noting the contradictions at the interface that both western scientists and many Māori people experience on a daily basis and the creative potential that exists within the interface:

Contests about the relative validity of science or Indigenous knowledge are usually conducted on the assumption that one is inherently more relevant than the other. Hardly ever does such a polarized debate generate wisdom and seldom does it lead to the generation of new knowledge or fresh insights. Instead positions become more entrenched as proponents defend their ideological positions.

In practice, however, it is not unusual for scientists or Indigenous peoples to live comfortably with the contradictions of different bodies of knowledge. Many scientists subscribe to religious beliefs that cannot be explained by science, and many Indigenous people use scientific principles and methods in everyday life while at the same time holding fast to Indigenous values.

Rather than contesting relative validities, there are an increasing number of Indigenous researchers who use the interface between science and Indigenous knowledge as a source of inventiveness. They have access to both systems and use the insights and methods of one to enhance the other. In this approach, the focus shifts from proving the superiority of one system over another to identifying opportunities for combining both.

- 2) Hutchings, J & Reynolds, P, 'The Obfuscation of Tikanga Māori in the GM Debate' (Unpublished Paper, in author's possession, no date):

Hutchings and Reynolds present a counter-hegemonic response to the 'selected' use of Māori experts' perspectives on the GM debate which is allowing tikanga Māori to be redefined and reinterpreted to provide an acceptable analysis of this technology to legitimise the work of research, universities and government agencies thus supporting western science discourses. The paper discusses the consultation process of GM to Māori as well as provides a summation of diverse Māori concerns with regard to GM demonstrating the diversity of the Māori views opposing the GM debate. The paper cites an example of manipulating tikanga Māori to suit partisan ends vis-à-vis the GM debate:

There are some stories and customary examples of mixing human tapu [sacred] and organs with other species. The stories of the ancients are filled with examples of men and gods transforming themselves into other life forms. Maui ... turns himself into a kereru (native pigeon) to secretly follow his mother into the underworld. Wairaka ... calls on the gods to metaphorically turn her into a man to avoid and appease the tapu involved in her sailing a waka [canoe] to safety. The

customary ceremonies involved in eating the vital organs of a vanquished foe symbolise the victor taking the abilities of his enemy into his own physical body. In each of these examples, there is no significant and prohibitive norm that results in the actors being somehow culturally inappropriate.<sup>4</sup>

Hutchings and Reynolds conclude that although there has been a strong and consistent expression of concern by Māori about biotechnology and genetic engineering, there is little room to say no to the research. Dissent is managed and domesticated by various processes such as co-option of Māori people, government promotion of more dialogue and education of Māori communities, increasing funding and resources to regulatory bodies and the obfuscation of tikanga Māori knowledge. Western science takes precedence over any resistance to new technologies.

3) Roberts, M, Haami, B, Benton, R, Satterfield, T, Finucane, L, Henare, M, and Henare, M, 'Whakapapa as a Māori Mental Construct: Some Implications for the Debate over Genetic Modification of Organisms' in *The Contemporary Pacific* (Vol. 16, No. 1, Spring 2004) at 1-28.

The authors of this article provide an elaborate exploration of the concept of 'whakapapa' utilising the whakapapa origins of the kumara (sweet potato) as a case study. The authors believe the primary lesson learnt from the exploration of origins of the whakapapa of the kumara is that risk-taking can be beneficial. This situation occurs when younger people outsmart older people and when a 'trickster/hero' (Maui-like figure) takes dangerous risks on behalf of his/her people so that they may have access to new knowledge and technology. The paper states:

One might therefore conclude from these stories that normally prohibited actions are justifiable if the cause or purpose is correct (tika) or worthy and the potential benefits appear to outweigh the risks ... sometimes it is only through deliberately flouting culturally embedded norms that important and beneficial changes to society are brought about. (p. 22).

Māori ancestors were risk-takers and the question to ask is whether it is appropriate to take risks in the form of biotechnology and research for the greater good of humankind, or does tikanga Māori adapt to permit some parts of biotechnology? If so, what is important is that Māori control the rate and direction of tikanga adaptation regarding biotechnology and other controversial areas and that they control such political processes. Hohepa Kereopa provides some insight into tikanga Māori and biotechnology:

4) Hohepa Kereopa, the Ngai Tuhoe tohunga discusses the area of genetic engineering in an interesting manner in 'Genetic Engineering' in Moon, P, *Tohunga Hohepa Kereopa* (David Ling Publishing, Auckland, 2003) at 124-125. Kereopa notes:

As far as genetic engineering is concerned, I don't have a problem with it. ... Some people say that because everything has its own wairua, if you mix them

---

<sup>4</sup> New Zealand pro-biotechnology lobby groups, the Life Sciences Network (Inc), Paora Ammunson and Tamati Cairns, submission to the Royal Commission on Genetic Modification, sB(g), s2, s23. See the website: [http://www.gmcommission.govt.nz/pronto\\_pdf/nzlsn\\_wb\\_ip0024paora\\_ammunson.pdf](http://www.gmcommission.govt.nz/pronto_pdf/nzlsn_wb_ip0024paora_ammunson.pdf).

artificially, you are creating something you don't really know about, and you are damaging the wairua of those things. But I've always believed that if people are going to do genetic engineering, there are ways we will know if things are proper or not because each species, each plant and animal, is its own separate universe. So if two species are genetically engineered, and the experiment doesn't work out, it means that they have tried to put the wrong universe together. So some of those experiments I have heard about, they went well for a while, but then I found out that some of the animals developed all kinds of sicknesses, so that tells me that the wrong universes were combined. In other words, because everything does have its own wairua, it can protect itself from the wrong sort of genetic engineering, and will only work when the right universe comes along. So for me, I have no objection to genetic engineering.

5) Mead, Hirini Moko, *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori Values* (Huia Publishers, Wellington, 2003):

Professor Mead provides an overview of the underpinning values of Māori society as well as approaches to dealing with 21<sup>st</sup> century Māori society and its challenges. Professor Mead discusses mātauranga Māori: knowledge; extensions of tikanga Māori and Nga ahi e ngiha mai nei: the fires that flare up. In the latter chapter, Professor Mead mentions how Māori need to deal with issues that have not been addressed or discussed seriously which will eventually affect Māori such as genetic engineering, genetic modification, in-vitro fertilisation, organ transplants and surrogate motherhood, to site some examples. Māori need to identify a 'Māori' position on these and other issues and in attempting to discover a position, Professor Mead notes that Māori have to engage with tikanga Māori and its knowledge base – mātauranga Māori. Professor Mead then provides five tests to apply to new contemporary issues for Māori in the 21<sup>st</sup> century that include:

- The tapu aspect;
- The mauri aspect;
- The take-utu-ea or TUE test;
- The precedent aspect; and
- The principles aspect.

Under the principles aspect, Professor Mead mentions a number of sub-tests including:

- Whanaungatanga;
- Manaakitanga;
- Mana;
- Noa; and
- Tika.<sup>5</sup>

In many cases, Māori do not know how to deal with new contemporary issues and how to frame a position, while others insist there must be a tikanga Māori position. Professor Mead suggests the above five tests to assist with developing and justifying a tikanga framework for what may be called a Māori position on current contentious issues such as biotechnology. Old ideas and challenges can also be subjected to these

---

<sup>5</sup> Mead, Hirini Moko, *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori Values* (Huia Publishers, Wellington, 2003) at 335-351.

same tests to find some answers. Professor Mead warned however that the discussion be firmly based on mātauranga Māori, on Māori traditions and customs and the principles of tikanga Māori. After adopting the above tests, Mead asserts that it should be possible to decide whether it is right to adopt the new technology or the idea of genetic modification or organ transplants. In some cases the issues however, are so complex that these tests might not help at all. Mead asserts that Māori might have to be more accepting of news ways of improving life chances. Some decision making processes generate much soul searching, many discussions and result in a greater understanding of tikanga Māori.

Each of the above references allude, either implicitly or explicitly, to the importance of cross-cultural dialogue between mātauranga Māori and western science to open a new creative knowledge space to unleash innovative thinking and cross-cultural connection. A fundamental aspect of any dialogue process is robust relationships between both worldviews.

## **ii) Robust Relationships**

The Māori worldview and tikanga Māori emphasise the importance of relationships. Whānaungatanga embraces whakapapa and focuses upon relationships. Individuals expect to be supported by their relatives near and distant, but the collective group also expects the support and help of its individuals. Manaakitanga is about nurturing relationships, looking after people and being very careful about how others are treated. Māori acknowledge special relationships with nga Atua (the Gods), Papatuanuku (earth mother), the whenua and te Ao turoa (land, resources and the environment), tupuna (ancestors, the past), tamariki (children, the present), mokopuna (grandchildren, the future), whānau, hapū and iwi (socio-political groups). Establishing and maintaining good relationships between and within groups continue to be an important component of effective processes for cross-cultural dialogue.

1) Hudson, M, Ahuriri-Driscoll, A, Lea, M & Lea, R, ‘Whakapapa – A Foundation for Genetic Research?’ in *Bioethical Inquiry* (Vol. 4, 2007) at 43-49.

This article discusses whakapapa as a foundation of traditional Māori social structure and it perpetuates a value base that locates people through their relationships to the physical and spiritual worlds. As part of a new envirogenomics research programme, researchers at the Institute of Environmental Science and Research (ESR) are developing a study with the iwi Ngāti Rakaipaaka in Nuhaka, Hawkes Bay, to identify combinations of genetic and environmental factors that may contribute to current health status. Culture, ethics and politics all play a part in determining the Māori response to genetic studies. A Māori participant in genetic research is considerably more than the genetic material they submit for investigation because an individual is inextricably linked to their whānau, hapū, iwi and te Ao Māori through whakapapa which is the basis of cultural traditions, understandings and ways of knowing. Hence locating outcomes of genetic research within the ‘bigger picture’ is central to maintaining the integrity of te Ao Māori, in the midst of new and emerging biotechnologies.

The paper addresses Indigenous concerns about genetic testing and how whakapapa forms an integral part of the envirogenomics research programme, and how ESR is

seeking to engage iwi in a dialogical process about the potential benefits of genetic screening research, with a view to exercising caution in applying scientific possibilities to Māori realities. Māori can and should benefit from genetic research but how and whether this is the case should be a key consideration in any that is undertaken which requires honest cultural critique, reflection and reflexivity, both externally of, and internally within, the respective Māori community which includes good relationships.

2) Harmsworth, G, *A Collaborative Research Model for Working with Iwi* (Landcare Research, Palmerston North, July 2001):

Harmsworth helps to develop an effective collaborative research model outlining some of the key ingredients of successful collaborative research with iwi that included good relationships. Harmsworth concludes that collaborative research needs to be founded on a solid relationship that is not taken for granted and is maintained by ongoing dialogue, communication, reciprocal visits and networking. The proposal and the thinking that goes into it often take years rather than months to develop. A number of models can be used to develop future collaborative research and all involve relationship building, participatory research and collaborative learning. Although not an exhaustive and definitive report, some of the key findings are:

- Research proposals and collaborative research can only happen once a meaningful relationship is established;
- Credible relationships take a long time to build, but are critical to successful collaborative research;
- A very clear understanding of future relationships needs to be articulated at an early planning stage and may follow certain protocols;
- Research and project management capability, and human capacity, are pre-requisites for starting collaborative research projects;
- Building human capacity and developing collaborative research go hand in hand;
- Developing collaborative research with iwi and hapū requires adequate resources;
- Characterising important Māori issues at a national level will help identify collaborative research opportunities;
- Collaborative projects with iwi need to be evaluated using a wider set of criteria than just research or science outcomes.

3) Parr, R, *Te Mātāhauariki Methodology: The Creative Relationship Framework* (Te Mātāhauariki Institute, Occasional Paper, No. 5, University of Waikato, 2002):

The Te Mātāhauariki Institute was a FRST funded research institute at the School of Law, University of Waikato, originally headed by Judge Michael Brown. The overall objective of the programme was a contribution to an intellectual climate to realise a vision of socially inclusive laws and political and legal institutions in Aotearoa/New Zealand derived from two polyphyletic traditions, which will have sufficient flexibility and robustness to meet the future needs of the citizens of Aotearoa/New Zealand as individuals and as members of collectivities. Parr's paper was part of the institute's objective on bicultural methodology and consultation processes. Parr noted the importance of relationships when engaged in cross cultural research:

Relationships are potentially unlimited expressions of the creative dimension to human existence. They are also the substructure of the human experience. We experience ourselves in relation to that which we are not. It is only through our relationships with other people, places and events, that we exist as a knowable quantity, as an identifiable something. Everything is relative. By this process of coming to understand ourselves in relation to that which we are not, and understanding that in relation to us, we learn.

In all matters of inquiry or research, the principle is no different: the discovery is made in the sphere of the relative. Establishing a relationship as the centre of the process is to make explicit what is implicit and to understand and facilitate the processes of learning. Relationships must involve feelings. Accepting the role of feelings in a research endeavour may seem strange to those who insist that logical validity is enough. However, as Edward de Bono writes,

[U]ltimately, it must be feeling that matters most. Feeling is what makes a human being human. In the end it is to satisfy our emotions and values that we arrange our actions. It is this importance of feeling that makes thinking so necessary.<sup>6</sup>

Awareness of the feelings and values of individuals and collectives leads to understanding of the same. Understanding is necessary for emotional security, inclusion and acceptance. To establish a relationship as the central framework for the research process is to open the research endeavour, the research participants, and society to these possibilities. By discovering who we are in relation to other people, other events, other cultures, we define ourselves. We take the first step in creating our vision for the future, a vision for all New Zealanders. Once we recognise the differences among us, we can begin to understand them and to rejoice in the richness of diversity.

4) Tipene-Matua, B and Wakefield, B, 'Establishing a Māori Ethical Framework for Genetic Research with Māori' in Henaghan, M, *Genes, Society and the Future: Human Genome Research Project* (Te Kaupapa Rangahau Ira Tangata, Law, Ethics and Policy for the Future, University of Otago, 2007) at 379-422.

This report focuses on 'new genetics' or the expanding nature of research on genetic variation that analyses the genetic links to common diseases (e.g. cancer, diabetes) as opposed to single gene disorders such as Huntington's disease. New genetics is specifically about studying and identifying genetics of more common diseases and the possibility of much more rapid and large scale analyses of factors contributing to diseases which Māori and other Indigenous Peoples suffer from disproportionately. As links between genetic variation and the health of certain populations (including Māori) continue to be made, issues arise that are primarily driven by ethical, social and political influences.

This research involved analysing relationships between health benefits from genetic testing of newborns and any cultural, spiritual or ethical issues this testing may raise. The paper examined Māori collective tribal responsibilities and individual rights with regard to the access to and use of human genetic material.

---

<sup>6</sup> De Bono, E, *Teaching Thinking* (Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, U.K, 1976) at 41.

### **iii) Constructive Conversations**

The historic marginalisation of alternative value and knowledge systems has prevented quality cross-cultural engagement and dialogue between knowledge systems. Constructive conversations are critical to develop a process by which two distinct systems of knowledge might meet and connect in an effective manner.

1) Du Plessis, R, 'Democracy, participation and 'scientific citizenship': New Zealand Initiatives' (Paper presented to the Policy and Politics International Conference on 'Policy and Politics in a Globalising World', Bristol, 24-26 July 2003):

Du Plessis reflects on the initiatives of the Royal Commission on Genetic Modification (2000-2001) as a major exercise in 'scientific citizenship' in New Zealand, followed by the general election in which state regulation of genetic modification and new biotechnologies were significant issues. Du Plessis analyses the challenges confronting those experimenting with interventions directed at dialogic discussion between Māori and non-Māori members of community organisations and other actors in the biotechnology industry.

Involvement in consultation processes about genetic modification and other new technologies is increasingly defined as a responsibility of citizens, and scientific organisations invite citizens to actively engage with scientists in science-focused discussion. Global shifts in the responses of governments and scientific organisations to science and technology politics and increasingly dissatisfaction with conventional democratic processes constitute the context for the constructive conversations research programme. Du Plessis notes however, that attempts at dialogue can perpetuate old inequalities between participants and consolidates differences between 'lay' panellists and 'experts,' even in environments that are dedicated to public participation and deliberative democracy which in turn undermines one's citizenship rights and responsibilities.

The paper calls for attention to the need to involve diverse publics in decisions about applications of genetic technologies and suggests that there has been little attention to the 'diverse' and often complex views and responses of actual or potential 'consumers' of new technologies. The constructive conversations project is directed at enhancing public participation in decision-making about emerging health biotechnologies and analyses what members of community organisations have to say about the social issues associated with these technologies. Crucial to the project is attention to Māori definitions of the issues associated with emerging health biotechnologies and the use of Māori conversational strategies in facilitating talk about these issues, hence the importance of kawa, tikanga and ritenga as being a key part of the process when working with Māori.

The process is informed by Māori cultural conventions for engaging in conversation about issues of controversy, draws on international and local experience of focus groups, consensus conferences, panels and dialogic workshops directed at involving members of the public in discussion about science and technology. Following reconvened focus groups with key actors, day long workshops were held bringing together research participants for discussion of issues arising out of the focus groups. The final stage of the project involved talking to policy makers about the relevance of the findings of the project for their work.

2) Cram, F, Phillips, H, Tipene-Matua, B, Parsons, M and Taupo, K ‘A ‘Parallel Process?’ Beginning a Constructive Conversation about a Māori Methodology’ in *Journal of Bioethical Inquiry* (Vol. 1, No. 1, 2004) at 14.

This article explores the roles of a sub-group of Māori researchers working in a larger, mainstream research project. As the title suggests, the article documents the beginning of a constructive conversation about establishing a parallel process as a more appropriate Māori methodology when working with Māori. A concern emerged about ensuring that the methodologies developed for dialogue are appropriate for Māori to allow for the investigation of Māori responses to specific applications of biotechnology. The project examined the usefulness of dialogue processes as a way of gaining greater public participation in decision-making about biotechnology. The process effectively means that a Māori team collects and analyses the Māori research data prior to re-engaging with the full research team. The paper suggests that a Treaty-based relationship in which all parties to the research engage and contribute effectively is critical. While there is a level of certainty about how this process will play itself out, there was a commitment to continue a constructive conversation within the team and to journey together in good faith and trust which is required for negotiating a shared knowledge space where mātauranga Māori experts and science experts can engage effectively.

3) Durie, M, ‘Understanding Biculturalism’ (Paper prepared for Kokiri Nga Tahī Hui, Gisborne, 1994) at 14-15.

Mason Durie set out some principles for reaching agreement between Māori groups and the Crown in this unpublished paper. Although the principles are framed within a legal-political context, the principles are germane for the Te Hau Mihi Ata project of negotiating space at the interface of mātauranga Māori and western science:

Principle 1 – Time:

Relationships take time to develop and agreements take even longer. Haste is seldom a recipe for successful negotiation.

Principle 2 – Active Commitment:

Consensus requires that there be an active desire to reach agreement. Unless there is a commitment search for areas of agreement, disagreement will dominate relationships.

Principle 3 – Common Goals:

Consensus will be more likely if goals common to all parties can be identified. Generally Māori and the Crown agree that-

- The environment must be managed in a sustainable way
- The needs of future generations must be considered
- Disparities must be eliminated

Principle 4 – Respect for Differences:

Consensus will be sweeter if each side is a winner. The advantages for each should be clear, though they may be quite different in nature. What is important is that a consensus agreement contains mutual benefits within overall common goals.

These principles provide important ideas relevant to the process of consultation which takes time, requires negotiation of relevant issues and a clear understanding of the parameters of the issue, and agreement in the objectives of the consultative process.

4) Stokes, E, 'Bicultural Methodology and Consultative Processes in Research: A Discussion Paper' (Department of Geography, University of Waikato, 1998):

The late Dame Evelyn Stokes provides an insightful and useful paper on appropriate methodologies for cross-cultural research. Her contents include discussion on biculturalism, legal pluralism, marae justice, the Treaty claims process, consultative processes, representation, Māori attitudes to knowledge, doing research in the Māori world, and tikanga Māori and socio-legal research. Her section on consultative processes discusses some of the strengths and pitfalls of cross-cultural research and appropriate processes for such research. Dame Evelyn noted the following:

My underlining assumption is that research methods should be worked out in the context of the particular situation. The researcher must set out his or her own role, along with the nature of the topic, objectives and all surrounding circumstances, before embarking on a project. In other words, it is necessary to have a clear idea why one is setting out on a particular journey before establishing the best route to follow....

It is not possible to do research in a cross cultural situation without an understanding of both cultures. The Oxford Dictionary provides a similar range of meanings for consult: take counsel with; seek information or advice from a person, book etc. There is no requirement in any of these meanings to accept the advice or information sought, but taking into account the interests of a person or group consulted certainly implies some intent

Consultation is the noun derived from the verb to consult which means 1) to ask advice from someone, 2) to refer to for information such as a book or map, 3) to have regard for a person's feelings, interests, etc; to consider. Consultation is the act of consulting or a conference for the discussion or the seeking of advice.<sup>7</sup>

The selection of an informed group invited to a meeting to express their opinion also has some inherent difficulties in process not least being in deciding whom to invite, and whether such individuals represent their own opinions, or speak for a larger group. A lack of dissent at a hui does not mean consent or agreement. Almost invariably, silence means dissent or opposition, but people may feel they have no power to change anything, so say nothing.

There are many factors to consider when deciding on appropriate consultative processes. The fundamental issues to be thought through include having a clear idea of what is to be achieved, why consultation is necessary – to acquire information, opinion, educate people, or reinforce one's prejudices – and who should be consulted to achieve what is wanted. If the purpose of consultation is to achieve some consensus, then this has to be spelled out clearly. Maybe, there will be differences of opinion. Perhaps mediation, facilitation or arbitration are more appropriate processes, or perhaps simply the recording of a range of opinions will suffice. No rules can be set down but the objective of the consultative process must be clear to all participants.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> *Collins Concise English Dictionary* (New Zealand Edition).

<sup>8</sup> Stokes, E, 'Bicultural Methodology and Consultative Processes in Research: A Discussion Paper' (Department of Geography, University of Waikato, 1998) at 2, 32-34.

5) Smith, Linda Tuhiwai, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (Zed Books, London, University of Otago Press, 1999):

Dr Linda Smith's book is a seminal piece on inter alia, research methodologies. The book is a counter-story to Western ideas about the benefits of the pursuit of knowledge. Looking through the eyes of the colonised, cautionary tales are told from an Indigenous perspective, tales designed not just to voice the voiceless but to prevent the dying – of people, of culture, of ecosystems. The book is particularly strong in situating the development of counter-practices of research within both Western critiques of Western knowledge and global Indigenous movements. Informed by critical and feminist evaluations of positivism, Dr Smith urges researching back and disrupting the rules of the research game towards practices that are more respectful, ethical, sympathetic and useful, versus racist practices and attitudes, ethnocentric assumptions and exploitative research. Using Kaupapa Māori, a fledgling approach towards culturally appropriate research protocols and methodologies, the book is designed primarily to develop Indigenous Peoples as researchers. Dr Smith begins to articulate research practices that arise out of the specificities of epistemology and methodology rooted in survival struggles, a kind of research that is something other than a dirty word to those on the suffering side of history.

Dr Smith's work encourages Indigenous Peoples to undertake research that uses methods that are culturally sensitive and appropriate instead of those which assume that research and research methods are culture free and that researchers occupy some kind of moral high ground from which they observe their subjects and make judgments about them. The second part of the book on different more appropriate approaches and methodologies for Indigenous Peoples, ought not to be read as a 'how to' manual but as a series of accounts and guidelines that map out a wide range of research-related issues. Significant spaces have been opened up within the academy and within some disciplines to talk more creatively about research with particular groups and communities – women, the economically oppressed, ethnic minorities and Indigenous Peoples. These discussions have been informed as much by the politics of groups outside the academy as by engagement with the problems that research with real, living, breathing, thinking people actually involves. Communities and Indigenous activists have openly challenged the research community about such things as racist practices and attitudes, ethnocentric assumptions and exploitative research, sounding warning bells that research can no longer be conducted with Indigenous communities as if their views did not count or their lives did not matter.

Dr Smith notes that Indigenous methodologies tend to approach cultural protocols, values and behaviours as an integral part of methodology. They are 'factors' to be built in to research explicitly, to be thought about reflexively, to be declared openly as part of the research design, to be discussed as part of the final results of a study, and to be disseminated back to the people in culturally appropriate ways and in a language that can be understood which is simply part of an ethical and respectful approach. There are diverse ways of disseminating knowledge and of ensuring that research reaches the people who have helped make it. Two important ways not always addressed by scientific research are to do with 'reporting back' to the people and 'sharing knowledge.' Both ways assume a principle of reciprocity and feedback.

In New Zealand, work is being carried out in terms of bicultural, partnership and multi-disciplinary research. Others have developed ways of working with Indigenous Peoples on a variety of projects in an ongoing and mutually beneficial way, which is the heart of the Te Hau Mihi Ata research project – to explore ways to link mātauranga

Māori and western science. Dr Smith's work is of invaluable assistance in this and many other areas with developing new inter-cultural dialogue processes between two world views and cultural epistemologies.

6) Denzin, N, Lincoln, Y and Smith, L, (Eds.) *Handbook of Critical Indigenous Methodologies* (SAGE Publications Inc., California, 2008):

This handbook makes connections regarding many of the perspectives of the new critical theorists and emerging Indigenous methodologies. The handbook extends beyond the investigation of qualitative inquiry itself to explore the Indigenous and non-Indigenous voices that inform research, policy, politics and social justice. The authors explore in depth some of the newer formulations of critical theories and many Indigenous perspectives and they seek to make transparent the linkages between the two. The handbook is an authoritative resource for researchers, scholars, and students in education, sociology, psychology, area studies, Native American studies, post-colonial studies, and women's studies.

#### **iv) Cross Cultural Dialogue**

This section of the literature review focuses on cross cultural dialogue. The section is organised into two sub-sections. The first sub-section will discuss cross cultural dialogue conceptually, while the latter will provide some practical examples and suggestions on how to appropriately engage in cross-cultural dialogue processes.

##### **A) Cross Cultural Dialogue Conceptually**

1) Mazzocchi, Fulvio, 'Western Science and Traditional Knowledge' in *Viewpoint: EMBO Reports* (Vol. 7, No. 5, 2006) at 463-466:

Mazzocchi however, provides a good discussion on the importance of dialogue across cultures:

A renewed approach to dialogue among cultures is required. Such a dialogue can only take place if there is a common principle shared by all participants. ... By acknowledging the uniqueness of each knowledge system, we can go well beyond a mere pluralist approach to knowledge. Dialogue can become a tool for social cohabitation as well as for discovering and enhancing knowledge. ... this dialogue should take place with the unknown and the otherness. By shifting our perspective and looking at other paths to knowledge that humans have developed and lived, we might create the necessary conditions for hitherto unknown knowledge to be revealed. All of these experiences describe the human experience of reality. ... Western science and traditional knowledge constitute different paths to knowledge, but they are rooted in the same reality. We can only gain from paying attention to our cultural history and richness.

2) Te Momo, Fiona, *Socially and Culturally Sustainable Biotechnology in Aotearoa/New Zealand: A Report on the Social, Cultural, Religious, and Spiritual Dimensions of Biotechnology for Māori* (Report prepared for Professor Judy Morton, Massey University, Auckland, no date):

Te Momo's paper provides a brief description on the research of Māori knowledge explaining social, cultural, religious and spiritual dimensions that exist in Te Ao Māori vis-à-vis biotechnology. Te Momo notes that dialogue with Māori on issues pertaining to biotechnology, genetic engineering and genetic modification is mainly driven by the agenda of government by fulfilling Treaty of Waitangi obligations and adhering to legislative requirements under the Resource Management Act 1991; or the business sector working with communities that may be affected by scientific research.

In terms of process, Te Momo noted that when approaching Māori communities to inform and work with Māori more appropriately, include the Māori language, pitch the issues to a lay person's understanding, be prepared for criticism and to work through broad issues, provide refreshments and time for feedback, resource the research properly, modify the research approach to be flexible, accept feedback without influencing dialogue; and keep the topics brief and broad. Non-Māori need to understand the Māori position(s) regarding sustainability of social, cultural, religious and spiritual dimensions of biotechnology for Māori.

3) Jenkins, Kuni, 'The Hui Taumata 2005 Vision: To Expand Māori Economic Pathways: Creating, Growing and Succeeding in our Future Together – Ka Hua, Ka Tupu, Ka Toa. Learning for Life through Cross-Cultural Dialogue' (Te Hui Taumata 2005 Conference, Wellington, 2005):

Jenkins, along with Alison Jones, issues a poignant warning when engaging in cross-cultural dialogue in this paper:

Alison Jones and I joined on a research project to study texts and their readings in order to assess the *terms* of contemporary possibilities for cross-cultural dialogue or 'understanding', and what the possibilities for today's relationships between Māori and Pakeha looked like. It was soon obvious that there were different meanings between the groups. A lesson in learning for life was to be found in our project as the struggle over 'whose meanings count, and what counts as meaning'. These become 'hotly contested issues' even when the dominant group protest that they want meaningful dialogue to take place. Jones suggests that:

*'calls for dialogue by the dominant white group are largely unconscious romantic desires for absolution and redemption – experienced when the other [Māori] gives attention to dominant group assertions that 'I want to understand'.*

Jones went further to claim that such dialogue is an:

*... imagined unity-through-dialogue requir[ing] the other [Māori] to "love me! teach me!" and to open up their 'territory' of experience and belief to the scrutiny of the dominant group yet again.*

The desire to learn, to be taught through a caring loving approach is not a new pedagogical strategy. Within the cross-cultural dialogue that Jenkins and Jones have been exploring, the element of desire is critical to the kinds of relationships that might develop between Māori and Pakeha.

Politicians and marketers are likely to easily identify with what Jones is saying about desire in terms of the way that education has become just another commodity, a product – in this case cross-cultural dialogue in education – desire and allure are essential elements to create if the product is to be popular with the client. The language of the market is about being ‘sexy’ about ‘tarting up’ the product, making it attractive and enticing, to increase the desire of the client. ‘Teach me! Love me!’ has a place in learning for life.

- 4) Agrawal, A, ‘Indigenous and Scientific Knowledge: Some Critical Comments’ in *IK Monitor* (Vol. 3, No. 3, 2004, online at <http://www.nuffic.nl/circan/ikdm/3-3/articles/agrawal.html>) (Accessed September 2008):

Agrawal suggests that contact, diversity, exchange, communication, learning and transformation among different systems of knowledge and beliefs are a normal function of knowledge production. He argues that notions of Indigenous knowledge and western science are relationally positioned terms, often situated in the context of the colonised and coloniser, and to successfully build new epistemic foundations, accounts of innovation and experimentation must bridge the Indigenous/western divide.

- 5) Okere, T, Njoku, C and Devisch, R, ‘All Knowledge is First of All Local Knowledge: An Introduction’ in *Africa Development* (Vol. XXX, No. 3, 2005) at 1-19:

Okere et al highlight the potential for cultural nodes of knowledge to positively contribute to the “commonwealth of world knowledge” through vertical and horizontal border-linking exchanges. They argue that a unique genius and distinctive creativity underlie the production of knowledge in any cultural context and that it is necessary to empower cultures to work on and appropriate the riches within their own local knowledge tracts. Integrating new relationships with knowledge in a way that retains a sense of resonance and coherence with the existing philosophies and psychologies of their own knowledge system is a necessary action, but it is one that likely occurs subsequent to the dialogue. It is only through the empowering of cultures to work on and appropriate the riches within their own local knowledge tracts that communities will re-acquire the cultural dignity and self-confidence to engage in knowledge exchange and the qualitative transformation of knowledge culture through the ‘integration of new insights and perspectives, technologies and practices which have proved their richness, superiority and greater functionality.’

- 6) Gurevitch, Z.D, ‘The Power of Not Understanding: The Meeting of Conflicting Identities’ in *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science* (Vol. 25, 1989) at 161:

Gurevitch notes that attempts to establish dialogue between conflicting identities usually focuses on mutual understanding and the common, while downplaying the elements of the conflict and ignoring the elements of otherness, which is especially important for conflicts in which the other is the opposite of the self. Gurevitch suggests that real dialogue requires that the parties first acknowledge this otherness as the distance between them. For dialogue to be an egalitarian meeting of equals, Gurevitch contends that every attempt at understanding requires not more explanation but first the power to not understand. This process recognises each other's freedom to exist as an 'other' and the freedom to participate on an equal basis as a free independent party to the dialogue. This is particularly important for Indigenous communities still marginalised within the hegemonic structures of post-colonial societies.

- 7) Mutu, Margaret, 'Dialogue as Social Self-Organization: An Introduction' in Hammond, S and Sanders, S.L, *Emergence* (Vol. 4, Issue 4, December 2002) at 7-24:

According to Margaret Mutu, the success of dialogic relationships depend on the ability of those who do not understand Māori values to acknowledge this lack of understanding, thus allowing a way forward in which both groups are able to share and respect each other's knowledge. Once the power to not understand has been established the foundation exists for better understanding of the other's knowledge and an enhanced awareness of self-knowledge.

- 8) Sarris, Greg, *Keeping Slug Woman Alive: A Holistic Approach to American Indian Texts* (California University Press, California, 1993) at 6:

Sarris notes that if we accept that the resilience of a cultural knowledge system is dependent on its ability to respond to transformation and change, then the level of openness to dialogue and confidence to develop new relationships with knowledge becomes a key attribute. As the process of dialogue and movement through understanding creates an environment where a person has to reconsider the nature of their relationships with themselves, with others and with knowledge, then participants must be aware of their boundaries, both personal and cultural, so that they might know the limits on and possibilities for understanding one another in an exchange.

The boundaries that form generalised dimensions of difference are the philosophical, the moral, the political, and the technological. The philosophical dimension involves the exploration of the spiritual understandings, systems of meaning (epistemological and ontological positioning) which essentially explores the relationship between the person and the intangible and unknown worlds. The technological dimension is concerned with the relationship between the person and various types of tangible knowledge and technology. This includes how they assess the validity and evidential worth of information. The moral dimension considers the range of values and ethics that inform their behaviours and expectations of their relationships with others. However, it is actually a barometer of their relationship with the inner self. In contrast, the political dimension is concerned with the relationship between the person and others in terms of identity, position and power.

Therefore, dialogue in each of these domains facilitates not only the understanding of the other but an understanding of the self. As Sarris notes ‘for cross-cultural communication to be open and effective, that is, in understanding another person and culture, you must simultaneously understand yourself. The process is ongoing, an endeavour not aimed at a final transparent understanding of the ‘Other’ or of the ‘Self’, but at continued communication, at an ever widening understanding of the ‘Both.’ A more “transparent” sense of one’s own culture is made most possible by in-depth understanding of the other.

- 9) Ausberger, D, ‘An Existential Approach to Anger-Management Training’ in *Journal of Psychology and Christianity* (Vol. 5, 1986) at 25-29.

Ausberger’s relevant classic statement regarding this research project is: “To know only one culture can mean that I know no culture. In knowing a second and a third culture, I discover the enriching wisdom of paradox: Things assumed to be universal are also specific, things absolute are relative, and things simple are also complex.’

## **B) Cross Cultural Dialogue Examples**

Having discussed the notion of cross cultural dialogue in depth conceptually, it is now important to illustrate cross cultural dialogue in practice where possible. However, this section will first outline possible Pacific cross cultural dialogue models and then a number of Māori and other examples in New Zealand and elsewhere.

- 1) Ministry of Social Development, *Pacific Youth Development Strategy: Deliver Positive Life-Change and Affirmation for All Pacific Youth in Auckland* (Ministry of Social Development, Auckland, June 2005):

The objective of this report is to articulate development strategies with action projects that will deliver positive life-change and affirmation for all Pacific youth in Auckland. The focus and format of the strategy was to genuinely reflect and effectively respond to the issues identified by Pacific young people and from the input of the External Reference Group. The report discusses the important Pacific notion of dialogue termed *talanoa* which is relevant to the Te Hau Mihi Ata research project. The report defines *talanoa* as:

A traditional Pacific process that has similar meanings in many Pacific languages. Talanoa means to have a conversation, to relate something, or simply to ‘talk story.’ Talanoa is based on principles of reconciliation, inclusion, honesty, respect for each other as individuals, respect for the rich Indigenous and other cultural traditions of the Central Pacific, and respect for spirituality, human values, aspirations for economic and social justice, and basic constitutional principles.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Ministry of Social Development, *Pacific Youth Development Strategy: Deliver Positive Life-Change and Affirmation for All Pacific Youth in Auckland* (Ministry of Social Development, Auckland, June 2005) at 5.

The report seeks to model, deploy and manage a Talanoa consultative process to formulate a Pacific Youth Development Strategy for Auckland that is jointly owned, endorsed, informed and implemented by the Pacific community, its youth, government and non-government service and funding agencies. In doing so, it highlights the integrity and inclusiveness of the Talanoa process.<sup>10</sup> Accordingly, a talanoa process was used in formulating the Ministry of Social Development's strategy for working effectively with Pacific youth in the greater Auckland region which included cross-cultural dialogue and a collective and collaborative approach. The report added:

The talanoa process ensured that a collective and collaborative approach was taken in formulating the strategy. It achieves this by providing a respectful environment in which the views of all participants can be heard, discussed and incorporated in the final outcome or product. Based on the platform of information through extensive consultation with Pacific young people, the External Reference Group used the Talanoa process to discuss the information, explore issues and ideas, and to provide feedback as the strategy developed. The extensive consultation with young people, from a range of areas, including school, church and community based groups ensured the strategy has been fully informed by young people themselves. The robust nature of the Talanoa process and the extensive consultation with young people which underpinned it, has resulted in a strategy which has strong buy-in from those who participated in its development and remains focused on the needs and views of young people.<sup>11</sup>

- 2) Kēpa, Mere and Manu'atu, Linitā, 'Pedagogical Decolonization: Impacts of the European/Pākehā Society on the Education of Tongan People in Aotearoa, New Zealand' in *American Behavioural Scientist Journal* (Vol. 51, No. 12, August 2008) at 1801 – 1815:

This article is an invitation to engage critically in the discussion of Indigenous languages and cultures and the implications for pedagogical decolonization. Among the issues raised are questions on the impacts of the beliefs, values and attitudes of the prevailing New Zealand European/ Pākehā society on the aspirations and education of Tongan students in the secondary sector of the education system. The article draws attention to the social and cultural contestations in affirming the place of Tongan people in secondary schooling in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Kēpa and Manu'atu refer to the Tongan notion of talanoa or a Pōtalanoa framework in the article as follows:

*Pōtalanoa* is a framework that does not limit Indigenous peoples' capacity to understand the complexity and richness of the Indigenous cultural milieu. *Pōtalanoa* is a framework enabling Indigenous peoples to understand the relationship of schooling in promoting and hindering the development of internal strength, 'feeling at home' within the educational environment, and the capacity to transform social and educational relationships that reflect the ideas, perspectives, interests, and activities of [educational institutions].<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid at 6.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid at 5.

<sup>12</sup> Kēpa, Mere and Manu'atu, Linitā, 'Pedagogical Decolonization: Impacts of the European/Pākehā Society on the Education of Tongan People in Aotearoa, New Zealand' in *American Behavioural Scientist Journal* (Vol. 51, No. 12, August 2008) at 1802.

*Pōtalanoa* is a verb and a noun. The noun *pō* refers to the night. The verb *talanoa* means to talk, to tell stories from the past, and to relate experiences of daily living. As a noun, *talanoa* is the talk, the story, or the tale. As an approach to learning, *pōtalanoa* enables Tongan people to unfold insights into schooling as it is practiced in Aotearoa. Conceptualising schooling as a cultural and political activity means including Tongan language into the learning process whereby Tongan people can connect with the place of their experiences and relationships to their culture through dialogue. For example, through *talanoa* in the *pō*, anxious and frazzled parents talk with each other, the principal, and the Board of Trustees about our children's schooling.<sup>13</sup> At the heart of *pō talanoa* is the capacity of Tongan people to relate with each other within a place based on kinship ties, faith, work, familiar experiences, knowledge, and so forth.

The significance of *pōtalanoa* lies in Tongan people's capacity to *tatala* and *fakatalatala* critically about the historical, political, philosophical, and cultural underpinnings of education in relation to them. The word *tatala* can allude to a variety of contexts. As a verb, *tatala* depicts some kind of movement, such as to remove, to take off, or to unwrap a cover surrounding a parcel and to unfold a roll of *tapa* cloth. Most important, it can mean to open a person's mind, body, and spirit to different viewpoints about something. In the latter sense, it could be said that *tatala* implies a separation of things that are connected by a multiplicity of layers or a network of something. ... In another sense, to *tatala* can mean to draw together fragmented bits of information to create clarity about schooling and culture. It should be highlighted that the parents bring with them a fragmented and vague perception of schooling and it is through *tatala* that they can connect and relate the bits of information, thereby coming to understand more deeply what is going on in school.

The word *fakatalatala* is produced by the causative prefix *faka* and by reduplicating the verb *tala*. Like *tatala*, *fakatalatala* alludes to a movement to separate, disentangle, release, or detach something. Thus it can be said to mean to unravel, to disentangle, or to separate out something. For instance, *fakatalatala* is useful in creating a sense of working together in a spirit of emergent understanding of the idea that a principal and teachers know what is best for Tongan students in school. No meaningful learning will take place if the process is devoid of context and practice. Consider for a moment that the tutors encourage the students to *fakatalatala* their misunderstandings and confusion about concepts they learn in mathematics in the English language. In the case of a mathematical problem, *fakatalatala* contributes to clarifying the steps of systematic working to foster understanding. By appropriating *tatala* and *fakatalatala*, the relationships between ideas and subject content are queried and knowledge is shaped. Conceptualising learning mathematics as a dialogical process means making sure that the students know how to carry out mathematical tasks competently and confidently.

*Pōtalanoa* can be produced not only by the interests of the people but through the *mālie* (social bonding) they experience when they talk together. ... *Mālie* is a verb, a noun, an adverb, and an adjective. It should be emphasised that actions produce

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid at 1812.

mālie, as the doers and the actors are forming meaningful and transforming relationships that can only be beneficial and advantageous to them in a ‘connected’ way, not in any exploitative way. Being connected refers to a holistic relationship between people and place. Because mālie espouses a philosophy of process, energy and transformation, it is central to Tongan people’s pursuit of what it means to live life to the fullest potential. As a value, it draws on Tongan language that provides insights into cultural meanings that the people construct to make sense of the relationships they form with each other and with other people in school. Warm relationships, communication, and the exchange of ideas and experiences are important dispositions in strengthening the people’s understandings of how [educational institutions] protect and support programs in school. ... *Mālie* then refers to relationships that Tongan people create when shaping their worldview and knowledge. Cordial, tender, and joyful relationships are paramount for vibrant communities and the realisation of Tongan people’s critical education. ...

As a conceptual framework, pōtalanoa suggests ways to dialogue in a complex way about the cultural and social forces on schooling. Pōtalanoa contributes ways to understand how schooling is socially constructed and structured; how Tongan people are produced, reproduced, and positioned by the arrangement. It renders ways to apprehend how the people come to experience schooling. ... It must be reemphasised that pōtalanoa that is mālie moves Tongan people beyond what is already known. Most important of all, pōtalanoa raises and encounters the relation of schooling to the world it inhabits and the relation of the student to his or her community and environment. ...

The idea of transforming schooling for Tongan students ... is linked to talanoa, tatala fakatalatala and mālie, and dialogue and warm relationships are linked to hope, and hope is linked to the belief that change for the better is possible and ... all are responsible for conceptualising pedagogical decolonisation. Pōtalanoa as a conceptualisation of pedagogical decolonisation embodies the hope that the incompatibility between the culture that prevails in school and Indigenous societies, among others, can be swept away by human relationships that are patient, artistic and active.<sup>14</sup>

- 3) Hassall, Graham, *Using Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue as a Social Transformation Tool – the Case of Fiji* (Expert Meeting on ‘Dialogue in the Social Integration Process: Building Peaceful Social Relations – By, For and With People,’ United Nations, New York, 21-23 November 2005):

Hassall discusses extensively the current political, economic and social turmoil within Fiji. Hassall covers the historical nature of the conflict, the importance of social integration stages and stakeholders, and the need for appropriate dialogue procedures with stakeholders which include cross-cultural dialogue. Hassall refers to the talanoa process as part of a dialogue process for conflict resolution in Fiji:

One intervention that has been attempted with political leaders from a ‘conflict resolution’ perspective is the **Talanoa** interactive dialogue process offered by Hawaii-based academic Sitiveni Halapua. The 4<sup>th</sup> Talanoa session was held 3-4

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid, at 1814.

November 2001 and sessions continued through into 2005. The outcome of Talanoa IV was agreement on the need to examine four areas: building trust and reducing suspicion and fear among leaders and communities; fostering wide acceptance of the rule of law; ensuring all communities feel secure in Fiji as their home; and examining the constitution.<sup>15</sup>

Hassall continues:

In chiefly societies there are ritualised forms of speaking and listening. These are known and understood *within* these societies but what is needed are forms of dialogue that work *across* cultures that take forms comprehensible to all parties. [However], dialogue amongst ... leaders has not proven sufficiently comprehensive to assist in resolution of the most critical issues [but] it should not be thought ... that there has been no progress in establishing inter-communal dialogue and understanding. Indeed, some government departments have made significant effort, often through the intervention of particularly committed individuals, towards mutual understanding of the different communities. ... [For example] the Ministry of Reconciliation and National Unity has put considerable effort into bringing representatives of ethnic communities into genuine dialogue and exploration of the issues.

However, Hassall noted how the talanoa process for dialogue across cultures in Fiji was not as successful as first hoped:

The talanoa approach, which has been described as ‘less formalised and possibly more ‘intuitive’ than formal mediation, has not achieved much visible success: political leaders agreed to establish several parliamentary committees to explore solutions to the problems of land and the sugar industry but some committees were appointed but never convened and Talanoa sessions appear to be being held at ever longer intervals.<sup>16</sup>

Notwithstanding the cynicism, Hassall does note some great achievements in Fiji for reconciliation through cross-cultural dialogue but he cautions that further appropriate interventions continue to be sought.

- 4) Tuala-Warren, Leilani, *A Study in Ifoga: Samoa's Answer to Dispute Healing* (Te Mātāhauariki Institute Occasional Paper Series, No. 2, University of Waikato, 2002):

Tuala-Warren researches the traditional Samoan ifoga institution as a viable option for pleas of mitigation in New Zealand. The traditional ifoga is a ceremonial public apology rendered to the injured person and his/her aiga (family). The offender's aiga rallies together to perform the ceremony which is a reconciliatory act of bowing down to the victim's aiga which belittles the offender's aiga. An ifoga is initiated as soon as possible after an offence has been committed so that retribution is avoided and peace is maintained in the community. Tuala-Warren notes:

---

<sup>15</sup> Pacific Islands Development Program, *Talanoa IV*, Leaders Statement on Harmony and Stability in the Rebuilding of Fiji, (4 November, 2001).

<sup>16</sup> Hassall, Graham, *Using Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue as a Social Transformation Tool – the Case of Fiji* (Expert Meeting on ‘Dialogue in the Social Integration Process: Building Peaceful Social Relations – By, For and With People’ United Nations, New York, 21-23 November 2005) at 8.

[*Ifoga*] was a means of putting a hold on ill feelings between *aiga* or villages, and the two *aiga* or villages would continue routines as if nothing had happened. ... In ancient times, the *ifoga* was a customary humiliation ritual that also often served to end bloodshed when war had been lost, or to avert a war which would be futile. .. When an *ifoga* was undertaken, it was customary that the other party should accept the gesture and agree to a peaceful settlement. A refusal, of course, meant war. ... *Ifoga* became a means whereby a wrong might be forgiven in such a way that the aggrieved family felt that justice had been done without the necessity of an act of vengeance. An *ifoga* has been described as a formal gesture of self-degradation. This gesture was the greatest loss of face which a Samoan could suffer voluntarily – one out of proportion to the seriousness of most transgressions – it was never viewed lightly by either party to a dispute.<sup>17</sup>

Tuala-Warren outlined the actual *ifoga* process as follows:

Once the decision is made to take an *ifoga*, the *ifoga* party will travel to the *aiga* or village of the aggrieved party in the early hours of dawn. The *ifoga* party will always be seated on the ground under the *ie toga* [finely woven mats] before sunrise. The timing is crucial as it is believed to be the safest time when the receiving party is sleeping. The decision as to who is covered by the *ie toga* also belongs to the *matai* [chief]. Sometimes all the *matai* are covered and sometimes only the highest *matai* of the *aiga* or village is covered. The offender party may or may not be present depending on whether the offence is serious. If the offence has resulted in death, the offender will never go as this is believed to incite feelings of anger or revenge from the receiving family.<sup>18</sup>

When the receiving party realises what is happening, the *matai* will meet amongst themselves and decide whether to accept or reject the *ifoga*. ... A speaking *matai* from the receiving party will then come outside and address the *ifoga* party. This can be a lengthy oratory before he removes the *ie toga* which is covering the *ifoga* party. The *ifoga* party will give money, boxes of herring and kegs of corned beef as gifts. This will be reciprocated by the receiving party giving *pasese* (monetary gifts). The money given by the *ifoga* party is not intended as a financial settlement but is more of an indication of real remorse on the part of the wrongdoer's *aiga*. The receiving party would probably serve food to the guests and upon conclusion of the meal; the *ifoga* party would take its leave.<sup>19</sup>

An accepted *ifoga* means that the incident will never again be mentioned by either *aiga*. Members of those *aiga* will respect the decision of their *matai* to accept the *ifoga* and will treat that decision with utmost respect. The *ifoga* party is able to carry on knowing that they have been forgiven by the receiving party, and that there is no longer any ill feeling towards them.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Tuala-Warren, Leilani, *A Study in Ifoga: Samoa's Answer to Dispute Healing* (Te Mātāhauariki Institute Occasional Paper Series, No. 2, University of Waikato, 2002) at 18.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid* at 19.

<sup>19</sup> *Idem*.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid* at 20.

At the end of her paper, Tuala-Warren discusses the meeting of the Samoan and mainstream New Zealand worldviews regarding the *ifoga* ceremony within the New Zealand criminal justice system context. She asserts that the acceptance of the *ifoga* ceremony in the legal system is a means of achieving justice for victims and their families in a culturally appropriate way. Tuala-Warren moreover discusses the *ifoga* ceremony in a cross cultural context and notes that it should only be carried out in such situations if the victim and his or her family agree to it. The focus is not just on punishing offenders but also on healing the victims and rehabilitating the offenders as well. Tuala-Warren therefore discusses the importance of the Indigenous worldview, in this case the Samoan worldview, and its accompanying values, laws and institutions, and, in a modest way, how they can be appropriately accommodated for at the interface of another mainstream worldview. Tuala-Warren discusses, albeit briefly, how constructive dialogue needs to take place between cultures to address the many complexities that exist at the interface of two cultures - in this context, what is the place of *ifoga* in the New Zealand criminal justice system.

- 5) Brinson, Jesse and Fisher, Teresa A. 'The Ho'oponopono Group: A Conflict Resolution Model for School Counsellors' in *The Journal of Specialists in Group Work* (Vol. 24, no. 4, 1999, Arizona State University 'Multicultural Group Work') at 369-382.

This article describes a conflict resolution group technique known as ho'oponopono. The ho'oponopono process was developed by native Hawaiians as a method of resolving conflict between tribal families. Mental health practitioners in Hawaii and other parts of the United States frequently use the approach in agencies and business organizations. The authors provide guidelines and a case example to illustrate how a group counsellor might implement this conflict resolution model in a school setting. Suggestions on how to best adapt the technique to other group settings are included.

## **THE PROCESS OF HO'OPONOPONO**

### **Background of Ho'oponopono**

Ho'oponopono has existed in the Hawaiian culture for centuries. Historically, Ho'oponopono dates back to where the roots of the Polynesian culture emerged, which is estimated between 100 and 750 A.D.<sup>21</sup> It could be described as a process of getting together with family members to talk out problems or to seek forgiveness for a transgression. Although the process of ho'oponopono can involve several variations, Brinson and Fisher have adopted a combination of traditional and contemporary perspectives that are most relevant to working in the American school setting context.

## **A MODEL**

### **Group Size and Setting**

Whereas the recommended upper and lower limits for participation in ho'oponopono are highly variable, Ito recommended a maximum number of about 10 to 12 individuals.<sup>22</sup> The sessions should be conducted in a formal meeting area to convey the seriousness of the discussions. An expansive and well-lighted room that allows

---

<sup>21</sup> Wall, J. A., & Callister, R. R. 'Ho'oponopono: Some Lessons from Hawaii Mediation,' in *Negotiation Journal*, (Vol. 11, 1995) at 46-54.

<sup>22</sup> Ito, K. L. 'Affective Bonds: Hawaiian Interrelationships of Self' in G. M. White & J. Kirkpatrick (Eds.), *Person, Self; and Experience* (University of California Press, Berkeley, Ca., 1985) at 301-315.

everyone to sit in a circle on the floor works best. The walls could be decorated with artefacts representing peace and tranquillity (e.g., pictures of water, light, meadows, etc.). Time is extended, marathon-like; multiple sessions for each stage are possible. Sessions are closed to new members once the process begins.

### **Screening for Group Inclusion**

In a traditional ho'oponopono screening, the counsellor (*huh*) notifies each individual who has been involved in or affected by the conflict (*hihiu*) that a screening for ho'oponopono will be taking place. ... Before individuals can participate in ho'oponopono, the counsellor must assess each individual according to personal values and beliefs. A principal goal of the assessment is to determine the extent to which all participants are mature and rational, sincere, truthful, and have the capacity to be non-judgemental in their participation toward other members. The counsellor interviews each potential group member and concentrates on comments that reflect each individual's attitudes and values about the following areas: (a) the extent of belief in retribution, which is related to the individual's willingness to forgive and forget; (b) whether there is a positive attitude toward change as a part of the group process; (c) the degree of understanding that conflict creates entanglement with others; (d) the importance of confidentiality; (e) each person's willingness to acknowledge how he or she contributes to the problem; and (f) the degree to which the individual holds the value of cooperation.

The key to effective screening is to determine the extent to which thorough, complete, honest responses to the counsellor's questions are given. The counsellor must ask for clarification on nonverbal cues that are inconsistent with verbal statements. The manner in which the student and his or her behaviours are perceived by the counsellor is the important quality that will determine participation in ho'oponopono.

### **Ground Rules**

Once the participants are chosen, they must understand and agree to the following before ho'oponopono can begin: All words and deeds that are part of ho'oponopono will be shared in an atmosphere of '*oia o'o* (the essence of truth). The counsellor is the only one who directs the process, deciding when to move on from one topic to another, lecture another about proper behaviour, and invoke periods of silence and quiet reflection. The verbal communication exchanged by participants other than the leader (although initiated by her or him) is confession, apology, or request for forgiveness. A key element of the process is everyone must remain involved. Only one person speaks at a time. And most important, everything will be kept confidential; nothing will be repeated outside the ho'oponopono group.

### **Opening Phase**

The four basic phases of ho'oponopono are as follows an opening prayer (*pule*), discussion (*mahiki*), resolution (*mihi, kala* and *oki*), and a closing ritual (*pani*). Traditional ho'oponopono begins with a prayer that the elder addresses to the Gods, preparing the group for participation in the process. Prayer sets a serious tone on which truthfulness and sincerity will be established and maintained throughout.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Meyer, M. 'To Set Right: Ho'oponopono: A Native Hawaiian Way of Peacemaking' in *The Complete Lawyer*, (Vol. 12, 1995) at 30-35; Shook, E. V. *Ho'oponopono*. (University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu, Hi., 1985). Shook, E. V., Kwan, L. K. 'Ho'oponopono: Straightening Family Relationships in Hawaii' in K. Avruch,

Prayer also reminds those present that there are powers and goals greater than themselves.<sup>24</sup> The spiritual component of ho'oponopono is considered a profound gift that allows one to develop a working relationship with the "great spirit" within and to learn to ask that in each moment, a person's errors in thought, word, deed, or action be cleansed. A modification of the opening prayer is suggested for settings in which prayer is inappropriate. For instance, silent meditation is recommended for groups conducted in schools. Once the group has completed the prayer, the members are asked if they wish to proceed. If there are objections, the procedure calls for individual counselling with the objecting individuals. After resistance is resolved, the formal ho'oponopono begins.

#### **Discussion Phase**

This is the beginning of the serious work on resolving the conflict. Each student is asked to choose an incident and give an honest interpretation of how the problem led to the resultant conflict between the parties. Some have referred to this process as "peeling the onion," dealing with each person's perception of the problem one at a time.<sup>25</sup> This discussion is the heart of ho'oponopono, the process that enables the group to come closer to forgiveness. The counsellor attempts, through constant questioning and restatements of what each person says, to clarify the students' interpretations and emotional responses to the problem. The point of the counsellor's questioning is important in that it allows the members to view the problem from a collectivist and individualist point of view. In other words, the members are encouraged to see how there are many facets to the problem that precipitated the ill will and hurt feelings between members.

After getting feedback from each student, the counsellor calls for a period of silence for self-reflection and time for participants to gather emotional strength. More important, silence is intended to pool emotional and spiritual forces for a common dispute resolution process.<sup>26</sup> It can last a few minutes, a few hours, or days. During the period of silence, students are encouraged to engage in introspection of one's own behaviour, motives, interpretations, assumptions, and affective responses to the problem and to other students in the group. In addition, students are directed to be empathetic to the behaviours, motives, feelings, interpretations, and responses of other students in the group. Essentially, the counsellor communicates that the solution can be reached when all members become aware of what they have done and realize that one essential attribute of conflict resolution is forgiveness through understanding.

Through discussion, the counsellor helps students understand how the conflict became an entanglement of negative emotions, pain, and miscommunication. This process helps the group members identify issues that need more clarification. When each person reaches a state of contrition, confession, restitution, and repentance, the

---

P. W. Black, & J. A. Scimecca (Eds.), *Conflict Resolution: Cross-cultural Perspectives* (Greenwood, Westport, Ct., 1991) at 213-229.

<sup>24</sup> Kamhis, J. 'Healing with Ho'oponopono' in *Aloha* (Vol. 6, July/August 1992) at 44-49.

<sup>25</sup> Boggs, S. T., & Chun, M. N. 'Ho'oponopono: A Hawaiian Method of Solving Interpersonal Problems,' in K. Watson-Gegeo & G. White (Eds.), *The Discourse of Disentangling: Conflict Discourse in Pacific Societies* (Stanford University Press, Palo Alto, Ca., 1990) at 122-160; Ogawa, B. *Colour of Justice* (State of California Press, Oakland, Ca., 1990); Wall, J. A., & Callister, R. R. 'Ho'oponopono: Some Lessons from Hawaii Mediation; in *Negotiation Journal*, (Vol. 11, 1995) at 46-54.

<sup>26</sup> Wall, J. A., & Callister, R. R. 'Ho'oponopono: Some Lessons from Hawaiian Mediation; in *Negotiation Journal*, (Vol. 11, 1995) at 46-54.

counsellor asks if the group is ready to move on to a solution.<sup>27</sup> If any individual is not ready, the counsellor declares a *ho'omalū* (cooling off period) on that particular problem until the individual has worked through whatever resistance he or she has. Typically, a counsellor works directly with resistant members by providing them with detailed assignments, questions, and feedback. These serve to help the individual resolve lingering concerns they may have. If the problem cannot be worked out, the ho'oponopono may have to proceed directly to the closing phase with a summary of what had been diagnosed as the problem and entanglement. In this situation, ho'oponopono has been successful only to the extent of assessing and identifying the problem situation.<sup>28</sup> However, in most instances, due to the skill of the counsellor, these alternatives are unnecessary and the group agrees to proceed.

### **Resolution Phase**

In the phase of forgiveness, the counsellor is concerned with mutual requests for forgiveness, apology, and confession. During the confession, the counsellor allows members to talk directly to one another. The characteristic of the talk is absolute truth that can be sensed emotionally by the other person. However, the process of forgiving involves more than just a verbal statement; each individual has to identify a specific act or behaviour that would indicate he or she ceases to hold a grudge against another. After each person has done this, the group members could offer restitution to the offended parties. The terms of it are arranged and agreed on. The mutuality of the essential aspects indicates that the conflicts and hurts have been released.

A symbolic gesture of having students cut the chain that bound them together is recommended. In addition, instruction to the group to avoid any further discussion of the problem that might create negative repercussion is also a consideration. Although the counsellor allows communication directly between the group members, the counsellor still checks each exchange for indications of genuineness. That is, the counsellor must constantly monitor congruence in the verbal and nonverbal messages communicated between parties.

### **Closing Phase**

The final phase of ho'oponopono is generally a closing feast. From a traditional Polynesian perspective, a meal represents a thanksgiving to the gods for their assistance in the peacemaking process. The authors recommend a simple potluck meal. The sharing of food, for the most part, demonstrates the commitment and bond of all who participated and provides a transition from the group experience to a more informal way of relating with each other. Before participants are allowed to partake of the meal, however, the counsellor should deliver a brief summary of what has taken place and, more important, a reaffirmation of the bonds that have developed during the process.

## **HO'OPONOPONO IN OTHER SETTINGS**

Facilitators familiar with this conflict resolution strategy can adopt it to other groups such as those found in community mental health facilities, corporate settings, and centres for family counselling. Ho'oponopono can be transferable with very few

---

<sup>27</sup> Ito, K. L. 'Affective Bonds: Hawaiian Interrelationships of Self' in G. M. White & J. Kirkpatrick (Eds.), *Person, Self; and Experience* (University of California Press, Berkeley, California, 1985) at 301-315.

<sup>28</sup> Shook, E, *Ho'oponopono* (University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu, Hawaii, 1985).

changes in its overall content. For instance, the screening phase that is often used in school settings can be replaced with mandatory participation policies found in corporations, whereas other settings may want to use contracts to reinforce specified beliefs and attitudes regarding group behaviour.

Numerous group facilitators have found ho'oponopono's opening prayer inappropriate. As mentioned in the case example, meditation is often suggested as a replacement for setting a serious tone. Organizational developers have examined a different approach; they see the benefits of substituting prayer with the corporation's mission statement and/or values. Facilitators in corporate settings believe that the conflict resolution strategy is enhanced when a foundation of salient corporate philosophies and beliefs is used in the process.<sup>29</sup>

The spirituality of ho'oponopono is not viewed negatively by all group facilitators. It is very appealing for those who work in pastoral and family counselling settings. The opening prayer can strengthen existing principles found in such settings as well as enhance the commitment and responsibility of group members. When analyzing the discussion phase for appropriateness for other groups, it is obvious that some settings may have conflicts that are not as clearly identified as they are in educational settings. For such situations, an additional step in the discussion phase would be beneficial, problem identification. This step would involve a clear delineation of the problem prior to analyzing the source of the conflict. Attention should also be focused on the interpretations made by the facilitator during the discussion phase. Currently, the ho'oponopono model stipulates that facilitators help group members interpret conflicts from an individualistic and collectivist point of view. Group facilitators should be cognizant of the fact that the type of interpretation is dependent on the group setting. In mental health settings and some corporate situations, it would be more useful to ensure a cognitive and emotional understanding of the conflict.

### **Summary**

Ho'oponopono is an effective conflict resolution strategy with four distinct phases. It is a non-judging, truth-seeking, solution-oriented counselling model in which the counsellor's culture need not become a confounding factor and can therefore be an effective cross-cultural model.<sup>30</sup> Once school counsellors become more familiar with the practice of ho'oponopono and can make the necessary adaptations for specific kinds of groups, counsellors may use the technique as a common intervention strategy for most group work activities. Of course, similar to most approaches in the literature, specific training in the technique provides the practitioner with greater confidence for implementation.

Although Brinson and Fisher described the ho'oponopono process from a problem-solving perspective, many of these ideas are adaptable for more traditional topics and themes as well. As a guiding principle, however, counsellors should consider the cultural context when implementing any counselling technique. What is frequently meant to increase effectiveness may backfire and become more combustible than expected. However, the ho'oponopono process may be a useful example of a cross-cultural dialogue process in action for the research project.

---

<sup>29</sup> Patten, T. H. 'Ho'oponopono: A Cross Cultural Model' in *International Journal of Organizational Analysis* (Vol. 2, 1994) at 252-263.

<sup>30</sup> Idem.

6) Hemara, W, *Tikanga Māori, Mātauranga Māori and Bioethics: A Literature Review* (Mauriora-ki-te-Ao/Living Universe Ltd, August 2006):

The report briefly suggests a methodology for cross-cultural engagement:

Towards a Methodology for the development of perspectives

In terms of dialogue process between cultures, the report proceeds to discuss a possible process(es) by which views arising from these themes might be constructed. This process includes:

- Descriptions of the four domains and of biotechnology/bioethics
- Presentation of these descriptions
- Problematising
- Gathering Responses
- Synthesising,
- Delineating
- Development of Preliminary Ideas/Findings
- Testing
- Finessing; and
- Quality Assurance – A Committee of Wise persons

7) Durie, M, 'Mana Tangata: Culture, Custom and Transgenic Research,' (Te Mata o te Tau Academy for Māori Research and Scholarship Massey University, 1994): [www.bioethics.org.nz/publications/human-genes-reflections-jan04/html/page5.html](http://www.bioethics.org.nz/publications/human-genes-reflections-jan04/html/page5.html)

In this paper, Mason Durie proposes a Māori methodology for Māori and biotechnology engagement. Present debate about GM, scientific and Indigenous world views depends to a large extent on the frameworks within which the analysis occurs. The strength of the methodology established by an Order in Council [Council Hazardous Substances and New Organisms (Methodology) Order 1998, SR 1998/217.] appears to be its capacity to assess scientific risk rather than risk to cultural or spiritual beliefs. It is likely that amendments to the HSNO Act will give greater weight to Māori perspectives and values within the decision-making protocols, but it is unlikely that they will provide robust methods to assist ERMA with an analysis of Māori perspectives using tools that are appropriate to an Indigenous body of knowledge. Nor, perhaps, is that the task of the Authority, concerned as it is with the mitigation of risk rather than the elaboration of Māori knowledge.

Māori anxieties about GM reflect the sudden advent of new technologies and the lack of ethical guidelines to address them. Mātauranga Māori has been challenged to provide a rationale for considering GM, though within a framework that is more comfortable with scientific philosophies and methods and based on the notion of risk management. At the same time, mātauranga Māori is not to be regarded as a body of knowledge that is fixed in time and applicable only to a distant past. It has a dynamic of its own and, like other knowledge systems, is in a perpetual state of evolution. In order to understand Māori cultural and spiritual values, one challenge is to shift the focus of the debate from a risk paradigm to a paradigm of potential.

In the paradigm of potential, the essential question is not so much whether Māori values will be compromised by research, but how Māori values and concepts can provide a basis for assessing the relevance and potential benefits of research. Using key Māori concepts, already identified in the GM debate, it is possible to construct a 'research potential framework' that considers how three groups of values (or concepts) can be used to identify useful outcomes from research so that modern research contributions can be assessed according to Māori world views.

The framework is based on three domains: the natural environment, the human condition, and procedural certainty. Māori values or concepts relevant to the domain of the natural environment include mauri (integrity), whānaungatanga (relationships) and kaitiakitanga (guardianship); while for the domain of the human condition the values include wairua (spirituality), tapu (safety), hau (vitality) and whakapapa (intergenerational transfers). The third domain, procedural certainty, includes tikanga (protocols).

Arising from each concept or value is a series of research outcomes that would be consistent with the particular concept or value. From the whānaungatanga concept, for example, a desirable outcome is that research will contribute to the integrity of ecological systems. From the concept of tikanga, a desirable outcome might be the development of a clear set of protocols, consistent with Māori values that would enable a new environment to be addressed.

**Table 2: A research potential framework**

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Māori Value/Concept</b>	<b>Desired Research Outcome</b>
<b>The natural environment</b>	Mauri Integrity	Research that contributes to the integrity of ecological systems
	Whānaungatanga Relationships	Research that contributes to strengthening relationships between people, between people and the natural environment, and between all organisms
	Kaitiakitanga Guardianship	Research that contributes to resource sustainability
<b>The human condition</b>	Wairua Spirituality	Research that contributes to human dignity within physical and metaphysical contexts
	Tapu Safety	Research that contributes to human survival and safety
	Hau Vitality	Research that contributes to the maintenance of human vitality

	Whakapapa Intergenerational transfers	Research that contributes to the standing of future generations
<b>Procedural confidence</b>	Tikanga Protocols	Research that contributes to the development of protocols to address new environments

Research indicators or targets can be developed, according to the type of research, to provide a set of measures for assessing research contributions. For example, research that contributes to human survival and safety might be measured by indicators that point to increased longevity or freedom from disease. Research contributing to human dignity, on the other hand, might best be measured by indicators that endorse world views or strengthen identity. Importantly, all domains should be considered, even if the relevance to a particular research project seems remote.

#### Summary

Galileo was caught in a whirlwind generated by two conflicting bodies of knowledge - science and religion. Māori feel they too have been caught between competing systems of order - science and indigeneity. Concern about GM, however, does not rule out its use but places a caveat around it by seeking assurances about benefits and the development of protocols - tikanga - that can provide a level of comfort and certainty.

Recent debates about GM in New Zealand have highlighted certain incompatibilities between mātauranga Māori and science, with different opinions about what constitutes safety, and different ways of proving a point. In order to understand any body of knowledge, the tools for analysis need to be congruent with the world views attaching to that knowledge base. The tools of scientific inquiry, for example, are not sufficiently incisive to analyse Māori spiritual beliefs, nor the other way around.

To that end, the risk management approach may not be the best way of reconciling Māori views with the views of science. Methodologies associated with risk management are themselves based on scientific analysis and do not allow for the celebration of positive implications from mātauranga Māori. A research potential framework has been suggested as an alternative way of considering the issues and assessing research. It draws on customary concepts, but considers the benefits from research rather than the risks. Where the benefits are high, risk might be better tolerated.

8) Wilcox, P, Charity, J, Moke-Delaney, P, Roberts, M, Tauwhare, S, Tipene-Matua, B, Kereama-Royal, I, Hunter, R, *A Values-Base Framework for Cross Cultural Dialogue Between Scientists and Māori* (Cellwall Biotechnology Centre, Scion Te Papa Tipu Innovation Park, Rotorua, Te Aroturuki –Māori Advisory Group for CBC , School of Business Management, University of Waikato, Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiarangi, Industrial Research Ltd, Wellington, Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology, Pakihi Partners Limited, Wellington, Marlborough Research Centre, Blenheim, no date).

Cross-cultural dialogue is an essential part of the evaluation of controversial technologies and research proposals of significance to Indigenous Peoples. If Māori in Aotearoa/New Zealand are to benefit from these technologies it is important that effective processes are developed and implemented to ensure enduring outcomes for their communities. The authors of this report provide a good analysis of a deliberate, multi-staged process to facilitate cross-cultural dialogue that starts well before research applications are submitted to funding and/or regulatory agencies.

Development of this model was originally motivated because there has been a lack of effective processes to ensure that Māori perspectives are incorporated into GM research programmes in a manner that ensured positive outcomes for Māori. This model was designed to be applied at the proposal development stage, and to incorporate Māori perspectives well prior to lodging applications with Environment Risk Management Authority of New Zealand or funding agencies. Such a model is necessary given the importance of Māori contribution to New Zealand society and economy. The process provides a framework for capturing future opportunities for research providers.

The process begins with provision of ‘toolkits’ to both the research provider and the Māori entities, which allows both to be better prepared to engage in constructive dialogue with each other concerning the proposal and its intended outcomes. The process allows for the evaluation of technologies and modification of research proposals by Māori to achieve mutually beneficial outcomes. It also recognises non-Māori scientists are often willing to participate but may feel apprehensive because of unfamiliarity with the language, protocols and values. The model suggests the use of a Māori intermediary/ies to assist scientists with re-evaluation of their proposals prior to the actual dialogue phase, and facilitate the interaction between the dialogue partners. The model accommodates a range of possible outcomes from the dialogue phase, and subsequent monitoring of outcomes from the research by both parties. While it may seem onerous to scientists to have to take the time to inform oneself about another culture, the report states that there is no substitute for informed dialogue.

Furthermore, for scientists wishing to work with Māori on a frequent basis, being informed of Māori perspectives should be perpetually beneficial. The future may envision scientists confidently engaging with Māori and drawing inspiration and fulfillment from delivering science-derived benefits to diverse communities. In addition, scientists will not be deterred by cultural barriers, but will take the time to listen to, learn from, and connect with tangata whenua. Similarly, science organisations of the future could be those that have established robust, time-tested relationships with Māori based on mutual respect and reciprocal beneficial agreements, projects and initiatives. Within such organisations, dialogue with Māori around controversial technologies will have developed to the point where engagement and involvement is operationally routine.

For Māori, the process still respects the need to allow hapū/iwi the time to ask questions and raise concerns with due care that allows enough time for thorough airing of the issues. There are also potential strategic benefits, for example, direct joint venture partnerships. Further benefits include up skilling of Māori in science which will increase the knowledge base of hapū and iwi. Another important potential outcome for Māori includes aversion of previous negative experiences of working with scientists where communication has been one-way, and consultation processes had predetermined outcomes which have eroded trust amongst some Māori. Reasons for such mistrust include the undermining of Indigenous status, plagiarism of Indigenous

knowledge by western researchers and a limited methodology which only allows for limited outcomes.

Although the model discussed in the report has been developed specifically for controversial technologies, it could be adapted for other purposes. For example, it could be used by non-Māori businesses considering implementing technologies which may impact Māori communities. Parts of the process could also be adapted to incorporate perspectives of other strategically important groups whose world views differ from the majority. Furthermore, parts of the process could be used for non-controversial research that are of interest to Māori. However, the model's applicability in these instances may be limited by the time in which it takes to implement. Still, some of the information in the toolkits may be useful to either party.

The model does not supplant the need for a positive relationship between research providers and mana whenua hapū. For Māori, the nature of this relationship reflects research providers' commitment to the acknowledgement of Māori values by recognising the importance of mana whenua status. Positive outcomes from the model for other hapū and iwi are more likely, if this relationship is strong. It is anticipated that adoption of this values-based model by scientists and scientific organisations will result in the transformation of science praxis, the creation of long-term relationships between scientists and Māori, and mutually beneficial outcomes for both.

- 9) Tipene-Matua, Bevan, *Having Honest Conversations about the Impact of New Technologies on Indigenous People's Knowledge and Values* (Conference Paper, Mātauranga Taketake, Traditional knowledge Conference, 2006):

Tipene-Matua discusses the need for robust research tools and methodologies to ensure the protection of Indigenous Peoples' knowledge and perspectives particularly as new technologies develop such as genetic technologies and the impact of western science on Indigenous knowledge, values and practices continue to challenge Indigenous Peoples to respond to a science motivated by corporate non-Indigenous imperatives. The debate becomes more complex when Indigenous Peoples are asked to weigh cultural or spiritual concerns against the potential for individual health benefits or to weigh individual rights to make choices against some fundamental tenets of tribal societies such as collective responsibility, collective decision-making, and collective well-being. Consequently, it is essential for Indigenous educators and researchers to develop ways of having honest and frank conversations with each other about sometimes highly politically laden and problematic issues confronting them like biotechnology.

Tipene-Matua refers to the constructive conversations research project and the need for better information about cultural, social, spiritual and ethical elements of new health biotechnologies and the need to find new ways of engaging people in dialogue. The paper argues that Indigenous Peoples, particularly Māori, must be vigilant in reclaiming and redefining their cultural values, practices and ways of being, if they are to effectively respond and benefit from new technologies. The paper proposes a principles approach to establishing effective frameworks and protocols for honest discussions about the spiritual and cultural issues raised by such technologies.

- 10) Tipene-Matua, B and Wakefield, B, 'Establishing a Māori Ethical Framework for Genetic Research with Māori' in Henaghan, M, *Genes, Society and the Future: Human Genome*

*Research Project* (Te Kaupapa Rangahau Ira Tangata, Law, Ethics and Policy for the Future, University of Otago, 2007) at 379-422.

This report focuses on ‘new genetics’ or the expanding nature of research on genetic variation that analyses the genetic links to common diseases (e.g. cancer, diabetes) as opposed to single gene disorders such as Huntington’s disease. The report proposes that genetic testing research could have significant benefits for Māori communities particularly if a broad approach to establishing and implementing moral, ethical and spiritual frameworks to drive such research is adopted. The final part of the report introduces what they term ‘Mana Protocols’ for genetic research and outlines how these could be developed and used to assist Māori whānau, hapū and iwi, researchers and regulators of genetic research. In terms of process, the report briefly stated:

**Kaupapa Māori Philosophy:** This kaupapa Māori research project acknowledges and recognises Māori epistemology and Māori cultural values and takes for granted Māori ways of knowing and being. The project is viewed in the wider context of tino rangatiratanga and the active pursuit of whānau, hapū and iwi self-determination; the reclamation of our Māori traditions; restoring the tapu and mana – wellness amongst whānau; improving the socio-political status of Māori; and achieving economic independence.

**Research Focus:** The focus of this research study was to analyse relationships between Māori perceptions of health benefits of genetic testing of newborns with Māori ethical, spiritual and cultural concerns, and the tensions between Māori collective tribal responsibility and individual rights with regard to the access and use of genetic material. The study sought to generate protocols that might be relevant and useful for specific stakeholder groups for effectively interfacing with Indigenous Māori communities. All participants were given an information sheet and consent was obtained by individual signature. A draft copy of the report was also circulated for final comment to the Iwi before the report was finalised.

**Tikanga Māori:** Participants were asked to give their perspective on tikanga Māori and examples of when tikanga may be conflicted; weighing tikanga against the potential gain health benefits from new technologies such as genetic testing; Māori collective decision-making; and the right of individuals to choose how their human genes are utilised.

The actual Mana Protocols state:

**Mana Tangata (human dignity):** Respect begins with researchers having at least some knowledge of the Indigenous language and culture of the research participants. (Ensuring researchers are culturally safe is likely to require training – e.g. knowing how the Treaty applies to the research being conducted). It is important to have regard to the welfare, rights, beliefs, perceptions, customs and cultural heritage, both individual and collective, of persons involved in research. It is desirable that a group be contacted prior to research being undertaken on the group to avoid disrespect or harm being caused in any way. It is important to develop strong relationships and engage communities through honest communication based on mutual trust and benefits. If it is anticipated that research

exposes a participant or group to a specific risk that risk must be disclosed. Each participant must have the right to demand compensation from the investigator for any injury or harm arising from his or her participation. Appropriate liability agreements should be drawn up between the researcher and the participating individual and/or group before commencement of the research (World Health Organisation 2006). Informed consent procedures and privacy protocols should be in place. Safe guards against discrimination and stigmatisation should be in place. Benefit sharing, appropriate counselling services and access to kaumatua advice should be offered.

Mana Whenua (political authority): Do Māori have the right to veto the release of any research data and are there opportunities to vest any resulting intellectual property in the Māori collective? Are there broader social or political implications arising out of or influenced by the research being conducted? How does it affect the ability of the Indigenous participant to be kaitiaki? What is the balance of power between researchers and those being researched and how can any imbalances be addressed? Will the genetic research impact on other groups in society (Māori and non-Māori) and how can such impacts be minimised? What options for collective decision-making or responsibility are available and how can these be supported?

Mana Atua (spiritual authority): providing space for contemplation regarding the proposed research. Are there opportunities to consider the potential for humility that might avoid causing spiritual imbalances or transgressions of spiritual integrity? Is the research motivated by public good (as opposed to knowledge for knowledge's sake or a purely financial imperative)? Is there a place for karakia (prayer) or ritual to ease any anxieties or to enable reconsideration of whether the research should continue? Is there an inner consciousness, uneasiness or anxiety about the research or does the research have a good wairua, a good feeling? What are the impacts on Māori spiritual values (e.g. whakapapa, mauri and wairua)?<sup>31</sup>

11) Metge, Joan, *Korero Tahi: Talking Together* (Auckland University Press, with Te Mātāhauariki Institute, 2001).

This book draws on the rich resource of tikanga korero to develop a procedure for managing group discussion in settings where groups (Māori and non-Māori) meet to talk about common concerns such as biotechnology. This book's procedures aim to create an environment, which is comfortable, safe and empowering to all participants in a discussion where all are accorded equal dignity and respect. The strategies highlighted by Metge can be used in many contexts such as workshops, conferences and discussions. Some of Dame Joan's insights relevant to the Te Hau Mihi Ata project of negotiating a space for effective dialogue at the interface of mātauranga Māori and western science are as follows:

An area of particular importance for cross-cultural communication and cooperation is that of group discussion, whether it is aimed at exploring a subject or coming to a decision. ... Māori long ago borrowed committee procedure from Pakeha,

---

<sup>31</sup> Tipene-Matua, B and Wakefield, B, 'Establishing a Māori Ethical Framework for Genetic Research with Māori' in Henaghan, M, *Genes, Society and the Future: Human Genome Research Project* (Te Kaupapa Rangahau Ira Tangata, Law, Ethics and Policy for the Future, University of Otago, 2007) at 421, 422.

applied it to the management of business meetings and subtly changed it in the process, but Pakeha have generally failed to recognise the values and rules governing discussion in Māori settings as a source worth tapping. They have remained monocultural in this context and have imposed their monocultural cultural practice on Māori. ... Tikanga governing discussions are rooted in a deep understanding of human psychology. When applied by skilled practitioners, they are highly effective in achieving their aims. They are a resource Pakeha have been foolish to neglect.<sup>32</sup>

Korero tahi procedures aim to create an environment that is comfortable and empowering to *all* participants in a discussion, an environment where none feel disadvantaged or intimidated by rules, words or actions they do not understand, and where all are accorded equal dignity and respect. To achieve this aim, discussion organisers must spell out the rules of korero tahi, explain its source and purposes and act as facilitators, not directors.<sup>33</sup>

The rules of korero tahi balance rights with responsibilities. They guarantee participants the right to express themselves in the language of their choice – but require them to provide a translation or paraphrase for the benefit of those who do not understand the chosen language.<sup>34</sup>

Dame Joan then lists four guiding principles for using korero tahi procedure within a pattern of cross-cultural cooperation:

- To acknowledge the Māori cultural tradition as the source and inspiration of korero tahi;
- To work to extend their own understanding of tikanga Māori as those tikanga operate in Māori contexts;
- To involve both Māori and Pakeha in any adaptation of the tikanga governing discussion for use in general meetings;
- To arrange whenever possible for Māori and Pakeha to work together in partnerships as organisers and facilitators.

As a way of managing group discussion, korero tahi is available in a variety of settings intended to widen the options available to New Zealanders, recognising and catering for cultural diversity. Metge outlines key processes for effective cross-cultural dialogue:

1) Setting rules and the use of space:

Māori collectively see the marae as the appropriate venue for debating issues of all kinds, especially at family and community level. Discussion is an integral part of every gathering held on a marae. When Māori meet for discussion in other places, they transform them in to the likeness of a marae for discussion by their use of space and application of marae rules of debate. ... In Māori the rules governing discussion are properly identified as nga tikanga korero which are not hard and fast directives but flexible guidelines that both encourage and require modification according to circumstances. In particular, they are modified according to whether the gathering is held on or off a marae complex, whether visitors are present or not and whether those

---

<sup>32</sup> Metge, Joan, *Korero Tahi: Talking Together* (Auckland University Press, with Te Mātāhauariki Institute, 2001) at 6.

<sup>33</sup> *Idem.*

<sup>34</sup> *Idem.*

visitors are kin or strangers. Like all tikanga Māori, they are grounded in basic Māori values, laying particular emphasis on respect for the spiritual dimension (expressed as karakia and the observance of tapu), ancestral connections (expressed in whakapapa and whānaungatanga), attachment to the land (whenua), generosity (aroha) and care for others (manaaki ki te tangata), peace (rangimaarie) and unity (kotahitanga). Among tikanga of varying levels of specificity, five are of basic importance:

- The use of physical space to express and mediate social relationships;
- The making of a distinction between tangata whenua (the people of the land) and manuhiri (visitors from elsewhere);
- The framing of discussion with karakia (prayers invoking the spiritual dimension) and with ceremonials of greeting and farewell;
- The vesting of responsibility for the management of discussion in participants as a group;
- The appropriate use of one, two or three distinct modes of discussion.<sup>35</sup>

Metge discusses korero tahi procedure policies:

- The organisation of space and seating in ways that make participants feel welcomed and included;
- Explicit recognition of a distinction between organisers and other participants, or of the absence of such a distinction, as appropriate;
- The framing of discussion between semi-formal expressions of welcome and farewell;
- Acceptance by all participants of collective responsibility for managing discussion;
- The complementary use of two or three modes of discussion.

## 2) Organisation and leadership:

Whether they gather for discussion or other purposes, Māori make a basic distinction between tangata whenua and manuhiri, host and visitors. During a hui on marae, tangata whenua are totally responsible for organising proceedings. They welcome visitors, initiate the stages in proper sequence, decide on the appropriate tikanga and deal with any problems that arise. For their part, the visitors also have rights and responsibilities, notably the right to be treated with respect and hospitality during their visit and the responsibility to accept their hosts' lead, to contribute to the discussion and other activities, and to express their appreciation appropriately in words and action, including the giving of koha (gifts). At Māori gatherings, no one person is unequivocally in charge. Leadership and responsibility inhere in the group as a whole (whether hosts or visitors) and are delegated to a core of chosen representatives. Leading roles are filled by men and women who combine seniority of age and descent with competence as speakers and organisers. They are team leaders rather than dictators. In the event of conflict or offence, the older folk, especially the women, take on special roles as mediators and peacemakers. The person most prominent in action is not necessarily the most respected and influential: according to tradition, the most high ranking tangata whenua speaks least and last, listening to others and summing up the consensus reached. All participants, whatever their status are expected to exercise a degree of responsibility and self-discipline, holding back rather than pushing

---

<sup>35</sup> Ibid at 10-11.

themselves forward, watching others to identify their needs and concerns, responding to non-verbal cues.<sup>36</sup>

The discussion itself may be ordered in one or more of three ways:

- *Huri haere i te whare* – going around the house;
- *Whakawhitiwhiti korero* – open, criss-cross exchange; and
- *Te haere o te rākau* – passing the stick.

These three forms are typically used at different times and for different purposes, and are favoured to varying degrees by different iwi. *Huri haere i te whare* is generally used first, to enable people to introduce themselves and break the ice. *Whakawhitiwhiti korero* is used the most, for discussions of major import. *Te haere o te rākau* is used in the evenings, to involve the diffident and to create a relaxed atmosphere.

In adapting the Māori pattern of organisation and leadership for general settings Metge notes that adjustments must be made according to the size and composition of the group to be managed, the frequency with which the participants meet and the purposes they have in mind. In the organisation of conferences, a small band of workers usually of the sponsoring institution are readily identified as hosts. They invite the other participants, choose the venue, arrange meals and accommodation assemble the programme and do what has to be done to make sure everything runs smoothly. As hosts applying korero tahi procedure, they also stage and take the lead in a formal welcome ceremony which gets the gathering off to a good start by making participants feel both welcome and welcomed.<sup>37</sup>

Depending on the size of the group and the availability of skilled personnel, the task of facilitating discussion may be carried out by two or more people working as a couple or be several working as a team. If possible, the couple or team should include both men and women, Māori and Pakeha, and people from older and younger age groups. The facilitators impart more about the collective responsibility and cooperation at the heart of korero tahi by demonstrating it than by talking about it.

The principle of collective, shared responsibility is of paramount importance in korero tahi. Instead of relying on one person with authority to maintain order and control rule-breaking, korero tahi places the responsibility squarely on the shoulders of all participants, hosts and visitors alike. Everyone must contribute to the success of the discussion by sharing their knowledge, experience and feelings, by disciplining themselves to give each other space literally and metaphorically, by supporting rather than undermining each other and by being prepared to challenge each other when necessary.<sup>38</sup>

Metge advocates dividing participants into small groups for at least part of the time when the numbers rise above fifteen to twenty. Keeping a large group together reduces the opportunities for speaking and increases risk of people becoming bored or inhibited by the number or identity of those listening. Division into small groups makes sure everyone is actively involved. Plenary and small group discussions are complimentary and Metge suggests using plenary sessions at the beginning to explain aims and general rules and at intervals and/or at the end to allow small groups to share their experience with each other.<sup>39</sup>

Metge suggests the session make use of all three Māori discussion modes by linking them into a sequence that capitalises on their respective strengths. This

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid at 17-18.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid at 19.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid at 21.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid at 21.

sequence may be used for one or more of several purposes: for exploring a subject, teambuilding, deciding on policy or course of action, investigating and deciding what to do about wrongdoing and resolving conflict.<sup>40</sup>

### 3) Powhiri

When Māori from different groups or institutions gather, they begin proceedings with a formal ritual of encounter – the powhiri welcome ceremony. The welcome ceremony is specifically designed to introduce individuals and groups to each other, reducing feelings of strangeness, anxiety or hostility to manageable proportions, so that everyone involved feels comfortable enough to engage in the real work of discussion to follow. To this end, the powhiri begins by stressing distance, literal and metaphorical, between hosts and visitors and then brings them closer, literally and metaphorically, by successive stages. These stages involve a series of exchange, initiated by the hosts and responded to by the visitors. The women's voices are heard in an exchange of karanga (calling), the challenge by a tangata whenua warrior is answered by an action signifying peaceful intent by the visitors' leader, hosts and visitors join in shared remembrance of their dead, sit opposite each other to exchange speeches of greeting, and finally, make physical contact, hand to hand in the hand-shake and nose to nose in te Hongi – expressions of trust from different cultural sources. When this point is reached, the two parties break ranks to mingle with each other, and the ceremony is completed by sharing food and drink.

Māori and non-Māori working together may draw on the underlying insights of the powhiri to devise introductory welcome ceremonies for mixed or non-Māori settings. A formal welcome ceremony is an idea worth borrowing, especially for situations where most participants do not know each other well and/or are entering into unknown territory. It creates a pause between the outside world and the discussion, giving participants time to reorient themselves to the setting and purpose of the gathering and to become familiar with new faces. Its principal aim is to create a friendly, comfortable and safe environment that allays participant's anxieties so that they can relax and open up.

### 4) Discussion

Discussion in Māori settings is conducted formally, according to unwritten rules. During the powhiri ceremony, speakers represent the group rather than themselves, follow a pre-arranged order and limit themselves to delivering greetings, providing information about identity and establishing linkages. In contrast, once the powhiri is over, all who wish to speak can do so, within limits set by modes and rules of discussion. As outlined above, the three main ways of organising formal discussion in Māori settings are:

- *Huri haere i te whare* – going around the house; usually beginning at the door with the hosts and proceeding clockwise round the house to end with the most important of the visitors
- *Whakawhitiwhiti korero* – open, criss-cross exchange; in which speakers stand to speak from the places where they are sitting, on both sides of the house, without set order; and

---

<sup>40</sup> Idem.

- *Te haere o te rākau* – passing the stick, a process begun by a host leader, after a short explanation. Objects used for this purpose can include walking sticks and taiaha. Whoever is given the stick must speak and/or sing, in serious or humorous vein, and then hand it on to someone of their choice.

Certain rules apply generally to all three of these discussion modes. The most important are as follows:

- No one person is in charge of managing the discussion. Order is maintained primarily by self-limitation on the part of speakers and by the kaumatua present, male and female, sometimes acting independently, sometimes in concert.
- Speakers announce their intention to speak verbally with a phrase such as *Tihei mauri ora!* (The sneeze of life!) or *Kia hiwa ra!* (Be alert!), rise to their feet and speak from a standing position.
- As long as they are standing, speakers hold the floor and are heard out without interruption or heckling. They may deal with more than one topic in the course of the same speech.
- Not only words but other forms of expression (especially musical ones such as waiata and haka) are used by speakers to convey their message and by kaumatua to rebuke a rule breaker, ease tension and hostility or revive flagging energies.
- The marae is held to be the appropriate place for voicing grievance and disagreements but also for their mediation and resolution. Every effort should be made to resolve problems and participants should leave them behind when they leave the marae.
- Breaches of these rules are dealt with by the oldest and most senior kaumatua present. Often it is the women who calm tense situations. The kaumatua arrange concerted action by means of no-verbal communication.

In terms of process for effective cross cultural dialogue, after formally welcoming participants, it is wise to gather them together in one group for an initial briefing session. Here the facilitators come into their own. Working as a team, supporting and amplifying each others points, they explain the overall aims of the programme, make sure that participants understand the purpose and parts of the welcome ceremony and set out the general rules and the mode of discussion to be followed in the first session. This should be done as succinctly as possible: participants will learn more by doing than listening.

If there are more than 15 participants, now is the time to divide them, or get them to divide themselves, into a series of smaller groups, each with one or preferably two facilitators to provide guidance as necessary. The facilitators take the lead in turn while the other stands by to comment, criticise and/or put a contrary point of view. Metge then instructed:

- Participants should sit in a circle with no gaps and nobody outside.
- No one person is in charge or manages the discussion. Participants themselves maintain order and manage conflict by monitoring their own observation of the rules. As a last resort, a facilitator or experienced participant may intervene.

- Intending speakers claim the floor by saying an appropriate phrase and rising to their feet. Whether they remain standing to speak or resume their seats may be decided by consensus or individual preference.
- Once a speaker has claimed the floor, interruptions and heckling are outlawed.
- While holding the floor, a speaker may deal with more than one topic, but should be as succinct as possible, knowing when to stop. Self-discipline is the order of the day.

#### 5) Going around the circle

This method is best used in the first discussion, immediately after the introductory plenary. It is good for breaking the ice and giving the shy or inhibited an opportunity to speak. Having spoken once, they usually find it easier next time. For best results, the number of participants should be kept to ten or under. Fifteen is possible but beyond that number the group is better divided into smaller ones. Instead of working to a pre-set agenda, proceed by eliciting the agenda from participants.

#### 6) Criss-cross exchange

When the process of going around the circle is completed, members of each discussion group move on to the criss-cross exchange mode of discussion. Facilitators should briefly review the general rules with particular stress on the rule against interruptions then:

- Participants should wait until they have something to contribute to the discussion before signalling that they want to speak.
- Once a speaker has sat down, he or she must refrain from speaking again until several others have spoken, the exact number increasing with the size of the group.
- Speakers are encouraged to voice any resentments or hostilities they are harbouring and to express their feelings honestly. They should however avoid immoderate language or personal insults.
- Having voiced their grievances and negative feelings, participants must accept the mediation of others and be willing to negotiate reconciliation, including making or accepting reparation.
- When discussion is over, participants must leave behind any confidential information, grievances or criticisms that have been revealed, carrying away what is positive and helpful.

If time permits, it is helpful, towards the end of the discussion, to allow participants to share their reactions to the process itself. If silence ensues for a while in the circle, that is not only acceptable but also fruitful. It is better for speakers to work out what they want to say while others wait than to rise in haste and confuse the debate with poorly considered opinions. Māori acceptance of silence reminds us that it is not a vacuum to be filled with words but itself a contribution to the debate, as important as rests are in music.

#### 7) Passing the stick:

When discussion using criss-cross exchange has covered the topic raised, or in the evening when people are beginning to lose concentration, it is a good idea to bring participants together again in plenary session and introduce the third discussion mode, passing the stick. Any suitable object may serve as the stick: a walking stick, colourful scarf, broken branch, and a book. A facilitator introduces this method by explaining the following rules:

- Everyone to whom the stick is passed must accept it and respond in some way.
- The recipient has complete freedom to choose what to do: share insights from the previous discussion, sing a song, recite a poem, tell a joke.
- After making their contribution, recipients pass the stick on to somebody of their choice, giving their reasons if they wish.
- Once someone has been given the stick, they must take all the time they need to get ready to respond. Others must wait on their readiness.

When the rules have been explained, the facilitator passes the stick to someone who has been briefed to set a model pattern. Well handled, this is a good way to give voice to those shy or anxious people who make a valuable contribution in small groups but retreat into their shells in plenary sessions. When passing the stick to such a person, it is both helpful and kind to throw them a lifeline by suggesting some gift or experience they have to share.<sup>41</sup>

#### 8) Decision-making:

In all discussions intended to reach decisions, Māori aim to achieve consensus, that is, a unified, collective agreement. ‘Achieve’ is the operative word here: consensus has to be worked for through a process that demands goodwill, patience and freedom from time constraints. In their early speeches, speakers pool all the information they hold relevant to the matter in hand. Then, using *whakawhitiwhiti korero*, they set out a range of different options and scenarios and argue their advantages, disadvantages and likely consequences. Increasingly, as the discussion progresses, they group themselves in support of two or three favoured options, discarding the others. When it becomes obvious that one particular option or compromise between options commands majority support, the holders of minority views let go – *tuku i a ratou* – and explicitly assent to the majority view, so that the final decision may be unanimous. The most respected and senior speaker present articulates this consensus in a final speech, closing the debate.

Seeking consensus processes in non-Māori settings are also important but participants must be prepared to invest goodwill, patience and time in order to achieve it. Full consensus is not always possible, because of time constraints and speakers who refuse to abandon minority views. The group must decide when to continue working towards consensus and when to settle for a majority decision. Often only hindsight can determine whether the holders of minority views were right to give them up for the sake of unity or right to hold to them at its expense.<sup>42</sup>

#### 9) Uses of Song and Humour

Māori frequently use particular *waiata* (songs). Powhiri speakers typically conclude their speeches with a *waiata*. Ideally the *waiata* is chosen to extend and

---

<sup>41</sup> Ibid at 39.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid at 39-40.

compliment the content of the speech. By standing to sing a waiata for a speaker, the members of his party show their support for him and the sentiments he expresses, while also asserting the mana of their group. The worst thing that can happen to a speaker is to be left to sing alone: this expresses the group's disapproval of his performance and leadership at the expense of the group's mana. Once the powhiri is over, speakers speaking in general discussion may use a well-chosen waiata to drive home a point, to set a mood, or bring their speech to a satisfying conclusion. Men and women with experience and confidence in public settings start a waiata when they see a need, for example, to counter a breach of protocol, to give those expressing strong emotion time to regain control, to lighten a tense atmosphere or to wake people up when they are tired or bored.

As well as waiata, Māori make effective use of humour to leaven debate and get their points across. To this day the most admired speakers convey hard truths in humorous anecdotes and analogies: even their targets can not help laughing, but get the point.

The Māori insight that discussion does not have to be either limited to the spoken word or invariably solemn is a valuable one. Both music and humour can be used effectively to help participants over rough ground, to mitigate clashes between personalities or strongly held views, to revive flagging energies and recapturing wandering attention.<sup>43</sup>

#### 10) Summing up – saying farewell

At hui, discussion on particular topics may be summed up by one or more senior speakers or it may be left hanging in the air to be continued at the next appropriate gathering. The hui as a whole concludes with a farewell ceremony – the poroporoaki. The poroporoaki is in several ways the reverse of the welcome ceremony. It is as informal as the latter is formal, since hosts and visitors are now on familiar terms. It takes place not in the sacred space of marae or meeting house but in the dining hall during or after the last meal. The proceedings are begun, not by the hosts, but by the visitors, who announce their coming departure. The roll of speakers is open, not closed: any or all of the visitors may have their say. They thank their hosts for their hospitality. Comment on the happenings of the hui and call the workers (the ringa wera or hot hands) from behind the scenes for special appreciation. One or two of the hosts reply, wishing the visitors a safe journey home. The visitors depart, even, if time presses, before the farewell is completed, and the hosts start cleaning up.

Having brought all participants together in a final plenary session, the facilitators may invite one person (perhaps the most experienced) to sum up the whole experience, covering method and content, and identifying areas of agreement and disagreement, or they may initiate an open session in which whoever wishes may speak. This is particularly wise at a large conference where relatively few get to speak in plenary as distinct from small group sessions.

When the business of the gathering is concluded, an informally formal farewell makes sound psychological sense. It can be as short or long as participants like to make it, as serious or as light-hearted. As many participants as wish to may express their thanks to the organisers, to the facilitators of the discussion sessions and to the workers

---

<sup>43</sup> Ibid at 42-43.

behind the scenes. The hosts respond, speeding them on their way, the visitors depart and the hosts begin to relax.<sup>44</sup>

11) Not the last word:

Metge concludes that her korero tahi procedure is gratifyingly successful in helping people from different and even opposing backgrounds work their way through to understanding, reconciliation and friendship, perhaps even a relationship of trust. Its effectiveness can be attributed in large part to the emphasis tikanga Māori place on consideration and respect for others and on the flexible adaptation of practice to suit particular contexts.<sup>45</sup>

12) Parr, R, *Te Mātāhauariki Methodology: The Creative Relationship Framework* (Te Mātāhauariki Institute, Occasional Paper, No. 5, University of Waikato, 2002):

The Te Mātāhauariki Institute was a FRST funded research institute at the School of Law, University of Waikato, originally headed by Judge Michael Brown. The overall objective of the programme was a contribution to an intellectual climate to realise a vision of socially inclusive laws and political and legal institutions in Aotearoa/New Zealand derived from two polyphyletic traditions, which will have sufficient flexibility and robustness to meet the future needs of the citizens of Aotearoa/New Zealand as individuals and as members of collectivities. Parr's paper was part of the institute's objective on bicultural methodology and consultation processes. Parr noted:

Only by becoming aware of and then understanding the different threads that make up a society can we look to weave them into a creative cohesion. ... The process of consulting with such skilled and wise people, *tohunga*, necessarily must be sensitive to tikanga Māori and Pakeha, and appropriate both to the people involved and the knowledge exchanged. Te Mātāhauariki uses a seminar process to draw on traditional Māori practice of group learning and discussion. In this sense we can talk of the seminar process as wānanga. The word wānanga traditionally refers to baskets of knowledge:

Nana nga mahi nunui, nana nga rakau e tipu mai na i ro ngahere, nana i hanga a Hina-ahu-one ki te puke o Tuanuku: nana hoki tiki nga kete o te wānanga i te Toi o nga Rangi, ara i Tikitiki o rangi.<sup>46</sup>

His deeds were extraordinary, his are the trees growing in the forest, he created the first being Hine-ahu-one at the hill of Tuanuku: he also retrieved the baskets of knowledge at the highest point of the heavens at Tikitiki o rangi.<sup>47</sup>

In a broader sense, the word wānanga refers to traditional knowledge and higher learning. The seminars are designed to facilitate the exchange of traditional knowledge through consultation. Before the information sharing begins, the participants are welcomed in Māori, and a karakia is said. The purpose of the karakia is to bless the proceedings. The karakia gives voice to the peaceful intentions of those present and

---

<sup>44</sup> Ibid at 45.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid at 45.

<sup>46</sup> *Te Toatakitini* (Number 25, Volume 1, 1923) at 7.

<sup>47</sup> In house translation by Tonga Karena, Te Mātāhauariki Institute, University of Waikato, 2001.

their expectation that the proceedings will not only begin in peace but will also end in peace. Then the kaumatua opens the korero by explaining the kaupapa.

Elements of tikanga Pakeha are also employed in this process. Prior to the seminar, researchers investigate the areas they wish to receive clarification on. This research is conducted according to Western academic tradition by exploring a range of sources, both primary and secondary and accurately recording any information found. The Māori newspapers, a collection of historic newspapers published primarily for a Māori audience between 1842 and 1932, have provided a wealth of information. ...This resource is in itself an example of how exposure to different ways of doing things can enrich a final product.

The findings of the research team are then outlined and the wānanga develops a life of its own as the participants respond to the research before them. Participants and researchers freely exchange impressions of material that the Institute has uncovered. Participants in the seminars discuss their understandings of tikanga, both from a historical perspective and within the contemporary context. Participants discuss key Māori terms or concepts from their own understandings, and in their own words. Also exchanged is advice about avenues for future research, sources to locate and examine, and other experts to consult.

The seminars provide Te Mātāhauariki with exposure to the wairua of Māori culture and therefore are central to the progress of the research institute in a myriad of ways. ... The participants are in control of the whole process, from being available and willing to participate, to the information and support given, to the continued involvement with Te Mātāhauariki after the seminar. During the seminar they decide what is too tapu to korero, and they decide what is not. They are free to determine the focus of the wānanga. The process of the wānanga must be flexible enough to include the unpredictable and subtle enough to discern the sensitivities and respond appropriately. It is the participants desire to have information available to future generations, their generosity, and most importantly, a mutual respect and sense of mutual trust between all concerned that makes the seminars possible.

In exploring the methodological principles that guide Te Pu Wānanga (kaumatua seminars), Parr advances the premise that research methods need to be worked out within the context of the research relationship itself. This article does not seek to prescribe a set of standards or rules to be followed by researchers. Instead, it endeavours to inform the debate.

### The Cross Cultural Issue

Within the general attempt to encourage and inform a conversation about research and research methodology, a more specific objective of Parr is to ventilate the issue of cross cultural research methodology. These two issues are often theoretically rent asunder, and cross cultural methodology is accorded a distinct treatment, estranged from the rest of methodology. In practice the differences between robust, appropriate methodology and robust, appropriate cross cultural methodology are often difficult to discern.

The term methodology describes the science of method, or a body of methods used in a particular activity, in this case, research.<sup>48</sup> Usually when we speak of research methodology, we mean that body of methods used to obtain knowledge. Yet, methodology is not just the methods, but it is also the theoretical framework within which the methods themselves are developed and applied. In order for research

---

<sup>48</sup> *Concise Oxford Dictionary* (7<sup>th</sup> Edition, 1982).

methodology to be robust, the actual methods used to obtain knowledge must be consistent with and appropriate to the overarching theoretical framework that constitutes the research methodology.

The theoretical component of the methodology influences the development of research methods and guides the way in which the actual methods are applied. In order to be effective, research methodology must also be appropriate to and sourced within its context. The particular characteristics of both the knowledge being sought and the repositories of that knowledge will determine the context. In the particular example of Te Pu Wānanga [kaumatua seminars], the founding principle of the theoretical framework is *creative relationships*.

Fundamental values underpinning all interactions between Te Mātāhauariki researchers and their eminent reference group are based upon that principle of creative relationships and are those of mutual respect, trust, and reciprocal generosity. The relationship between those vested with the knowledge and those seeking the knowledge determine not only what will be revealed, but also how it will be revealed, and the appropriate methods and modes of operating. It is through this creative relationship framework that all other aspects of the research are conducted.

The cross cultural issue arises within this context. Cross cultural methodology is that which creates relationships between members of different cultures. In order for people to cooperate and learn to understand one another, there must be a way of relating. This is fundamental to the shared human endeavour. When researchers from one culture experience and attempt to understand to the all-encompassing context of another culture, the principle is no different. They also need a framework to guide them through the ethical dimensions of the relationship. If the research relationship is creative and cooperative, based upon rapport, mutual respect and reciprocity, the methodological framework itself supplies the tools to operate effectively within a cross cultural situation. In other words, cross cultural methodology is one aspect, or one application of good methodology.

This is evident in the research carried out by Te Mātāhauariki. A team of researchers carries out the methodology at the centre of this discussion. Those researchers are both Māori and Pakeha. During seminars conducted with Māori participants, there is a cross cultural interaction for some researchers and an interaction within one culture for others. During seminars conducted with Pakeha experts the cross cultural relationship is reversed. The methodology used is the same. To suggest that some members of the team should use a different methodology to enable them to research effectively in a cross cultural context is nonsensical. To be effective methodology must be consistently appropriate to the circumstances, whether these be characterised by situations involving difference of gender, age, class, or culture.

A more noticeable distinction in *modus operandi* than that which operates cross culturally is evident across the age/seniority spectrum. Thus the senior researchers (both Māori and Pakeha) demonstrate a more express involvement in the seminar, carefully crafting a balance between asking more questions and guiding the seminar and letting the seminar participants navigate the waters of their own knowledge. It is the wisdom of the senior researchers, and their personal commitment to the co-participant and to the research that enables this delicate and constantly changing balance to be achieved. At best there is a subtlety which can instinctively avoid questions that those present may not wish to answer and a recognition and acceptance of the boundaries.

In keeping with *tikanga* Māori and the way the relationship was formed, it is the senior researcher/s who takes the responsibility for welcoming co-participants to the

seminar, introducing the other members of the research team, and explaining the nature of the research. They identify the areas the research team has particularly targeted for consultation, as a way of opening the session. The senior members guide the junior members of the research team, both Māori and Pakeha. Following the cues of the senior members, both express and implied, and listening to the korero, they take notes and manage the recording equipment. Careful not to disrupt the flow of the seminar, or interfere in the intricate process of revealing knowledge, they ask questions of their own when appropriate, often as invited by the senior members.

The methodology discussed in this article could be utilised in a variety of particular circumstances, both across and within cultures. However, the objective of research conducted by Te Mātāhauariki is to inform a debate about ways in which we can understand different cultures and ways in which we can translate our understanding across cultures. Hence the focus of this article is on the use of methodology to facilitate relationships and encourage understanding across cultures. The principles set out in this article are intended to be enabling and useful for those engaging in research on both sides of the research relationship....

Creative, cooperative relationships are fertile, productive interactions among participants guided by common objectives. In such circumstances the research relationship becomes more than the sum of its parts, evolving into an inspirational endeavour, enriching all participants and potentially the greater society in which the endeavour is embedded. All of the principles guiding research undertaken by Te Mātāhauariki are based around the theme of creative relationships.

## 1. Principles of Creative Research Relationships

### (i) Intention and Reflexivity

A prerequisite of entering into a creative research relationship must surely be the intention to do so, to the best of the ability of those involved. What is also required is scrupulous investigation of the capacity to enter and maintain such a relationship. In a sense this is 'self research', and this self-research is a forerunner of truly cooperative research. A thorough understanding of the researcher's own context is of crucial importance to creative, cooperative research. As is true in all contexts, relationships are greatly enhanced when each member adds to the mix the richness of their own personal experience and the wisdom gained through lengthy personal reflection on that experience.

Closely related to the ability to reflect upon oneself and the enriched understanding ensuing from such reflection, is the ability to traverse both cultures. Until you are comfortable with your own culture and secure in your understanding of it, arriving at a worthwhile understanding of another culture will be problematic. For a creative relationship to also be cross cultural what is necessary are the skills to operate effectively *within* both cultures, and *across* both cultures in an inter-disciplinary capacity. In order to experience this, a researcher must have a solid understanding of themselves, of their own culture, beliefs, values and epistemologies. Only then can a proper understanding of another culture be attempted.

This understanding of one's self is crucial to the understanding of one's role as a cooperative researcher. Paradoxically perhaps, the effort to understand another culture also provides one of the sharpest tools for greater self understanding, enhancing the ability to compare cultures and then pare away the limited understandings caused by immersion in one's own culture.

Having established the need for self reflection, initiation of a research relationship also requires intention. This intention is a personal commitment. This

commitment is reciprocal, but either those wishing to undertake the research or those wishing to be co-participant can initiate and generate the commitment. This is particularly true in the contemporary context. Many of the traditional assumptions about cross cultural research relationships represent one model which does not fit with contemporary circumstances.

One such issue involves power and the formation of cross cultural research relationships. Certainly the issue of power arises in the formation of a cross cultural research relationship. Power issues arise in every relationship, to greater or lesser degrees. Power is about relationships, and ways and means of relating. However, much of the historical discussion of this issue has described the power relationship from only one vantage.

Often it is assumed that Māori are in an invidious position when compared with a researcher presumed to be educated, carrying the authority of the Western academic tradition. This is an over simplification. As in any relationship, some qualities confer power, and others take it away. In some situations it may be advantageous to have an academic training and the trappings of Western society, and in some situations it may not be. It is simplistic to assume that having the training of a researcher automatically gives a status across cultures that can elevate the researcher into a position of power and render the potential subjects powerless. Often in such situations the power of the researcher is only perceived.

When we look at the contemporary context it becomes clear that previously research and particularly cross cultural research, was dominated by a monocultural model that informed the values of researchers and coloured the methodology used. The inevitable and justifiable reaction against this created another monocultural model, with similar implications for the way in which research was done. What is needed now is a third model that moves beyond the embeddedness of prior antagonisms. The principles of the creative relationship framework may provide this opportunity.

Having established the intention, and reflected seriously upon the particular context that one brings to the research relationship; Parr provides a number of steps to get to the next stage which is to demonstrate that intention and form a relationship:

- Intention and reflexivity;
- Rapport – formation of research relationships;
- Utu- reciprocity; and
- The re-iterative process.

In terms of the latter step, Parr noted the following:

One of the ways in which reciprocity is manifested is the re-iterative process. This describes a process where knowledge is encouraged to develop through the dynamics of the participants. The Latin word *iter* means to journey, and so, to reiterate is to make another journey, often a slightly different one. Thus the reiterative process is one of many journeys between the participants - journeys that shape and enhance the venture that lies between them.

The research becomes that which unfolds mutually, through the ongoing process, where openness, trust between participants, engagement and development of potentially long lasting bonds create a situation of real reciprocity. This process also entails 'recycling description, emerging analysis and conclusions.' At each of these stages the researcher is obliged to make the journey back to the co-participant. At Te Mātāhauariki once the transcripts have been created from the seminars, they are taken back to the participant, for comment and analysis. Such a process is essentially

cooperative and consultative and also respectful of tikanga and Mātauranga. The co-participant is free to indicate, after review, any material that he/she may not wish to be disclosed publicly. That decision must be the inalienable right of the experts.

13) Meredith, P & Parr, R, *Collaborative Cross Cultural Research for Laws and Institutions for Aotearoa/New Zealand: A Summary Paper* (Te Mātāhauariki Institute, Occasional Paper, No. 1, University of Waikato, 2001).

This paper discusses some good ideas for cross-cultural engagement and dialogue where Parr and Meredith note:

Collaborative cultural research is undertaken against a background of trying to understand not only differences but also commonality between cultural groups. Collaborative cultural research is animated firstly by the search for knowledge that both stimulates and informs cross-cultural endeavours and secondly by the desire to make this knowledge easily accessible ... so that unity and diversity can coexist in a creative rather than confrontation tension. ... It is about transcending boundaries in a bridge-building exercise. ... it is about producing knowledge that answers questions ... about Māori and Pakeha worlds, Māori and Pakeha perspectives, Māori and Pakeha cultural practices and values in areas which are seen as significant in Māori and Pakeha terms.

... Central to this contribution to knowledge by way of collaborative cultural research is treating a group as participants on a shared journey rather than bounded or discrete, existing only unto itself.<sup>49</sup> Parr and Meredith then provide a number of suggestions to assist with their endeavor:

- Equitable participation – all participants should have equality of agency and voice in the research not one culture being ‘objectified and described by the other;
- A question on who should engage in research? – there must be some interaction between members of different cultures in the roles of researcher and co-participant;
- Contextualising the research – not denying the authenticity of Māori experiences and voice and displacing Māori lived experiences with the ‘authoritative’ voice of the ‘expert’ voiced in terms defined and determined by the ‘expert.’ It is important that we ‘situate knowledge’ in its particular historical, social, political and legal context and adopt this as an epistemological stance for the research at hand;
- Quality assurance – all research necessitates sound and robust scholarship but the quality of culturally specific knowledge needs to be assessed although not romanticized and mystified, by its own cultural conditions and perspectives;
- Appropriate cultural research frameworks – the importance of utilizing a Māori cultural framework or Kaupapa Māori research according to a Māori epistemological stance and guidelines. The interpretation of Māori data must be perceived in Māori terms. However, collaborative cross-cultural research also involves marrying cultural knowledge in the search for points of convergence between participants.

---

<sup>49</sup> Meredith, P & Parr, R, *Collaborative Cross Cultural Research for Laws and Institutions for Aotearoa/New Zealand: A Summary Paper* (Te Mātāhauariki Institute, Occasional Paper, No. 1, University of Waikato, 2001) at 2-3.

In terms of dialogue, Parr and Meredith stress the need for and promotion of communication between members of different cultures on relevant issues, values and concepts. We should not be afraid to engage in cross cultural translation and mobilization. ... The key tasks of the collaborative cultural researcher then are as a communicator, translator, mediator, facilitator, catalyst and negotiator. The paper quotes Dame Joan Metge at the end referring to both Māori and Pakeha: ‘We compliment each other. We also stimulate, challenge and strike sparks off each other. We will understand more, explore more deeply by working together than we could ever do separately.’<sup>50</sup>

14) Fisher, R & Ury, W. *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement without Giving In* (Arrow Books, London, 1987):

In terms of an amicable, principled process for dialogue between two parties with differences including perhaps cultural and epistemological differences, this book may be of some use. The book began as a question asking what is the best way for people to deal with differences. Fisher and Ury draw on their respective backgrounds in international law and anthropology and an extensive collaboration over the years with practitioners, colleagues and students to come up with this practical method for negotiating agreement amicably without giving in. As opposed to hard and soft negotiations, this work proposes a third way – the method of principled negotiation developed at the Harvard Negotiation Project to decide issues on their merits rather than through a haggling process focused on what each side says it will and won’t do. Fisher and Ury suggest that you look for mutual gains wherever possible, and that where your interests conflict, you should insist that the result be based on some fair standards independent of the will of either side. The method of principled negotiation is hard on merits, soft on people. Principled negotiation shows you how to obtain what you are entitled to and still be decent. It enables you to be fair while protecting you against those who would take advantage of your fairness. Briefly, Fisher and Ury’s principled negotiation components are as follows:

Fisher and Ury provide strategies for dealing with the problem(s) by not bargaining over positions. Arguing over positions produces unwise agreements, is inefficient, and endangers an ongoing relationship and there is an alternative. In terms of method, Fisher and Ury assert the need to separate the people from the problem, focus on interests, not positions, invent options for mutual gain and insist on objective criteria. Furthermore, they counsel groups to develop a best alternative to a negotiated agreement, as well as some strategies for hard bargainers.

Separate the people from the problem – negotiators are people first who have two kinds of interests – in the substance and in the relationship. The relationship tends to become entangled with the problem, and positioning bargaining puts relationship and substance in conflict. Separate the relationship from the substance; deal directly with the people problem.

Perception – empathy, don’t deduce their intentions from your fears, don’t blame them for your problem, discuss each others perceptions, look for opportunities to act inconsistently with their perceptions, give them a stake in the outcome by making sure they participate in the process, and make your proposals consistent with their values.

---

<sup>50</sup> Ibid at 16.

Emotion – first recognise and understand emotions – theirs and yours; make emotions explicit and acknowledge them as legitimate; allow the other side to let off steam, don't react to emotional outbursts and use symbolic gestures.

Communication – listen actively and acknowledge what is being said; speak to be understood, speak about yourself, not about them; speak for a purpose.

Prevention works best – build a working relationship and face the problem not the people.

Focus on Interests not Positions: for a wise solution reconcile interests not positions. Interests define the problem, behind opposed positions lay shared and compatible interests as well as conflicting ones.

How to identify interests? Ask why and why not, think about their choices, realise that each side has multiple interests; the most powerful interests are basic human needs.

Talking about interests – make your interest come alive, acknowledge their interests as part of the problem, put the problem before your answer, look forward, not back, be concrete but flexible, and be hard on the problem soft on the people.

Invent options for mutual gain – diagnose, prescribe and broaden options, look for mutual gain and make their decision easy.

Insist on objective criteria – deciding on the basis of will is costly, develop fair standards and procedures, ask what is your theory, agree first on principles, reason and be open to reason, and never yield to pressure.

15) Tiakiwai, S, Tanner, C, Skipper, A, Philips-Barbara, G and Greensill, A, *Finding Common Ground – Dialogue on Wastewater Management to Address Māori Cultural and Spiritual Values* (Ministry of Research, Science and Technology, NIWA, Hamilton, October 2004):

This project sought to investigate and develop through dialogue with Māori communities, what common ground between Māori and scientists could be found on the issue of wastewater treatment and management. The project also sought to identify key design parameters and approaches to wastewater management preferred by Māori. Some of the key report findings regarding cross cultural dialogue included:

#### 1. Timeframe

Further consideration needs to be given to project timeframes, particularly to allow appropriate time for initiating and developing relationships between science organizations and Māori communities. While the timeframe did not adversely affect the outcomes of the two dialogue hui, it may have impacted on the quality of participation at each of the hui.

#### 2. Sharing of knowledge

Entering a dialogic relationship assumes that all parties have a common agreed-to understanding of what the key parameters of the project should be. The sharing of knowledge was an integral component of this project, yet there were differing levels of understanding as to how information would be shared and generated through the dialogue hui process.

#### 3. Preparedness for entering into a dialogue hui

In line with the above point, the planning phase of the dialogue hui becomes critical to ensure that the dialogue hui runs successfully. Again, it is important that understandings from all parties are made explicit and are agreed to.

#### 4. Role of iwi coordinators

The role of the iwi coordinators is critical to the success of the dialogue hui. Based on the learnings from the first dialogue hui which identified a need to separate out the role of hui facilitation, the role of the iwi coordinators was tweaked for the second dialogue hui. Consideration as to how the iwi coordinator should/could participate in the hui, coordinating access to the community, being a link between the community, the scientists and the social scientist are all critical roles within this dialogic framework. It was also important that the iwi coordinators have the confidence of the iwi and scientist groups for whom they are working, and that the interests of all these diverse groups are represented fairly and accurately.

#### 5. The usefulness of a dialogue hui approach

All groups viewed the dialogue hui approach as successful, in a number of ways. For one of the iwi groups, it allowed them to test the commitment of the scientists in engaging with them over a period of time. For both iwi groups, the dialogue provided an opportunity to engage over an issue they had common interest in, with scientists they had previously had little or no access to. This changed perceptions about scientists, and particularly allowed the establishment of relationships based on a shared interest, wastewater. It also emphasised how much of their access to scientists and scientific information on wastewater treatment issues and options was mediated and controlled by local councils, who filtered the information through their own cultural and organisational world views. For the scientists, it was an opportunity to work tangibly alongside Māori, to learn more about their culture and approach to wastewater issues, and to share their own understandings about wastewater. In effect, the dialogue hui was an environment which was created specifically for scientists and iwi to engage – this was new and the learnings generated from this are reflected within the report. The scientists saw the benefits of dealing directly with iwi, both in understanding the cultural basis for iwi approaches and generating practical innovative solutions. They realised the potential for better incorporation of iwi perspectives into resource management decision-making practices under the Resource Management Act, using such dialogue-based approaches to replace current consultation practices. This would give Māori access to scientific resources to develop and promote practical wastewater management alternatives that fit with their cultural and spiritual values.

#### Concern with the dialogue hui approach

The main concern about the dialogue hui approach was that it allowed only an initial dialogue to occur. Both iwi groups stressed the importance for scientists to recognise that dialogue is an ongoing and sometimes lengthy process. All groups understood the funding issues related to projects such as this. However, by engaging in the dialogue hui approach, all found it provided further opportunities to look at continuing the dialogue started.

16) Cronin, K, Jackson, L, *Hands Across the Water: Developing Dialogue between Stakeholders in the New Zealand Biotechnology Debate* (MoRST, Victoria University, 2004,):

This report is a pilot project conducted over March-December 2003 to test new approaches to ‘dialogue’ between scientists and the community. Commissioned by the New Zealand Ministry of Research and Technology under its dialogue programme which is aimed at improving capacity across the science and community sectors to communicate about science and technology in New Zealand. The project used the genetic modification (GM) debate as a case study of public discourse around controversial science and technology. It engaged participants in an interactive process, testing selected communication techniques in facilitated workshops. The research highlights areas of agreement and disagreement on the risks of GM and their significance, and identifies options for improving future communication about GM and other forms of technology. The report defines dialogue as:

An exchange of information between experts and decision-makers and the wider community. ... Dialogue puts the emphasis on a two-way communication process between members of the public and the technical community, to deliberate on issues and provide different perspectives. It enables the science community to listen and learn a wide range of perspectives, not just their own or that of single issue pressure groups. Dialogue describes a conversation that enables each party to acknowledge, listen to and respect the other’s viewpoint and to move forward in a way that is mutually constructive. Dialogue can be applied to issues such as:

- Consultation over local issues e.g. waste disposal;
- Wider community concerns e.g. health provisions;
- Issues characterised by perceived risk to people’s well being e.g. genetic modification.<sup>51</sup>

Dialogue is useful to engage citizens in discussion and to encourage a two-way relationship between the public and scientific knowledge. The process of engagement can challenge polarized stances and entrenched positions, creating a climate for more effective communication. Goals that should be achieved through dialogue include:

- Providing people with the skills and opportunities to deliberate on issues, thereby promoting informed debate and decision-making;
- Clearly identifying areas of common ground and of dissent between participants;
- Eliciting the lay knowledge held by non-experts;
- Changing the knowledge and perceptions of ‘experts’;
- Building mutual understanding between different groups; and
- Providing ‘early warning’ of potential problems and opportunities.<sup>52</sup>

The research draws on approaches used in environmental conflict resolution, risk communication and technology assessment. It also builds on recent New Zealand research which indicates significant potential for New Zealand scientists to appreciate and articulate the social context and expectations surrounding biotechnology – and for members of the lay public to articulate key scientific questions that require resolution. The task of this project was to create a meeting place for that discussion to take place.

---

<sup>51</sup> Cronin, K, Jackson, L, *Hands Across the Water: Developing Dialogue between Stakeholders in the New Zealand Biotechnology Debate* (MoRST, Victoria University, 2004) at 6-7.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid at 7.

This research highlights the ‘space’ in which the discourse about GM takes place, including the public domain and private spaces. The project tested three techniques, which might allow that dialogue to happen:

- Appreciative Inquiry;
- The Civil Conversation; and
- Issues Mapping.

The first two methods were developed from family therapy and organisational development. The project was aimed at applying them to questions of public policy and science. This was an innovative approach, to see if approaches developed primarily for resolving conflict in interpersonal relations might be applied to issues in the public domain. The approaches were customised for use in New Zealand and applied in small four-hour workshops by three expert facilitators.

‘Appreciative Inquiry’ has been used in organisational development and cultural change. It encourages participants to look for what works in a situation, creating a discourse where they can describe where they want to be in the future, based on successful elements in their past experience. It is about creating a positive vision rather than focusing on problems and problem solving.<sup>53</sup>

‘The Civil Conversation’ is an approach developed by Rhonda Pritchard in New Zealand, based on ‘The Public Conversation’ programme in the US. It involves a structured conversation, led by a facilitator, in a small workshop setting with six participants. The method is especially designed for discussing differences about public questions where there are significant social values involved.

‘Issues Mapping’ has been developed by Karen Cronin. It derives from approaches in risk communication, notably the ‘mental models’ approach.<sup>54</sup> Reflecting a traditional ‘deficit’ paradigm, this approach defined the risks of a technological proposal as assessed by experts. The risks as ‘perceived’ by the lay public were then modeled to identify where they deviate from the ‘actual’ risk data held by the experts. Risk communication programmes are then applied to overcome the apparent gap between lay and expert assessments.

‘Issues Mapping’ goes a step further, constructing a model of the risk perceptions held by technical experts and comparing these to the community model. A ‘landscape’ of the issues can then be generated, identifying areas of overlap and agreement, and areas of disparity. The ‘shared model’ of the landscape is then fed to participants as a basis for discussion and engagement. ‘Issues Mapping’ assumes that both ‘lay’ and ‘expert’ stakeholders develop perceptions through a process of framing and that both views are valid, although based on different premises.<sup>55</sup> The risk communication task, therefore, becomes a process of facilitating the two participant groups in dialogue rather than realigning community responses to expert calculations.

The key findings of the report included:

- All three approaches showed potential for future dialogue;
- The importance of people showing respect for others and their point of view;
- The crucial role of the facilitator(s);
- The importance of a safe space for fair play in the public domain;

---

<sup>53</sup> See Hammond, S and Royal, C, *Lessons from the Field: Applying Appreciative Inquiry* (Thin Book Publishing, 1988).

<sup>54</sup> See Morgan, M, Fischhoff, B, Bostrom, A and Altman, C, *Risk Communication – A Mental Models Approach* (Cambridge University Press, 2002).

<sup>55</sup> See Wynne, B, *Expert Discourses of Risk and Ethics on Genetically Manipulated Organisms: the Weaving of Public Alienation* (Politeia, 2000).

- Interpersonal skills developed primarily for resolving conflict for people in primary relationships were being applied to questions of national policy;
- That dialogue may now be moving into a more carefully managed process of ‘engagement;’
- The necessity of improving the talking and listening skills of individual scientists; and
- The ‘message’ sent out to the community must be consistent amongst all scientists – not just the personable ones sent out to ‘communicate;’

Limitations included:

- Time – a positive future relationship means the groups would meet ideally once a fortnight for six months to earth it in real-life relations. Lack of time for subsequent rounds of workshops and multiple stages for the process require more time;
- Experience and skills learnt in the workshop may not translate fully or enduringly, once participants return to their home groups and colleagues. Stakeholders from both groups need to be engaged in an ongoing process in which they have an investment in improving the quality of dialogue, and an ability to translate, develop and reinforce new behaviors.

### **The Civil Conversation**

*Rhonda Pritchard, October 2003*

#### *Definition and brief description*

The Civil Conversation is Rhonda Pritchard’s reworded term for the Public Conversation originally designed by a group of American family therapists in Cambridge, Massachusetts, to create a structured and constructive dialogue between people who have been previously polarized in debate on an ideological issue. The rewording was proposed because the word ‘public’ implies a conversation held in a public setting. The topic is usually one on a current public issue but the conversation is held in private. Civil was chosen because it is synonymous with polite or courteous and its meaning also relates to the citizen as an individual.

The philosophy and method of the Public Conversation draws on narrative theory developed and adapted to individual and family therapy by Australian therapist Michael White and New Zealand therapist David Epsten. At the heart of a narrative approach is the ‘postmodernist idea that we don’t so much perceive the world as interpret it...We collapse our experiences into narrative structures or stories to make it intelligible and inevitably give some patterns of experience more weight than others and cultural pressures help determine which patterns define us.’<sup>56</sup> The weighting of selected patterns leads to ‘dominant stories’.

#### *How the method was first developed*

The Public Conversations Project was initiated in 1989 by Richard Chasin, Margaret Herzig, Sallyann Roth, Laura Chasin and Carol Becker. While watching a

---

<sup>56</sup> Cowley, G and Springen, K, ‘Rewriting Life Stories’ in *Newsweek* (17 April, 1995) at 70-74.

televised debate on abortion they observed that the participants behaved in ways that reminded them of destructive and fruitless arguments they had observed in therapy settings. This provided the impetus for them to plan an alternative process to offer people on either side of the pro-life/pro-choice debate, using their family therapy experience to facilitate a more respectful, measured and reflective style of relating between participants. They proceeded to conduct a series of eighteen conversations between people involved in the debate in Massachusetts and later applied the method to other public issues in other settings in the United States.

#### *The essence of the method*

The essence of the method lies in the notion of dialogue, in contrast with debate. While the originators acknowledged that debate 'can be effective in comparing different ways to analyse and solve problems and can play a valuable role in public and political processes, it can often become destructive when it is repetitive, entrenched and rhetorical'.<sup>57</sup> In debate, people are more likely to express certainty about their own views, denigrate or dismiss the views of others, ask questions to test rather than to inquire. If they listen at all they typically do so to scan for the other's ignorance, or moral or logical flaws. In dialogue people speak openly and listen respectfully and attentively, ask genuine and curious questions and seek to understand the beliefs and opinions of others. People are encouraged to speak personally rather than as representatives of a group, to tell stories drawn from their individual experience and to express dilemmas and uncertainties, thus steering the discussion away from polarised principles, policies or positions.

#### *Situations/issues to which the method has been applied (internationally and in New Zealand):*

The original eighteen conversations on abortion involved six participants each time; three on either side of the debate. The Public Conversations Project team also applied the method, or aspects of the method to larger groups dealing with other controversial issues: forest practices, conflicts over homosexuality and religion, population policy, women's health and rights.

Civil conversations have been conducted in New Zealand among groups of mediators, mental health practitioners and with lobby groups on a range of topics including the use of the term Ms, dogs on beaches, voluntary euthanasia and repeal of Section 59 of the Crimes Act (physical punishment of children).

#### *Key features of the method*

The objective of the civil conversation is to promote open speaking, respectful listening and greater understanding rather than agreement or resolution of differences. An invitation is made along the following lines:

People who have strong views on an issue often feel they have to persuade or convince others to their side. We can quickly become polarised. Today we hope to have a different kind of conversation, one in which you will be able to share your thoughts and feelings around this issue. We hope you will speak as unique individuals rather than as representatives of a position. This is an opportunity to be with people with different views, and to ask questions about which you are genuinely curious.

---

<sup>57</sup> Chasin, R, Herzig, M, Roth, S, Chasin, L, Becker, R and Stains, R, 'From Diatribe to Dialogue on Divisive Public Issues: Approaches Drawn from Family Therapy' in *Mediation Quarterly* (Vol. 13, 1996) at 4.

The stereotypes represented in the public debate may lead us to think there are only two sides or two homogeneous groups but there's often a lot of variation within each group. We'd like to learn about your personal experiences and individual beliefs.

Informed voluntary decision to participate.

Seating is arranged in a way that does not put 'factions' together. Group agreements are made that usually include:

- Speak personally not as a representative of an organisation or position;
- Use respectful language (avoiding loaded words e.g. 'Don't get PC.' 'That's typical male/ feminist...');
- Avoid assigning intentions, beliefs or motives to others;
- Allow participants to pass. Any participant who is not ready or willing to answer a particular question may simply decline responding to it with no explanation required;
- Allow others to finish speaking. This implies that speakers will be sensitive to others' attention spans;
- Respect all confidentiality or anonymity requests that the group has agreed to;
- Stay on topic.

The dialogue is managed by a facilitator and is structured around the following questions:

#### *Civil Conversation Questions*

The first question is asked and participants are given a minute to think about it. They respond in the order they are seated. While each speaks the others just listen. Same procedure for questions 2 and 3.

1. We would like you to say something about your life experience in relation to this issue and what has made you interested in it: events or personal history that may have shaped your current views and feelings about the issue;
2. Now we'd like to hear a little more about your particular beliefs and perspectives about the issue. What is at the heart of the matter for you, as an individual?
3. Many people who have participated in dialogues like this have said that within their general approach to this issue they have some dilemmas about their own beliefs, for example, some value conflicts or ambivalence. Do you experience any mixed feelings, value conflicts, uncertainties or other dilemmas within your overall perspective on this issue?

#### *Questions of curiosity*

We invite you to ask questions of one another, questions that arise from genuine curiosity, not rhetorical questions or are statements in disguise. The purpose is to reach a greater understanding of one another's thoughts and ideas, not to persuade.

#### *Two closing questions*

What do you think you have done or not done to make this conversation go as it has?  
Do you have any parting thoughts you would like to talk about?

#### *Applications of the method*

(a) in a New Zealand setting

The original public conversation project team began their conversations with a light meal and social time for participants to meet informally. The social confidence of

American participants in engaging with one another as individual strangers does not easily translate into a New Zealand context. The method has been modified to start with a facilitated conversation but to allow for informal engagement at a later stage once people have learned a little about one another.

The story-telling aspect of the method has been shown to translate very easily for those Māori and Pacific Island people who have been part of civil conversations in New Zealand. They consistently comment on how much more familiar this process seems to them than the adversarial style debate.

(b) to a science/technology topic

Genetic modification is a topic involving questions about trust in science and scientific inquiry, the quality of empirical evidence, interpretation of results from research, trust in the integrity of commercial enterprises, as well as more personal attitudes and responses: emotions, values, beliefs and faiths. This makes the conversation likely to be challenging for the facilitator and for the participants – to clarify what kinds of experiences and differences are being exposed at any given moment, and to maintain the dialogue modality especially on matters of evidence where debate is the usual and familiar method of engagement.

(c) in a small-scale trial

The fact that this conversation will be observed by two researchers presents the risk that the freedom to speak personally with the promise of confidentiality, which is a core feature of the method, may be compromised in this context. While anonymity is being offered here it is not strictly confidential when participants may be quoted. We cannot predict whether this will inhibit open disclosure.<sup>58</sup>

### **Appreciative Inquiry**

*Graeme Nicholas, December 2003*

#### *Appreciative Inquiry – origins and character*

Appreciative Inquiry (AI) emerged at Case Western University in Cleveland, Ohio, as an evolution of an action research approach to change management. It is a research (enquiry based) process of change.

Appreciative Inquiry is the art of discovering and valuing those factors that give life to an organisation, community or group. In its most practical construction, Appreciative Inquiry is a form of organisational study that selectively seeks to locate, highlight and illuminate the life-giving forces of the organisation. When we enquire into the things in an organisation that are life-giving, we can choose to focus on those qualities. Through involving others in our enquiry, we can have a considerable impact on the image of the organisation and, ultimately, on the way it functions.

In contrast to some other approaches, Appreciative Inquiry is rooted in a constructionist understanding. Its fundamental tenets are that what is attended to becomes determinative, that there is no distinction between research/enquiry and intervention, and that the genesis of the future is to be found in the themes, values and

---

<sup>58</sup> Cronin, K, Jackson, L, *Hands Across the Water: Developing Dialogue between Stakeholders in the New Zealand Biotechnology Debate* (MoRST, Victoria University, 2004) at 165-168.

images embedded in the narratives we tell of our past. This is quite distinct from problem-centred approaches.

Human systems are adapted to be creative and innovative, and so organisations, in the view of Appreciative Inquiry, are full of solutions rather than problems. It is the organisation's diversity, multiplicity and forward movement that need to be highlighted and built upon.

One example of a change process that AI uses to lead an organisation in the direction of the most generative and creative, is called the 4-D Process (or sometimes 5-D Process):

- **Define** the area or aspect that attention is going to be given to.
- **Discover** what gives Life to an organisation; what is happening when the organisation is at its best.
- **Dream** about what might be; what the world is calling the organisation to be.
- **Design** ways to create the ideal as expressed by the whole organisation.
- **Deliver** through ongoing processes

#### *Appreciative Inquiry approaches to societal dialogue*

The use of Appreciative Inquiry (AI) at a societal level may be an extension from its roots in organisational change, but is neither novel nor misplaced. One celebrated application of Appreciative Inquiry is referred to in an article by the 'father' of AI, David L. Cooperrider in 1996. It was called 'Imagine Chicago' and involved cascading appreciative interviews throughout the city of Chicago.

The appropriateness of AI as an approach to dialogue and change at societal level can be seen in recognising that, when it comes to developing policy and direction for a society, a city or a nation can be validly seen in organisational terms. Each is an amalgam of individual or sub community values and interests, with common or shared values and interests; and each has some form of leadership or governance structure with responsibility for providing credible and productive policy.

AI brings to this its ability to move people beyond stated positions and enable the focus to shift onto shared values, common humanity and enabling experiences. Thus AI offers a process of "positive dislodgement of certainty", creating the setting for new insight. This serves Bohm and Isaac's understanding of dialogue well. In line with the work of Argyris and Schön, AI helps make explicit embedded values and assumptions and makes them available for both constructive relationship-building through dialogue, and future action.

#### *Adaptations and implementation for "Hands across the Water"*

True to the nature of AI, the design included careful attention to every detail of contact with the participants. Even the first invitation was seen as an intervention shaping subsequent outcomes. Participants were invited to participate. They were interviewed by the researchers by phone in an open-ended way that attempted not to frame any key issues or risk consolidating positions held. Attention was given to the choice of venue for the facilitated process and the setting of the room. The physical space and the ambience of the room and facilitation are significant aspects of intervention, creating a quality of environment that can be determinative.

The basic design involved five phases:

- Initial focus on the creative choice each person had made to be part of the process.
- An introduction to the distinctive approach to Appreciative Inquiry and appreciative interviewing.
- Pairing for mutual interviews, in each case a scientist and a 'community' person.

- Group reflection on the interview experience seeking themes, strands and values.
- Group reflection and individual response on insights and anticipated changes as a result of participating.

One important decision in using Appreciative Inquiry is just what the focus is to be on. This was particularly important in this instance because the declared focus of the research was dialogue around genetic modification technologies. It is the essence of AI to draw out participants' experience in relation to the focal topic. We found it productive to make the primary focus that of constructive experience of dialogue, rather than to focus directly on genetic modification. This is because the aim of AI is to enhance capacity for creative futures, and in this example the capacity building was clearly to be able to have more constructive engagement. Having made that decision, the process and interview guide were shaped with a primary and secondary focus in mind. Experience of dialogue was primary; dialogue about genetic modification and experiences that shaped each person's approach to genetic modification was the secondary focus.

The workshops designed for this project were very much an attenuated sample of Appreciative Inquiry practice. The nature of the research protocol limited the time available for working with the groups and required some engagement with the participants before and after the workshop that had more to do with the researchers' needs than AI best practice.

The major shortcoming of these workshops was that they did not provide opportunity for the participants to build on the relationship and insights gained and to go on to scenario building and action commitments.

Another artificial aspect was the need to standardise and script the process and keep it orthodox as Appreciative Inquiry. This was necessary for the research purpose. Outside the constraints of the research requirements, each of the facilitators would exercise more artistry and freedom in drawing on AI thinking and practice along with insights from other methodologies.

## **Summary**

There is a need to find new ways of engaging people and groups in effective cross-cultural dialogue. Much literature exists concerning the need for appropriate cross-cultural dialogue processes regarding the incorporation of Māori values, perspectives and epistemologies into discussions concerning biotechnology and bioethics, but there is a paucity of literature concerning the actual nature and methodologies of dialogue processes, how dialogue can be constructed, and how appropriate dialogue processes might be applied in practice. Much of the literature acknowledges the need for more cross-cultural dialogue processes and some of the conceptual challenges, but there is little on the practical implementation of such processes, although more cross cultural dialogue projects are starting to emerge.

A number of western dialogue models for engagement and their merits have been discussed in the literature including, inter alia, the Appreciative Inquiry, Civil Conversation and Issues Mapping models which have their strengths and weaknesses. Yet processes for cross-cultural dialogue have often only come from western methodology models. Some Māori have ignored that which we know best – our own tikanga for searching for answers to today's challenges. In our search for modern models for dialogue across cultures that will

allow us to progress with cultural integrity, we have often ignored the models of our own making and that are rooted in our own world view. Perhaps some of the answers are to be found within us. Perhaps re-examining and applying tikanga Māori governing discussions and dialogue in an updated 21<sup>st</sup> century context provides a possible way of engaging mātauranga Māori and western scientists in effective dialogue.

A similar situation may exist for Indigenous Peoples in the Pacific with engaging updated traditional processes for dialogue such as talanoa, ifoga and ho'oponopono institutions. Mātauranga and tikanga Māori, and Pacific People's traditional dialogue processes, always were subject to appropriate change and creative adaptation. If anything can be identified as originating in and handed down from our pre-European Māori ancestors unchanged, it is not any particular social form or particular practices but the principle of creative adaptation itself.

Furthermore, relevant Māori principles and strategies for engagement have been outlined in the literature such as a deliberate multi-staged process that includes the provision of 'toolkits' to prepare groups to engage in constructive dialogue, and the use of Māori intermediaries as translators and facilitators. Durie suggested adopting a paradigm of potential framework where Māori values provide the basis for assessing the relevance of potential benefits of research. Tipene-Matua and Wakefield suggested robust methodologies and frameworks that include Māori knowledge and values such as mana protocols.

In addition, there are an increasing number of Māori and non-Māori who utilise the interface between science and Indigenous knowledge as a source of inventiveness today. They have access to both systems and use the insights and methods of one to enhance the other. The aim of cross-cultural dialogue should not focus on proving the superiority of one system over another but rather identify opportunities in terms of innovation and creativity that draws from both sets of knowledge. Royal referred to *mana* as creative potential while Pou Temara referred to a third space of knowledge creation and production as *pitomata*. A key activity is the negotiation of spaces that allows effective engagement and dialogue between mātauranga Māori and Western science to occur in a way that respects Indigenous knowledge while promoting innovative thinking.

*E tipu e rea, mo nga ra o te ao,  
Ko to ringa ki nga rākau a te Pākehā,  
Hei oranga mo to tinana.  
Ko to ngakau ki nga taonga a o tipuna,  
Hei tikitiki mo to mahunga.  
Ko to wairua ki te Atua,  
Nana nei nga mea katoa.*

*Grow up O tender child in the days of your world,  
In your hands the tools of the Pākehā,  
As means to support and sustain you.  
In your heart the treasures of your ancestors,  
As a plume for your head.  
Your spirit given to God,  
The source of all things.  
- Sir Apirana Ngata*

## References

1. Agrawal, A, 'Indigenous and Scientific Knowledge: Some Critical Comments' in *IK Monitor* (Vol. 3, No. 3, 2004, online at <http://www.nuffic.nl/circan/ikdm/3-3/articles/agrawal.html>) (Accessed September 2008).
2. Ausberger, D, 'An Existential Approach to Anger-Management Training' in *Journal of Psychology and Christianity* (Vol. 5, 1986) at 25-29.
3. Brinson, Jesse and Fisher, Teresa A. 'The Ho'oponopono Group: A Conflict Resolution Model for School Counsellors' in *The Journal of Specialists in Group Work* (Vol. 24, no. 4, 1999, Arizona State University 'Multicultural Group Work) at 369-382.
4. Cram, F, Pihama, L & Barbara, G.P, *Māori and Genetic Engineering: Research Report* (IRI (International Research Institute for Māori and Indigenous Education), University of Auckland, May 2000).
5. Cram, F, Phillips, H, Tipene-Matua, B, Parsons, M and Taupo, K 'A 'Parallel Process?' Beginning a Constructive Conversation about a Māori Methodology' in *Journal of Bioethical Inquiry* (Vol. 1, No. 1, 2004) at 14.
6. Denzin, N, Lincoln, Y and Smith, L, (Eds.) *Handbook of Critical Indigenous Methodologies* (SAGE Publications Inc., California, 2008).
7. Du Plessis, R, 'Democracy, Participation and 'Scientific Citizenship': New Zealand Initiatives' (Paper presented to the Policy and Politics International Conference on 'Policy and Politics in a Globalising World', Bristol, 24-26 July 2003).
8. Durie, M, 'Mana Tangata: Culture, Custom and Transgenic Research' (Essay for the Bioethics Council, on the internet at [www.bioethics.org.nz/publications/himan-genes-reflections-jan04](http://www.bioethics.org.nz/publications/himan-genes-reflections-jan04)) (Accessed November 2007).
9. Gurevitch, Z.D, 'The Power of Not Understanding: The Meeting of Conflicting Identities' in *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science* (Vol. 25, 1989) at 161.
10. Harmsworth, G, *A Collaborative Research Model for Working With Iwi* (Landcare Research, Palmerston North, July 2001).
11. Hassall, Graham, *Using Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue as a Social Transformation Tool – the Case of Fiji* (Expert Meeting on 'Dialogue in the Social Integration Process: Building Peaceful Social Relations – By, For and With People,' United Nations, New York, 21-23 November 2005)
12. Hutchings, J & Reynolds, P, 'The Obfuscation of Tikanga Māori in the GM Debate' (Unpublished Paper, in author's possession, no date).
13. Jenkins, Kuni, 'The Hui Taumata 2005 Vision: To Expand Māori Economic Pathways: Creating, Growing and Succeeding in our Future Together – Ka Hua, Ka Tupu, Ka Toa. Learning for Life through Cross-Cultural Dialogue' (Te Hui Taumata 2005 Conference, Wellington, 2005):
14. Kawagley, A. Oscar, *A Yupiaq Worldview: A Pathway to Ecology and Spirit* (Waveland Press, Inc, Illinois, 1995).
15. Kēpa, Mere and Manu'atu, Linitā, 'Pedagogical Decolonization: Impacts of the European/Pākehā Society on the Education of Tongan People in Aotearoa, New Zealand' in *American Behavioural Scientist Journal* (Vol. 51, No. 12, August 2008) at 1801 – 1815:
16. Maryboy, Nancy and Begay, David, *Sharing the Skies: Navajo Astronomy: A Cross Cultural View* (World Hope Foundation, Indigenous Education Institute, 2005).

17. Mead, A & Tomas, N, 'The Convention on Biological Diversity: Are Human Genes Biological Resources?' in *New Zealand Environmental Law Reporter* (July, 1995) at 127-132.
18. Mead, Aroha Te Pareake, 'Human Genetic Research and Whakapapa' in Te Whaiti, Pania, McCarthy, Marie & Durie, Arohia (Eds), *Mai i Rangiātea: Māori Wellbeing and Development*, (Auckland University Press, Bridget William Books, Auckland, 1997) at 126-141.
19. Mead, Hirini Moko, *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori Values* (Huia Publishers, Wellington, 2003).
20. Mead, S.M, *Nga Tikanga Tuku Iho a Te Māori: Customary Concepts of the Māori* (Department of Māori Studies, Victoria University, Wellington, 1984).
21. Metge, Joan, *Korero Tahī: Talking Together* (Auckland University Press, with Te Mātāhauariki Institute, 2001).
22. Milroy, Stephanie, 'A Māori Perspective on Cloning' in School of Law, *Hello Dolly? Therapeutic Cloning of Human Embryos and Human Cloning Conference Proceedings* (Centre for New Zealand Jurisprudence, School of Law, University of Waikato, 26 May 2001) at 35-40.
23. Ministry of Social Development, *Pacific Youth Development Strategy: Deliver Positive Life-Change and Affirmation for All Pacific Youth in Auckland* (Ministry of Social Development, Auckland, June 2005).
24. Mitias, M and Al-Jasmi, A 'Intercultural Dialogue' in *Dialogue and Universalism* (Vol. 3, No. 4, 2004) 143-161.
25. Moon, P, *Tohunga Hohepa Kereopa* (David Ling Publishing, Auckland, 2003).
26. MoRST, *The Interface Between Mātauranga Māori and Mainstream Science* (Ministry of Research, Science and Technology, Wellington, 1995).
27. Mutu, Margaret, Dialogue as Social Self-Organization: An Introduction in Hammond, S and Sanders, S.L, *Emergence* (Vol. 4, Issue 4, December 2002) at 7-24.
28. Okere, T, Njoku, C and Devisch, R, 'All Knowledge is First of All Local Knowledge: An Introduction' in *Africa Development* (Vol. XXX, No. 3, 2005) at 1-19.
29. Roberts, M, Haami, B, Benton, R, Satterfield, T, Finucane, L, Henare, M, and Henare, M, 'Whakapapa as a Māori Mental Construct: Some Implications for the Debate Over Genetic Modification of Organisms' in *The Contemporary Pacific* (Vol. 16, No. 1, Spring 2004) at 1-28.
30. Roberts, M, 'Walking Backwards into the Future: Māori Views of Genetically Modified Organisms' in *Inaugural Journal of the World Indigenous Nations Higher Education Consortium (WINHEC)* (2005).
31. Royal, C 'Te Whare Tapere: Towards a Model for Māori Performing Arts' (Doctoral Dissertation, Victoria University of Wellington, 1998).
32. Royal, C.T, *The Woven Universe: Selected Writings of Rev. Māori Marsden* (Estate of Rev. Māori Marsden, 2003).
33. Royal, C, 'Te Kaimanga: Towards a new vision for Mātauranga Māori'. Located on the internet at [www.mkta.co.nz](http://www.mkta.co.nz) (Accessed November 2007).
34. Royal, C *The Purpose of Education: Perspectives arising from Mātauranga Māori: A Discussion Paper* (Report prepared for the Ministry of Education, Version 4, January 2007).
35. Sarris, Greg, *Keeping Slug Woman Alive: A Holistic Approach to American Indian Texts* (California University Press, California, 1993).
36. Shuter, Angie, *Scoping Paper: A Review of the Experiences of Other States in the Development of Sui Generis Mechanisms for Protecting Knowledge* (Te Puni Kokiri Paper, Wellington, February 2002).

37. Smith, Linda Tuhiwai, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (Zed Books, London, University of Otago Press, 1999).
38. Tau, R., Te Maire, *Nga Pikituroa o Ngai Tahu: The Oral Traditions of Ngai Tahu* (University of Otago Press, 2003).
39. Te Mātāhauariki Institute, 'Te Matapunenga: A Compendium of References to the Concepts and Institutions of Māori Customary Law: Proto-Compendium' (CD, Te Mātāhauariki Institute, University of Waikato, Hamilton, May 2007).
40. Te Momo, Fiona, *Socially and Culturally Sustainable Biotechnology in Aotearoa/New Zealand: A Report on the Social, Cultural, Religious, and Spiritual Dimensions of Biotechnology for Māori* (Report Prepared for Professor Judy Morton, Massey University, Auckland, no date).
41. Te Momo, F 'Exposing Diversity: Uncovering Common Scientific Values Between Biotechnology, Indigenous Knowledge and Western Knowledge' in *International Journal on Technology, Knowledge and Society* (Vol. 1, No. 6, 2005).
42. Tiakiwai, S, Tanner, C, Skipper, A, Philips-Barbara, G and Greensill, A, *Finding Common Ground – Dialogue on Wastewater Management to Address Māori Cultural and Spiritual Values* (Ministry of Research, Science and Technology, NIWA, Hamilton, October 2004).
43. Tipene-Matua, Bevan, *Having Honest Conversations about the Impact of New Technologies on Indigenous People's Knowledge and Values* (Conference Paper, Mātauranga Taketake, Traditional knowledge Conference, 2006).
44. Tipene-Matua, B and Wakefield, B, 'Establishing a Māori Ethical Framework for Genetic Research with Māori' in Henaghan, M, *Genes, Society and the Future: Human Genome Research Project* (Te Kaupapa Rangahau Ira Tangata, Law, Ethics and Policy for the Future, University of Otago, 2007) at 379-422.
45. Tuala-Warren, Leilani, *A Study in Ifoga: Samoa's Answer to Dispute Healing* (Te Mātāhauariki Institute Occasional Paper Series, No. 2, University of Waikato, 2002):
46. Walker, M, 'Māori and Science' (Conference Address, *Strategies for the Next Decade: Sovereignty in Action* (School of Māori and Pacific Development, University of Waikato, 1997) at 68-79.
47. Williams, David, *Mātauranga Māori and Taonga: The Nature and Extent of Treaty Rights Held by Iwi and Hapu in Indigenous Flora and Fauna, Cultural Heritage Objects and Valued Traditional Knowledge* (Waitangi Tribunal Publications, Wellington, 2001).
48. Wilcox, P, Charity, J, Moke-Delaney, P, Roberts, M, Tauwhare, S, Tipene-Matua, B, Kereama, R, Hunter, R, *A Values-Base Framework for Cross Cultural Dialogue Between Scientists and Māori* (Cellwall Biotechnology Centre, Scion Te Papa Tipu Innovation Park, Rotorua, Te Aroturuki –Māori Advisory Group for CBC , School of Business Management, University of Waikato, Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiarangi, Industrial Research Ltd, Wellington, Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology, Pakihi Partners Limited, Wellington, Marlborough Research Centre, Blenheim, no date).
49. Woods, Huia, 'Traditional Indigenous Peoples' Knowledge Systems as Viable Mechanisms for Sustainable Resource Management under the Convention on Biological Diversity' (LLM Thesis, School of Law, University of Waikato, 2004).

*'Te rongonui o te taniko, kei roto i te whiriwhiri noa mau tonu tona ataahua.'* – *'The beauty of the taniko is that there is more than one pattern.'*