

Engaging with indigenous knowledge to shape a bicultural counselling programme in Aotearoa New Zealand

Susan Crozier¹ | Nigel Pizzini²

¹Hospice West, Henderson, Auckland, Aotearoa, New Zealand

²Health and Social Practice, Unitec Institute of Technology, Auckland, Aotearoa, New Zealand

Correspondence

Nigel Pizzini, Healthcare and Social Practice, Unitec Institute of Technology, Private Bag 92025, Victoria Street West, Auckland 1142, Aotearoa New Zealand.

Email: npizzini@unitec.ac.nz

Abstract

This paper is an account of the rationale behind the authors' efforts to create a Masters in Counselling programme, centred on a poststructuralist approach known as narrative therapy, that might be deserving of the designation "bicultural". In developing the new degree, the goal was to bring the knowledge, language and values of the indigenous Māori people of Aotearoa New Zealand alongside and into a dialogue with international, Eurocentric, non-Māori counselling theories and practices. Our hypothesis was that this dialogue might result in an innovative and transformational learning experience that could prepare counselling practitioners to work for more equitable outcomes with diverse client groups. We share this account of our narrative and the reflections stemming from our programme development work believing they offer a contribution to thinking about how counsellor education can engage well with cultural diversity. Beyond the question of how counselling practitioners are to engage with culturally diverse clients, which risks falling into essentialising models of diversity, we argue that the engagement with biculturalism, as suggested by the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi), provides a powerful lens for thinking about creating a socially just and inclusive counselling practice.

[Correction added on 26 December 2019, after first online publication: The order of authors has been corrected, with Susan Crozier listed as first author.]

KEYWORDS

bicultural, counsellor education, mātauranga Māori, narrative therapy, poststructuralism

1 | UNDERSTANDING THE AOTEAROA NEW ZEALAND CONTEXT

In 2018 the authors were both teaching on a postgraduate counselling programme in Tāmaki Makaurau (Auckland), Aotearoa New Zealand. We were recruited to develop a new Masters in Counselling degree at our institution centred on narrative practice (White & Epston, 1990), a poststructuralist approach to counselling that understands the problems people bring to counselling as socially and culturally produced. This task coincided with a renewed determination in our department, our institution, and across the education sector in our country, to incorporate *mātauranga Māori* (the knowledge of the indigenous Māori people) into formal education (Black, Bean, Collings, & Nuku, 2012). What was new for us was to make this bicultural approach integral to curriculum design at every level rather than an added component that remained marginal to our overall educational project.

Te Tiriti o Waitangi (the Treaty of Waitangi) is an agreement between the British Crown and Māori, signed on 6 February 1840 by 43 Northland chiefs and Lieutenant Governor Hobson (Network Waitangi, 2016; Stenson, 2004). As a founding document of the colonial state it codifies the relationship between Māori and the Crown. For reasons discussed in the following section, the application and implications of Te Tiriti remain a contested area of public life, with a considerable gap between aspiration and practice to this day, nearly 180 years after the Treaty was signed (Came, Cornes, & McCreanor, 2018; Came & da Silva, 2011; Elkington, 2011; Glynn, 2015). A commitment to biculturalism/Treaty partnership in our country is supposed to be a guiding principle of education and other health and social services, and in many instances it is (for examples see: Black et al., 2012; Came et al., 2018; Unitec Institute of Technology, 2011; Ministry of Education, 2010). It is in this light that efforts are made towards education practices that honour Te Tiriti o Waitangi, reflecting and valuing the heritage and cultures that were intended to be brought alongside one another under the terms of the Treaty. A truly bicultural relationship acknowledges the rights of *tangata whenua* (the indigenous people of this country) under Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

As we sought to include mātauranga Māori in our developing programme, we had in mind the need to avoid misunderstanding and misappropriation of cultural knowledge. Our country has a traumatic history of colonisation in which the land, the language, the resources, the way of life, and the culture of the indigenous people have been stolen, undermined, and distorted by European colonisers. Whenever *Pākehā* (a descriptive word applied to non-Māori people and things from Europe, or specifically the United Kingdom; Webber, 2008) engage with Māori *taonga* (treasures) and *tikanga* (cultural practices), Māori are understandably attuned to signs that colonisation and racism are at work yet again (Jones, 2017). A history of violence and violation has left a legacy of anger, hurt, and mistrust that makes engagement across cultures a risky undertaking for all involved, though, of course, the stakes are particularly high for indigenous people since they bear more heavily the costs of history.

As *Tauīwi* (an inclusive Māori term for all people of non-Maori descent [Ariki, 2008] as distinct from *Pākehā*, which denotes white/European descent specifically) counsellor educators, we approached the task of weaving in mātauranga Māori with the hesitancy and uncertainty that comes with belonging to the dominant cultural group and recognising the power and privilege we hold. We were all too aware of the risk of perpetuating colonising discourses. Māori academic and counsellor Joy Te Wiata noted experiences of *Tauīwi* seeking to work cross-culturally being accused of further colonising moves:

They found their endeavours to honour Māori in their work made them vulnerable to the charge of co-opting Māori language and knowledges and thus participating in the further colonizing of Māori. (Te Wiata & Crocket, 2011, p. 24)

However, we also felt that the failure to engage cross-culturally might be equally injurious. In developing this new programme, we took the view that, in honouring our partnership obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi, it is not acceptable to focus only on Eurocentric models of counselling. In addressing diversity, counsellor educators have fallen into sectioning off the beliefs, practices, and concerns of minority groups into a separate, and often small, section of education and practice. In Aotearoa New Zealand educators have met their Treaty obligations by corralling attention to the history and culture shaping Māori concerns and Māori counselling practice into a discrete content block, often at the beginning or end of a programme or via a *noho marae* experience (a stay in the central area of a traditional Māori community). We argue that this practice risks leaving dominant cultural ideas and practices intact and does nothing to explore how tikanga and Māori wisdom could contribute to those practices.

We believe that such included but separate approaches to Tiriti-based counsellor education are an inadequate response to contemporary society and the future of counselling practice in Aotearoa New Zealand. Although it is accepted practice for Māori and Taiwi curricular content to maintain relative autonomy, there is also increasing recognition that these two realms could usefully be placed in dialogue with one another more fully. Therefore, with the encouragement of Māori colleagues in our department, we were determined to dive in and make our best efforts to place mātauranga Māori at the heart of the new programme, actively engaging in a living encounter between the two cultural paradigms.

2 | THE COLONISATION OF AOTEAROA NEW ZEALAND AND TE TIRITI O WAITANGI/THE TREATY OF WAITANGI

As is probably clear by now, there is a fundamental social justice imperative at work here, acknowledging the traumatic history of colonisation in Aotearoa New Zealand and seeking to align with Māori in the ongoing work of decolonising knowledge, language, values, culture and healing, and spiritual practices. In order to make sense of this goal, we need to take a detour into history.

Aotearoa New Zealand was colonised by the British in the early part of the nineteenth century. At first, Māori welcomed the newcomers as trading partners and were eager to learn about European ideas and technologies. Māori were actively entrepreneurial and engaged in trade across the region. In addition, indigenous values of hospitality meant that Māori were willing to share their resources and create room for these English settlers (King, 2003). However, in the early decades of the 19th century, the numbers of settlers ballooned and the threat to Māori society, tribal land holdings, and resources became increasingly problematic. In an effort to assert their rights in terms that the colonisers would understand and respect, tribal chiefs sought to enter into a formal agreement with the Crown (for more information about Māori leadership efforts to assert their sovereignty, and the earlier Declaration of Independence by the Confederation of the United Tribes of New Zealand, see Network Waitangi, 2016, p. 9). As well as claiming control over their own land and resources, the chiefs wanted the British to manage their unruly settler populations (King, 2003).

The story of alienation from land, resources, language, and culture is a familiar one across the New World in which European settlers arrived and proceeded to decimate the local culture. What is particular about the situation in Aotearoa New Zealand is that a formal treaty was negotiated between Māori tribal chiefs and the representatives of Queen Victoria. In 1840 these parties met at Waitangi, in the Bay of Islands, and the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi) was signed (Stenson, 2004).

The history of the Treaty is a complicated one. There were actually multiple versions of the Treaty and the version signed by the British differed from the one signed by the Māori chiefs (Te Tiriti; Network Waitangi, 2016;

Stenson, 2004). Central to the difference is the question of sovereignty or *rangatiratanga* (absolute territorial authority). The British signed the Treaty from a sense of their own assured cultural superiority and rights as the colonising authority. But, from a Māori point of view, Te Tiriti signalled a partnership in which they were guaranteed sovereignty over their lands, resources, and people, and the Crown would get on with the job of managing the settler population (Network Waitangi, 2016).

Since the 1840s, Te Tiriti o Waitangi has been repeatedly breached by successive colonial governments, enabling ongoing erosion of the wealth and culture of the indigenous people (King, 2003). Māori land was illegally taken, laws were passed to undermine Māori language as well as spiritual and cultural practices, and racism meant that Māori people were continually disenfranchised and excluded from the social and economic benefits of the developing new world society (see King, 2003; Wynyard, 2017). As a result, Māori people today have only a tiny fraction of the land and wealth they once owned—just three million acres of the 66 million they held before 1840 (Fyers, 2018), many Māori have no knowledge of their cultural origins and identity, and Māori are over-represented in numerous statistical measures of social distress including poverty and poor health outcomes, drug and alcohol abuse, domestic violence, and rates of imprisonment (see Bell, Elizabeth, McIntosh, & Wynyard, 2017).

However, in the face of colonisation, Māori have fought to retain their land and culture and have not stopped claiming that Te Tiriti o Waitangi must be honoured. Since the 1970s in particular, Māori have been engaged in processes of decolonisation, reclaiming and revitalising their language, knowledge, and cultural practices (Hutchings & Lee, 2016; Huygens, 2007). Alongside this cultural resurgence there have been ongoing legal battles to seek restoration of land and of sovereignty, and to secure compensation for illegal land and resource thefts (Hayward & Wheen, 2004). In addition, Māori have invested considerable effort in education and social services to respond to their needs in culturally appropriate ways (Durie, 2001; see also Herrmann, 2016).

3 | COUNSELLING AND COUNSELLOR EDUCATION IN AOTEAROA NEW ZEALAND

There is a history of white, western, Pākehā ideas, values, and practices shaping the fields of counselling, as well as education and other health and welfare services. Eurocentric systems of meaning have been imposed on Māori who have been described and treated in deficit terms, so that their own knowledges, values, and practices have been pathologised or silenced (Durie, 1998, p. 67; Durie, 2007). An example of this process was the passing of the Tohunga Suppression Act, brought to the New Zealand parliament by Māori MPs in 1907. Intended to stop traditional healing that included the supernatural, it impeded the transmission of *rongoā* (indigenous knowledge about medicinal use of plants; Te Ara, 2006). Even though it can be argued that Māori provide more and more services in education (Hohepa, Smith, Smith, & McNaughton, 1992), health (Boulton, Simonsen, Walker, Cumming, & Cunningham, 2004; Turia, 2003), and welfare for Māori, inequities in the provision of and access to those services continue (Durie, 1998; Poata-Smith, 2013). Current examples include the government-funded health system and the criminal justice system (McIntosh & Workman, 2013).

It has long been an ethical requirement for counselling to honour the cultural diversity of clients (Agee et al., 2011). In Aotearoa New Zealand, the New Zealand Association of Counsellors (NZAC) has made it a requirement of counsellor training since 2002 that candidates demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the Treaty and its principles (Cornforth & Crocket, 2011; Crocket et al., 2013; NZAC, 2002). Thus the NZAC code of ethics states:

Counsellors shall seek to be informed about the meaning and implications of the Treaty of Waitangi for their work. They shall understand the principles of protection, participation and partnership with Māori. (NZAC, 2002, p. 2)

Prior to our work on a new Masters of Counselling, counsellor education in our institution involved a stand-alone block of course content focusing on the histories of colonisation and decolonisation in Aotearoa New Zealand. In an assessment task, students were asked to demonstrate understanding of the effects of colonisation and the efforts of Māori to reclaim their culture and sovereignty. In addition, students were asked to reflect on their own cultural identities, how they had been shaped and how that shaping influenced their understanding of counselling practice. The invitation here, among other things, was for Pākehā students in particular to understand the nature of the privilege they hold and their place in a society built on a colonial discourse of cultural superiority and entitlement.

Of course, many students were themselves Māori and had stories to tell about growing up with conflicting experiences of their cultural identity. Ours is an increasingly multicultural society and many of our students identified with multiple ethnicities. Others were recent migrants and brought with them their own stories of cultural meaning, belonging, and displacement. By asking people to reflect on their cultural identity, lecturers in the previous programme believed that students might gain some insight that would inform and support their engagement with Māori clients. However, some students found this undertaking to be challenging and it did not always yield the intended outcome.

The previous programme also sought to incorporate *tikanga Māori* (customs) by including practices of *karakia* and *waiata* (prayer and song) to open and close the day in our class meetings. On several occasions we welcomed Māori guest lecturers to speak about their work with *whānau Māori* (Māori families). In completing the educational requirements of the New Zealand Association of Counselling, students were also required to participate in a *noho marae*, which is an overnight stay at a *marae* (traditional meeting place), to have a lived experience of Māori cultural values and practices, such as *manaakitanga* (practices of hospitality and care), *whakawhanaungatanga* (practices for establishing relationship), and *wairuatanga* (practices of spirituality).

As enriching and thought-provoking as these experiences may have been, it is also possible that, for many students, they remained an isolated experience that did not actually prepare them to move between cultural paradigms sensitively and skilfully. We have come to understand that including, but separating, Māori knowledge and practice within a counsellor education programme that is still largely founded in white/Western models of theory and practice (derived from Europe or America), risks leaving colonising practices intact. Our concern is that this approach could foster an “othering” of Māori in ways that heighten distinctions and engender more distance between Māori and non-Māori.

This approach has two potential consequences for counsellor education: one is that Tauīwi students are not really engaged with Māori knowledge and values and so are ill-prepared to work with Māori clients in ways that can respect and meaningfully engage with Māori culture. The other potential consequence is that a Pākehā-centric counsellor education does not create a hospitable environment for Māori students wishing to train as counsellors. As professor of Māori education Wally Penetito (2009) argued: “For the majority of Māori students, no matter where they are, formal education remains a frustrating and unhappy experience” (p. 15). The frustration arises from having to check one’s identity at the door and engage with the Pākehā world on Pākehā terms. While most Māori are used to living and moving between *te ao Pākehā* and *te ao Māori* (the Pākehā world and the Māori world), there is a growing recognition of the need and value of providing education for Māori as Māori; an education that recognises, values, and places as central the cultural knowledge and practices of this indigenous people, unique to Aotearoa New Zealand (Glynn, 2015). Our aim is to shift from a deficit construction of Māori people and ways of being as a problem to be solved, and enable what Jones (2017) termed a “turn instead towards the strengths within Māori/indigenous communities and the insights of indigenous thought and analysis” (p. 183).

4 | THE CHALLENGE AND ITS COMPLICATIONS

As a result of the history and understanding outlined above, our challenge has been to go beyond isolated “cultural competency” training, to think about how to honour *te ao Māori* by weaving Māoritanga into our programme. We

wanted to place Māori knowledge (*mātarauanga Māori*) and values (*whananga pono*) at the heart of our programme, alongside and in a dialogue with white/Western theoretical frameworks. As authors and designers of a Masters programme in Counselling, our aim has been to prepare Tauivi counsellors to better respond to the needs of Māori clients, and to create a safer and more enabling learning space for Māori counsellors in training.

Alongside this aim, however, we recognise that Aotearoa New Zealand is an increasingly multicultural society with a significant proportion of Pacific peoples and migrant and refugee peoples from all over the world (Webber, 2008). The duality of “Māori” and “Pākehā” is a somewhat artificial binary, since many are of mixed descent. While Pākehā usually refers to European or British cultural heritage, increasingly our society includes people from China, Korea, Nigeria, Somalia, South Africa, Eastern Europe and many other nations and ethnic groups. In acknowledgement that Māori are the first people of this country, the *tangata whenua* of this land, the term Pākehā is often replaced by “Tauivi” (person coming from afar) or “Tangata Tiriti” (people of the Treaty) to more broadly include all non-Māori.

Furthermore, neither our students nor our clients are simply Māori or Other—as discussed above their identities can be experienced as complex hybrid mixes (Webber, 2008). They come from many different cultural, religious, and language backgrounds. They are male and female, older, younger, gay and straight and trans, they are able-bodied and living with limitations and they are relatively socio-economically advantaged or disadvantaged.

It is also the case that Māori are not singular—they also come from many different cultural and language backgrounds within Māoridom. Some have grown up knowing their *whakapapa*—their heritage, their language, their tribal affiliations, and tribal lands. Others have no known connection to their whakapapa. Some are fluent speakers of their native language, while others have never had the opportunity to learn. Some have multiple cultural identifications—Chinese, Pasifika, Irish, Scottish, English and some affiliate only to their Māori side.

The term “Māori” is also problematic. Melinda Webber, associate professor of education and social work, of Ngati Te Arawa/Ngapuhi/Pākehā affiliation explained:

Māori were and are a tribal people. They describe themselves according to their tribal membership, rather than their national membership. They are Māori only in relation to Pākehā . . . Before the arrival of Europeans, Māori had no name for themselves as a nation, only a number of tribal names. . . . From the time Europeans arrived, Māori used the term Māori to distinguish themselves as “normal or usual,” as opposed to the “different” European settlers. (Webber, 2008, pp. 13–14)

Given this diversity, there is not one version of Māori culture that we can fix in place and hold up as the authentic version that we will honour in our developing programme. As we have come to understand, creating a bicultural programme is not a matter of dropping in additional blocks of Māori content. Rather, we would argue that it invites us to think about care for tangata whenua and Māori knowledge/world views in ways that are frequently culturally unfamiliar to us as Tauivi.

5 | DISTURBING OUR OWN EUROCENTRIC WAYS OF “KNOWING”

Counsellor education that addresses cultural diversity might take a number of approaches. One might be to educate future counsellors in the nuts and bolts of the beliefs and practices of a selection of minority groups. While seeking to be informed can be helpful, the risk here is that the diversity within diversity is erased or elided—we learn a few key facts about the “other” that we add to our basket of expertise as we go forward into counselling conversations. The problem here is the essentialising effect of categories of persons—an assumption that all persons gathered under the heading “women” or “Muslims” or “Māori” have the same values, hopes, and knowledge based on the human groupings they are gathered into.

The other related risk is that we look for empathic commonalities between self and other, a practice that Taiwi associate professor in education, Wendy Drewery (2005) suggested is “colonising” because it can “incorporate or subsume the other” (p. 308). For example, the liberal-humanist perspective that informs person-centred therapy might lead us to seek for presumed universalities, such as certain basic psychological needs, that underpin identity. This assumption of an inherent and universal human experience can cause us to overlook unique and important aspects of diverse identities.

Drewery (2005) troubled the Rogerian idea of empathic engagement based on a notion of connecting with the experience of the other “as if” it was your own. She argued that “even apparently supportive relationships based on empathy . . . risk producing a problematic form of relationship where the meanings of one are incorporated into the meanings and frameworks of the other” (p. 308). This form of engagement can have a homogenising or reductive effect on conversations with diverse others, which may reproduce a form of psychological colonisation.

American therapist and counsellor educator William C. Madsen (2007) provided a dramatic example of the ways in which cultural diversity can be misunderstood and even pathologised within frameworks that assume universalising ideas about human experience. He relayed the story of a Southeast Asian new mother whose culturally specific response to praise of her baby leads to an escalating pathologisation. When the obstetrician praises the beauty of her new baby, this mother insists that her baby is ugly, which raises medical alarm bells about “an attachment problem” (p. 25). She continues to argue for her baby’s ugliness and also seeks to hide the baby from the medical team, further consolidating a pathologising interpretation of her behaviour. Eventually it comes to light that her actions are an expression of efforts to protect her much-loved child from an evil spirit who might be drawn close by people praising the baby and a fear that this evil spirit might steal away his soul.

This Eurocentric misinterpretation of diverse beliefs, practices, and ontologies is also evident in the history of Māori encounters with psychiatric services. For example, in Māori culture many people have living connections with ancestors experienced as voices or presences (Bidois, 2006). Within Western psychology the experience of hearing voices can be interpreted as psychosis, whereas in a culturally sensitive practice such presences and relationships can be valued and engaged with (NiaNia, Bush, & Epston, 2016).

From the perspective of counsellor education, then, how do we prepare our students to engage respectfully and in non-colonising ways with others whose beliefs, knowledges, and value systems are significantly outside our own experience? And, in particular, how do we prepare counsellors to engage with those whose beliefs, knowledges, and values have been subjugated by the colonising and universalising force of Eurocentric models of psychology and counselling therapy? These questions have shaped our thinking in developing our own Masters in Counselling.

In seeking to include mātauranga Māori in our programme design, we did not want to assume that we knew about mātauranga Māori, in the sense that it is a content component that could be mastered and neatly delivered in a contained way. And we did not want to assume that we knew what parallels or resonances could be drawn between the post-structural, collaborative counselling frameworks we knew about and the values and practices of Māori approaches to well-being.

In other words, we were interested in how mātauranga Māori might radically disturb the kinds of assumptions that our Western counselling paradigms hold. As Taiwi counsellor educators, we put ourselves forward to have our own “knowing” disturbed. We were, in a sense, being asked to model the kind of non-colonising practices that we hoped our students would learn—engaging with respectful curiosity, positioning people who identify as Māori in ways that are dignity-enhancing and supportive of the adoption of agentic and self-determining positions on their own terms. Inspiration for these aspirations is found in the working example of the Just Therapy Team (Waldegrave, Tamasese, Tuhaka, & Campbell, 2003).

6 | QUESTIONING LIBERAL HUMANIST NOTIONS OF THE SELF

Central to this undertaking is troubling a notion of the “self-contained individual” that lies at the heart of Eurocentric culture. Within the neoliberal paradigm that has come to dominate Western societies, relationships are structured as transactions between individuals within the marketplace (Sampson, 2003). Humans are frequently conceived of as bags of psychological needs, strengths, and pathologies that need to be regulated through the disciplinary structures of law, education, psychology, and health.

For indigenous societies, the notion of the self-contained individual is a fundamentally alien idea. In indigenous cultures, identity is always relational, based on forms of connection and belonging that reach into the past, into the material and non-material realms, and into relationships of kinship and community:

[Relationships] with others and with the land, rather than individuality, are constant, primary considerations in living within a Māori world, where the autonomous, controlling self is not the dominant model. (Drewery, 2005, p. 309)

With a nod to her own European heritage and acknowledging the limitations of the position from which she speaks about Māori culture, Drewery located particular ways in which Māori culture constructs personhood as relational:

- Relationship is the primary mode of being.
- Respectful relationship is a primary value.
- Care for the other involves the preservation of his or her dignity or *mana*.
- Relationships are constituted and performed in speech and action.
- Speech is an action in and on the world. (Drewery, 2005, p. 310)

Given that Māori culture is so fundamentally relational, we reasoned that the engagement between *mātauranga Māori* and the white/Western models of counselling we know and feel equipped to teach needed to be dialogical, involving a relationship between entities both deserving of understanding and respect. We determined that we needed to avoid seeking to translate *mātauranga Māori* into European concepts, or vice versa, and to avoid trying to find equivalences between practices that might risk a reductive misunderstanding of the richness of Māori culture in particular. Our hope was that the models of counselling we had to teach might come into a conversation with *mātauranga Māori* in a way that would destabilise fixed positions of knowing and expertise and instead invite relationships of hospitality in which one could find ways to meet the other via an ethic of care and safety.

This approach resonated with Drewery's interpretation of Sampson's work, which, she argued:

proposes a dialogical account of relationship and selfhood, by which I understand that persons are able to engage in a dialogical relationship in full acceptance of their differences. With Levinas, he proposes that unconditional kindness to strangers is foundational to an ethical psychological practice. (Drewery, 2005, p. 309)

Our hope then has been to welcome *mātauranga Māori* as an independent, sovereign partner in a conversation that would create new places for our students to stand in their practice with diverse others, including Māori as *tangata whenua*, but also in a conversation of respectful curiosity and care for everyone they meet in their counselling practice.

7 | TROUBLING THE CENTRE

Such were our good intentions. And, as worthy as they seem when they are on the page, we need to acknowledge that, due to several constraining factors, there was little consultation with Māori colleagues and stakeholders about whether this was a plan that they would like to engage with or whether there was another (better) way of approaching the ethical and social justice concerns at the heart of our endeavour.

Our lack of full consultation—and our lack of attending to our partnership with Māori—was a problem. As the inheritors of colonial privilege, our approach could be read as simply perpetuating our historical theft of Māori culture, taking over and trying to “do” mātauranga Māori on our own Pākehā terms.

Alison Jones is a Tauīwi New Zealand educational researcher who has long engaged with Māori communities and is aware of the risks of Tauīwi taking over:

It is perhaps inevitable that dominant groups commonly assume . . . [that] we are always-already “the centre” and thus we position ourselves as the speakers, actors, creators, managers of everything. We are the ones who will take on injustice and sort out the problem of a bicultural society. (Jones, 2017, p. 182)

Jones's reflection is a salutary reminder that when we, as Tauīwi, come up with a plan involving mātauranga Māori, we need to ensure we have consulted and have engaged in the kind of care for relationship that would enable an effective partnership to emerge.

In developing our programme, we would have liked to have had a Māori colleague working alongside us. This was not a possibility given the limited time frame and financial realities we faced, so we went ahead in the hope that we would have a Māori colleague in the fullness of time. What we intended by doing so was to take responsibility for *making space* for mātauranga Māori, rather than being the ones to *do* mātauranga Māori. We saw ourselves as providing hospitality to the other, making space for the other, being ready to engage, but also taking responsibility for grappling with the project while simultaneously working towards stepping aside.

In retrospect, it now seems that as we charged ahead, efficiently writing and designing the new Masters curriculum with our eye on the compliance and approval processes we needed to get through and the time frames imposed upon us, we neglected the consultation and care for the relationships that would enable a successful partnership to emerge. We were, effectively, creating spaces on our own terms that we only presumed and hoped Māori would come along and choose to occupy. As ambitious and well-intentioned as our desire to create a Masters programme with mātauranga Māori at its heart may have been, there were dimensions to the undertaking that we only peripherally addressed in our planning, right from the start.

8 | WORKING THE HYPHEN BETWEEN MĀORI AND PĀKEHĀ

It is not simply that we should have known, or that we should have been better educated in terms of Māori culture, though that may be true. Rather, we would say that it is important to understand our own assumptions, to get these out in front of us before we start and to engage with Māori partners who might, in their own bilingual and bicultural competence, be able to trouble some of the ideas with which we work.

Jones (2017) has given a great deal of thought to what it means to work cross-culturally, between coloniser and the colonised. She cited Michelle Fine's (1994) phrase “working the hyphen” to speak to “the complex space of the self-other border”.

The indigenous-settler hyphen reaches back into a deeply shared, and troubled, past. In Aotearoa New Zealand, even our names—Māori and Pākehā—discursively produce the other. Each term brought

the other into being, to distinguish the ordinary people (the word 'Māori' means 'ordinary') from the white-skinned settlers. The shared indigene-coloniser or Māori-Pākehā hyphen . . . marks a relationship of power that continues to shape differential patterns of cultural and social privilege. (Jones, 2017, p. 184)

The fact that this tension between Māori and Pākehā exists might lead to a determination on the part of Pākehā to address the space between in ways that seek to resolve it, or at least seek to contain it, so that "we" (Pākehā/Tau-iwi) are comfortable. But being comfortable most likely means that our own cultural paradigm is restored to the dominant position. We might seek to erase difference and bring about relationships that align with liberal humanist values of appreciating our commonality, or look to focus on ideals of "different but equal." However, this different but equal approach, as Jones (2017) pointed out, erases the structural and historical inequities built into the hyphen and can also have a homogenising effect, reducing the tensions of the Māori-Pākehā encounter to sameness.

Jones (2017) also pointed out that, in the context of Aotearoa New Zealand, the attempt to assume mutuality does not work. As she explained,

However much Pākehā might assert, desire, or assume the "us" in modern life, Māori usually insist on a difference; the hyphen is un-negotiable . . . To negate the difference in a society dominated by European assumptions is to sign the death warrant for Māori knowledges, language and identity. (p. 186)

We have witnessed in argument among our own department faculty, Māori and Pākehā/Tau-iwi, that when Pākehā/Tau-iwi claim to know and understand bicultural practice that honours two worldviews, our Māori colleagues are very quick to point out that we clearly do not, based on our words and actions. When we seek to enter into a genuine partnership it takes time to allow voices that have been historically silenced to be heard. We have come to understand that what we are being invited to do is to step back, to be patient, to listen, and to wait for the bigger pattern to emerge. As Jones (2017) pointed out, when indigenous people step up, we (Pākehā/Tau-iwi) are effectively being asked to stand down.

However, what Jones (2017) also invited us, as Pākehā/Tau-iwi, to recognise is that "the hyphen, after all, joins as well as separates" (p. 187). There is connection and there are reasons to work together. But these connections and reasons to collaborate will not protect us (as well-intentioned Pākehā/Tau-iwi seeking to enter into an engagement with mātauranga Māori) against the ways in which Māori will need to separate themselves—to assert the specificity of their knowledge and identity in ways that will not be subsumed into Pākehā/Tau-iwi agendas and projects.

As Jones (2017) concluded, "the relationships between Māori and non-Māori . . . will always be tricky, contingent, uncertain and constantly under negotiation" (p. 190).

9 | WHAT IS OUR ROLE AS TAU-IWI COUNSELLOR EDUCATORS?

In order to follow through on our commitment to the creation of a truly bicultural, te Tiriti-based counselling programme, we needed Māori staff members in addition to Māori consultants and guest lecturers. But we were also aware of not just sitting back and letting Māori take responsibility for all things Māori, essentially leaving our so-called "mainstream" practice intact. We have come to believe that, as Tau-iwi counsellor educators, we need to model for our students a willingness to become hospitable to Māori culture and values and call for justice in ourselves.

We take inspiration from a question raised in a text published in 1820, five years after the early settlers first began to make their presence felt in Aotearoa New Zealand. The question was "*Ka whakamāoritia te Pākehā*" translated as "Are the Europeans naturalized?" (Jones, 2017, p. 188). For Jones, this scrap of text "provides an insight . . . into what the Pākehā-Māori relationship might ideally have looked like from a Māori point of view, before the

weight of colonisation put an almost unbearable stress on it" (p. 188). That is to say, at that time, Māori expected that Pākehā would learn Māori ways; Pākehā were expected to integrate, to learn the language and the culture of te ao Māori. In the early days of colonisation there was an expectation, much as Western host nations hold with new arrivals today, that we Pākehā would learn how to be Māori.

Of course, what we know is that while some of the earliest settlers did integrate into Māori society, that has not been the history of our nation. Jones (2017) asked, "Given the failure of Pākehā to integrate into Māori society in the last 200 years, how is it possible for Pākehā . . . to work with Māori on Māori terms?" (p. 188). She continued:

proper engagement . . . requires Pākehā individuals to become ordinary, at ease in Māori contexts, open to Māori knowledges, and familiar with te reo Māori. And to achieve this is to be oriented to learning, watching, listening in human relationships of depth and longevity (as well as having a sense of humour, suspended judgement, and humility!)—along with a necessary consciousness of the wider relationships of power in which this engagement takes place. (p. 188)

As a Pākehā/Tauīwi person who has worked with Māori colleagues and in Māori settings across a career of more than 30 years, Jones emphasises the need for longevity in the work, and also for humility—an acceptance of not knowing. The discomfort of learning to function in another culture might involve an admission of actually knowing the wrong things, so that one risks being offensive, or being humiliated due to a lack of social competence in a setting that is unfamiliar. Appreciating this difficulty, based on our own experiences of seeking to work in bicultural settings, we saw our efforts to design the programme as merely an early move, a first foray into partnership on terms that we knew were shaky, but which we hoped would be a beginning of a new way of doing things.

It is a strange admission to allow that we did not entirely know what we were doing and that this not knowing was important to us. Indeed, we would argue that this not knowing itself was an expression of a willingness to have our knowing troubled, our cultural dominance displaced or even dismantled.

Knowing what we know now, we recognise that we needed to be in partnership from the outset. Full partnership would begin with building a relationship of connection with, and seeking the guidance of, a *kaumatua* (elder, person of status in the *whānau*, family or community) who holds the spiritual/cultural dimension of the undertaking, and can ensure the safety of all those involved. We recognise that the development of this programme needed to be embedded in place and community in this way (Penetito, 2009).

10 | WHAT OTHERS HAVE DONE: MASSEY UNIVERSITY

Of course, our programme is not the first to seek to respond to our Treaty obligations and strive for a bicultural engagement and education. In order to be an accredited training programme recognised by the New Zealand Association of Counselling, it is necessary to educate students about the history of the Treaty of Waitangi and their obligations to be bicultural partners under the Treaty (NZAC, 2016). In thinking through our own approach to this work, we have looked at what counsellor educators at other institutions have done.

Steve Lang and Brent Gardiner (2014), two Pākehā Counsellor Educators at Massey University, described their efforts to create a counsellor education programme guided by Te Tiriti o Waitangi as "bicultural pluralism." This came about through consultation with Māori and, with recognition of the diversity of New Zealand society, aims to be able to meet the needs of all cultures. "Our goal here is to help create counsellors who can then serve the whole nation rather than the section of the community that shares the cultural profiles of the counsellor" (p. 74). They describe their project as existing in a liminal space between treaty obligations and the needs of postmodern pluralism, and set out to offer a framework "which combines an indigenous pedagogical ideology with a 'westernised' one" (p. 74).

What has to be appreciated in the account that Lang and Gardiner provided is that they did consult fully with Māori; their approach was the result of extensive workshoping and dialogue. They reported the many hours of

thinking that went into the creation of a framework called ARC, Attend Reflect Collaborate, which aligns with the *Whakapiri–Whakamārama–Whakamana* (W-W-W; Engagement, Enlightenment, Empowerment) approach suggested by Māori consultant Sir Mason Durie (Lang & Gardiner, 2014, p. 80).

Nevertheless, we feel uncomfortable with the language of appropriation in their account. They speak of seeking to “appropriate the past and merge it with the future by taking an indigenous approach and merg[ing] it with a western one” (p. 80). The notion of “appropriating” seems a fundamentally problematic concept when Pākehā describe their engagement with indigenous knowledge. Such language suggests a failure to fully grasp the power built into their position and a perpetuation of the colonising stance that makes Māori resources a grab bag of goodies from which Pākehā are free to choose. But we have not been part of the process and consultation they have undertaken; perhaps our objection is only semantic, and sufficient care has been taken to tend to relationships with Māori such that the model is truly *mana*-enhancing (*mana* is a quality that can be translated as personal power, status, integrity, prestige).

The “bicultural pluralism” project outlined by Lang and Gardiner was ambitious, and it does seem important to think about ways that counselling could work effectively with all the citizens of our diverse and multicultural society. Nevertheless, we find ourselves discomfited by two further aspects of the plan that they proposed. In the first instance, it is troubling to claim to have achieved this “bicultural pluralism,” as though it were a fixed state that could be described and known as a completed entity. It seems to us, given the tensions inherent in “working the hyphen” outlined by Jones (2017) above, that the project might productively be a far more uncertain one that is necessarily always up for negotiation. We certainly see our own efforts as an initial foray that might sift and sort over time as the engagement with diverse others teaches everyone, especially those in positions of pedagogical authority, to be humble and patient.

In addition, Lang and Gardiner invoked William Shakespeare, that icon of English culture, to provide the metaphorical structure for their exposition of the theory of “bicultural pluralism”:

He captured the trials and tribulations of the people around him with an eloquence rarely bettered. The compelling idea he presents is that we are all players in a play that is bigger than any of us, and that we all interact and intersect producing our dramas and moments of joy. (p. 74)

Their reason for invoking Shakespeare, we understand, was to make a statement of cultural identity and belonging that indicated the importance of *whakapapa* (or lineage) for the Pākehā authors. As part of working biculturally, Pākehā/Tauīwi are often invited to enter into Māori ways of thinking in which the past precedes the self, understanding that we do not come to our positions in society without a history, and acknowledging our indebtedness to our ancestors. However, it seems to us that, in this context, calling on Shakespeare as a cultural ancestor has unhelpful effects. In literary scholarship, the appeal to the cultural authority of a dead white male is a telling marker of the ways in which dominant groups assert their cultural superiority. Given the ways in which the British have consistently undermined Māori culture, Shakespeare seems like a heavy *patu* (club) to wield in a conversation about biculturalism.

Helen Au Yeung (2016) was critical of Lang and Gardiner's model, arguing that it contained little that is new and that it simply outlined an approach that all counselling should aspire to already. She said that it failed to address the need for counsellors to examine their own cultural identity and also to educate themselves about their client's culture as a means of “uncovering the uniqueness of each client” (p. 480). Citing Anderson and Gehart (2007) and Dyche and Zayas (1995), Au Yeung argued that counsellors should educate themselves about a given client's cultural background, not to know who they are in any essentialising or reductive way but in order to explore how the client lives and understands themselves uniquely in relation to that cultural background. Au Yeung argued that attending to counsellors' own cultural background should enable them to become aware of their own “assumptions, values, and biases” (p. 481).

But is awareness enough? We would argue that we need to equip trainee counsellors to be aware of their own cultural values, but more than this, to be equipped as critical thinkers who can interrogate their assumptions and be aware of how they position themselves and others in a counselling conversation. What we hope for in our model of bicultural/te Tiriti-based education is that counselling students would enter into a sustained engagement with mātauranga Māori that, over time, could establish habits of thought and practice that are hospitable to diverse others.

Nevertheless, we wish to give the team at Massey credit. They are working with Māori consultants and they do seek to continue to learn and develop their programme, framing it as an ongoing conversation in which they aim to be “sustainable and responsive” (Lang & Gardiner, 2014, p. 82). Our criticism comes out of our own recognition of how difficult it is to achieve the aspirations that they have outlined, to create an approach to counselling that is successfully both bicultural and pluralistic.

In our own work and thinking in response to the framework outlined by Lang and Gardiner (2014), we would like to slow this project down and not be in a hurry to “solve the problem” of biculturalism or pluralism. Rather, we hope to accept a “politics of disappointment” as Jones (2017) put it, “to not turn away in frustration, or engage superficially, but to remain in positive, engaged struggle together and with each other” (p. 190). We hope to position ourselves consciously in relation to the problems of injustice and otherness inherent in Māori-Pākehā collaborations. In this sense we do not seek to come up with an ideal framework for which we would advocate, but rather to offer a much more tentative exploration of some difficult questions.

11 | THRESHOLD—TE WAHAROA

Lang and Gardiner (2014) raised another worthwhile set of questions and problems in their discussion of “liminality.” Recognising the way in which established and entrenched ideas can get in the way of our engagement with diverse others, they wrote:

In a recidivist way we may return to pre-existing beliefs when we assume we know or understand. This regression can happen all too easily when care is not taken to acknowledge and be open to manage and explore the liminal space between cultures. (p. 77)

However, Lang and Gardiner seemed to be suggesting here that this liminality is an in-betweenness that is quite knowable; as though there were clearly Māori on one side and Pākehā on the other. We argue that Māori is not one thing and nor is Pākehā, and therefore there will be no clear in-between.

We suggest that the liminal space between cultures is not singular: it is not one space that one is either in or out of, not one space that one can explore. We also suggest it cannot be managed, as the quote from Lang and Gardiner above suggests. Rather, it is a much more slippery betwixt-and-between that is irreducible, more of a shifting matrix of possibility than a territory that can be mapped, explored, known, or managed.

Furthermore, as Pākehā/Tauiwī, we have always to acknowledge the power on our “side” of the bicultural partnership. If we frame biculturalism as some kind of equal encounter leading to a fashioning of multiculturalism, then we tilt towards erasure of difference. As Jones (2017) has argued (p. 184), simply incorporating mātauranga Māori into our world view risks an assimilation, translating difference into what we already know, when actually the invitation of bicultural encounters might be to allow ourselves to be evicted from our certainties.

Nevertheless, the experience of thresholds has significance in the Māori worldview (Crocket et al., 2013). In *marae* architecture, the gateway or portal (*waharoa*) marks the threshold between *manuhiri* (visitors) gathering, and the *tangata whenua* (people of this land) calling them forward. Through the *pōwhiri* (ritual of welcome), *manuhiri* cease being “visitors.” Drury (2007) pointed out that the significance of the *pōwhiri* is much more than just

welcoming visitors: "It is an encounter calculated to reduce space and distance between groups and to explore the basis of relationships" (p. 175).

The hyphen joins and separates. We are connected and we are separate. We are multicultural and our differences are not to be erased. This is complex territory indeed.

12 | WHAT OTHERS HAVE DONE: WAIKATO INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Vivianne Flintoff and Shirley Rivers (2012) provided an account of their efforts to address bicultural practice, describing the ways in which they met the ethical and political requirement to respond to Te Tiriti o Waitangi by invoking a metaphor of weaving for their programme. They spoke of an "interweaving between indigenous models of practice and selected western theories and practice" (p. 235) and asserted that "the differing worldviews of Māori and western-influenced theory share parity of value" (p. 236).

As counsellor educators, one identifying as Pākehā, the other Māori, Flintoff and Rivers teach four counselling modalities, one of which is specifically Māori and presented early in the curriculum. But they do not really address the ways in which this Māori modality reappears throughout the programme. The suggestion seems to be that by teaching a Māori model of counselling near the outset, it automatically becomes foundational to the other three modules making up the course.

In this approach, Flintoff and Rivers seek to honour the Treaty of Waitangi "from a position of appreciation for the diversity of multiplicity and richness that engaging with the worldviews of both Māori and the West can bring to professional identity and practice" (Flintoff & Rivers, 2012, p. 236). Their position is one of humility and openness, acknowledged as "incomplete and partial" in which they seek "a counselling practice that is fashioned for this land and peoples" (p. 236).

What we find particularly resonant in Flintoff and Rivers's work is the notion of creating "safe spaces for difficult conversations . . . where students of all cultures . . . can offer challenges, speak their unease, hold pain and tension, and where stories of both chaos . . . and carnival . . . can be spoken and received" (p. 236).

This notion of creating safe spaces for difficult conversations is, we believe, a central responsibility of our role as educators on a programme that seeks to give a central place to mātauranga Māori. For many Tauīwi, the requirement to hear and engage with Māori narratives and values is experienced as a challenge to their identity and their right to be in this country, or even an unnecessary surplus to the real work of counselling. For students of many nationalities who are more recent arrivals in Aotearoa New Zealand, their concern is with multiculturalism. Migrants and refugees are rightly concerned with having their culture and origins recognised and respected in a highly Anglo-centric society. Asking migrants from India or China or Somalia to appreciate biculturalism can provoke a demand that the specificity of their own identity and history be acknowledged. This raises the question of how all these voices and competing identity claims can be heard and appreciated, while holding an understanding of the historical and political significance of the rights of indigenous people. Taking responsibility for creating "safe spaces for difficult conversations" is a challenge that we as Tauīwi educators have to address. And is this not a good practice for counselling towards reconciliation in our work with individuals, couples, families, and whānau?

Flintoff and Rivers presented a similar argument to that outlined by Au Yeung (2016), arguing that counselling students should come to know their own cultural assumptions and biases in order to be better able to engage with others from cultures that are different to their own. They took up the notion outlined by previous authors that multiculturalism be approached through biculturalism (Crocket, 2010). We would like to better understand how this idea works in practice.

Seeking to go beyond "cultural competence," Flintoff and Rivers (2012) argued that they are in pursuit of "infusion": "cultural content is 'infused' throughout all the models of the counselling programme" (p. 237).

It is therefore our teaching aim that graduates be able to articulate how living in Aotearoa New Zealand makes available to them rich understandings of counseling practice and identity . . . through the weaving of Māori practice with western practice. (p. 237)

They went on to note that such an undertaking requires a commitment from counsellor educators to engage in ongoing bicultural education. However, as we begin our own engagement with mātauranga Māori, we find ourselves asking what is really meant by these metaphors of infusion or interweaving?

Increasingly we have come to understand that the infusion or interweaving of Māori cultural values and knowledge might change the nature of the fundamental aims and objectives of a Euro-centric counselling programme in ways we had not predicted at the outset. Such an outcome, surely, is a key part of the invitation of biculturalism. Just as Māori culture has not been left intact by its engagement with te ao Pākehā, our Western models of counselling might need to be thoroughly shaken up by a willing engagement with Māori culture.

Flintoff and Rivers positioned their exploration of biculturalism within a poststructuralist paradigm that foregrounds the constructed nature of reality. Culture and counselling are seen to be socially constructed entities—they are creations, condensations, and producers of discourses located in particular moments in history and particular social contexts. In our programme we are at pains to teach our students the power of language to position people in a dialogue in which they have agency or are deprived of it (Drewery, 2005). This understanding is central to the counselling approaches that we currently teach on our programme.

Also central to the poststructuralist/postmodern paradigm of our programme is the deconstruction of truth claims. Whatever ideas, beliefs, or practices we hold to be “true” have effects in the world and have power encoded within them (see White & Epston, 1990, p. 30). Thus, when we ask students to have awareness of their cultural biases and assumptions, we are actually asking them to deconstruct the ways in which they embody and enact power in their very mode of being. This is a tall order for many students, regardless of cultural identity. For many students it is a demanding intellectual game that they never quite master, regardless of their cultural identity or counselling competence.

13 | NARRATIVE THERAPY

Te Wiata (2006, p. 11) challenged us to consider “What are the possibilities of practice where there is an honouring of marginalized bodies of knowledge such as mātauranga Māori within the mainstream counselling profession?”

In response to this question, we have grounded our thinking in the philosophy and practice of narrative therapy, as developed in Australasia by Michael White and David Epston (1990). Although there are many ideas and practices that have shaped narrative therapy as a political project that is essentially “post-psychological” (McLeod, 2000), we particularly want to emphasise the notion of “subjugated knowledges” (White and Epston, 1990, p. 20).

Drawing on twentieth century French philosopher Michel Foucault's (1977) understanding of power as productive, White and Epston (1990) came to understand that personal experience is produced in a network of power relations that shape ways of being, thinking, feeling, speaking, and acting. Certain ways of being are socially/culturally privileged, while others are overlooked, forgotten, erased, or even pathologised. In unpacking the idea of subjugated knowledges, Tina Belsey (2001) explained that, for Foucault:

there are two classes of “subjugated knowledges”: one constitutes previously established, erudite knowledges that have been buried, hidden, disguised, masked, removed, or written out by revisionist histories; another involves local, popular, or indigenous knowledges that are marginalized or denied space to perform adequately. (pp. 77–78)

She continued:

A central focus of [narrative] therapy harnesses the notion of resurrecting the subjugated knowledges to generate “alternative stories that incorporate vital and previously neglected aspects of lived experience.” (White & Epston, 1990, p. 31, cited in Belsey, 2001, p. 78)

We would argue that creating a bicultural counsellor education programme requires us to teach in ways that enact this interest in the potential inherent in subjugated knowledges. Flintoff and Rivers skilfully addressed the nuances of this undertaking, demonstrating the ways in which “mainstream” counselling cannot simply add on some ideas and practices from Māori culture while leaving a Eurocentric core in place:

Such a Eurocentric notion marginalizes indigenous (and other) models of practice and is therefore yet another colonizing practice. . . . Evoking the metaphor “main/stream” suggests the existence of other streams which are minor or tributaries to the “main” and consequently “centralises” dominant western knowledge. That which is not considered “mainstream” becomes the “other.” (p. 239)

In entering into an engagement with mātauranga Māori, we are asking questions about what is allowed to count as knowledge in a counselling programme; what is allowed to be put on the table as a means of understanding the world and our therapeutic engagement with others.

14 | WHAT HAVE OTHERS DONE: UNIVERSITY OF WAIKATO

Māori and Taiwi staff and associates of the Counselling Programme at the University of Waikato recently published a collection of essays entitled *Moemoeā: Māori Counselling Journeys* (Crocket, Davis, Kotzé, Swann, & Swann, 2017). In a section entitled “Learning, Teaching and Supervision” the authors explored some of the ways in which the Waikato programme enacts its commitment to biculturalism, and prepares student counsellors to engage with Māori culture. These include inviting students into Māori spaces “to hear particular Māori spaces speak to them and then to take up the responsibility of speaking back” (p. 181). This version of marae interaction strikes us as more nuanced and culturally engaged than noho marae practices at many other institutions (more akin to included but separate components of those counsellor education programmes).

Year after year Māori staff host the counsellor education hui [gathering]. . . . Together, Māori staff and counsellor education staff hope that their partnership . . . in offering noho marae will produce counselling practices that day-to-day take up the possibilities that partnership ethics offer for non-colonising practice. (Waititi, Kotzé, & Crocket, 2017, p. 182)

This chapter went on to describe the *kawa* (protocol) and customs of the marae and the invitation offered to explore traditional practices, and to reflect on “diverse cultural stories within an indigenous learning space” (p. 183). One of the authors, Cheri Waititi, acts as *māngai* (spokesperson), giving voice on behalf of the *wharenuī* (meeting house), telling the stories of the *taonga* (treasures), carvings, weavings, and murals that populate the space and “assisting the students to hear Te Aohurihuri [the name of the wharenuī] and its taonga speak” (p. 184).

As Waititi et al. explained:

It is an important step into Māori ontology to listen to the wharenuī and hear its taonga speak. . . . Each phase of the noho marae has prepared us for this experience of hearing in this way, of encountering objects that are taonga that speak to us and call us to respond. (pp. 184–5)

In response, students are invited to share a story into the space that comes from their own lives, by speaking about a photograph or other object carrying significant meaning for them, making connections with what they have heard from the whareniui.

This practice of place-based education (Penetito, 2009) is a means of placing Māori knowledge and values in the foreground, and the focus on care for relationships inherent in Māori cultural practice gives safety and strength to Māori and other indigenous students. Writing of a second, longer noho marae at Maniara that is part of the counselling programme, the authors describe it as a pedagogy of place, specific to its location, its people, and our nation, informed by a commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Taylor, Crocket, & Kotzé, 2017). Margaret Somerville (2010), in explaining “place pedagogy,” wrote that “our relationship to place is constituted in stories and other representations; place learning is local and embodied; place learning occurs in a contact zone of contestation” (p. 342). This zone of contestation reflects the history of colonisation. Any space in Aotearoa New Zealand is contested because of what has been taken from tangata whenua. The notion of a contested space also thinks back to the liminal space invoked by Lang and Gardiner, and the hyphen that both separates and joins Māori and Pākehā/coloniser and indigenous people.

Taylor et al. (2017) described the hopes for this second noho marae in this way:

We have come to understand that if the interests of tangata whenua are to be served by counselling, there is a need for all counsellors—Māori, Pākehā and Tauīwi—to examine the systems of knowledge that produce the counselling theories and practices available to apply alongside clients. Such examination becomes possible when we investigate and reflect on our own cultural locations and the systems of knowledge by which we have been shaped. The noho marae offers a robust learning context to come to understand our own and others’ cultural locations, and the ways in which systems of knowledge, previously invisible or opaque to us, have shaped our own lives, our families’ lives, and our communities. (p. 196)

The approach outlined gave more strength to the kind of awareness building that Flintoff and Rivers (2012) identified; students are being resourced to enquire into the contingency of their own identities (understood not as naturally arising, but as the product of history and culture). They are also enquiring into the ways that power and privilege are encoded into forms of identity and into the ways in which we speak with one another.

As Taylor et al. (2017) explained:

Such learning goes beyond the learning of particular cultural competencies . . . to robust investigation of the discourses that constitute life for us and for clients. . . . This is the kind of radical learning that calls us into giving accounts of ourselves . . . that is, to locate ourselves within historical, social and political relations. (p. 198)

Specifically, the learning is located in, and takes place through, the embodied experience of meeting together, living together, and speaking and hearing together within the *tikanga* (customs) of the marae setting, under the guidance of the *whāaea* (mothers, aunts) who welcome their guests and provide a safe space for these explorations.

Taylor et al. (2017) did not outline how this learning might shape student engagement in the course overall, or how it might lead to an ongoing commitment to move into the Māori world in order to continue this “radical learning.” However, they assert the urgency for

counselling students to understand the complexities of identity claims, recognizing that identity categories do not represent a unified homogenous group. . . . Yet . . . Māori are tangata whenua, and this identification does important political work in response to the conditions, particularly the inequalities, of post-colonial life. (Taylor et al., 2017, p. 200)

What is interesting about reading the two chapters from *Moemoeā* that outline the bicultural teaching and learning practices undertaken on the Masters in Counselling at Waikato University, is that the authors spend much more time describing locations and actions than they do outlining a theory or framework for engagement. These accounts are context rich and offer relatively little in the way of formulae that one could uplift and put into practice. This is clearly a deliberate attempt to give voice to experiences and ways of knowing that are not reducible to acronyms or course outlines. The reader is drawn to slow down and encounter, in a material sense, what it means to experience biculturalism in practice. There are stories about named people and named settings that carry significance in themselves. There are stories about personal realisations and insights linked to place that reach into the past and then carry forward in time to emerge in other settings. The details of cars arriving at the marae, shoes left at the entrance to the meeting house, the laughter shared over meal preparation are both generic and specific—summoning a particularly human, physical, social, and relational encounter in which learning takes place and which is the learning.

These counselling students are engaged in Māori contexts and the objective is “active examination of our own locations as professional counsellors, and citizens, before and while we seek to collaborate in post-colonial relationship” (Taylor et al., 2017, p. 201). The programme shifts the terms of engagement from didactic delivery of concepts towards an embodied engagement, and an engagement with “non-human others” (Hoskins & Jones, 2017, p. 49) that is immersed in *te ao Māori*. But ultimately the stated objective is a critical awareness of self, and Western poststructuralist ideas are used to carry out this reflective analysis.

We hold a sense that *mātauranga Māori* draws us towards new ways of thinking that are valuable in their own right. However, the question remains: How can we engage with *mātauranga Māori* without appropriating it to a Pakehā or Tauīwi agenda (even without realising we are doing so, even with good intentions)? How can we honour *mātauranga Māori* and let it speak on its own terms and in support of its own interests?

15 | A HIATUS, RATHER THAN A CONCLUSION

This exploration came to a sudden and unexpected pause when our institution, at a time of financial crisis and consequent restructuring, called a halt to the implementation of our proposed programme. While we might continue to explore and reflect on the questions raised here, we are no longer given the time to do the work of researching, consulting, and designing a new programme. One of us has moved on to work in another context.

Nevertheless, a pause is often the opportunity for a fresh look and, once we stopped being driven forward by the deadlines of approval processes and long-term planning, a pattern began to emerge. We could see that, while there was much that was valuable and well-intentioned in our plans, we had not adequately done the work of co-creating partnerships with Māori colleagues and stakeholders. We had not consulted beyond the tokens that time and institutional processes required, and we did not have the guidance and support of a *kaumatua* to lead us through the spiritual and cultural considerations that needed to be in place.

What, then, can we offer from our explorations and experience that might contribute to thinking about preparing counsellors to engage across cultures?

Hopefully, what is clear from our reflections and explorations in this paper is an understanding that intercultural or bicultural practice is not something to be covered off by the inclusion of a discreet body of content that leaves the dominant cultural paradigm intact. In addition, we have come to understand that the creation of a genuinely bicultural programme will not come about through a single initiative, but will require ongoing negotiation and dialogue. The space between cultures, in the context of a history of colonisation, is a liminal space which is inherently fluid. The hyphenated space of treaty partnership is a connecting space and also, necessarily, a contested space.

What we have come to understand is that a whole process of relationship building needed to precede programme planning and design. Some talking with and listening to people, places, and history needed to happen, and

even some resting into the specific temporal and relational experience of te ao Māori, in which there is time for what needs to be done, rather a sense of being driven by urgency and deadlines.

What we take away from this experience is a willingness to be awake to the wisdom and care that tikanga Māori provides in ways that we did not appreciate before starting this journey. It invites us to sit quietly in the presence of the indigenous culture of this country that we call home, and to place it before us whenever we seek to move forward in ways that will have consequences for others.

REFERENCES

- Agee, M., Crocket, K., Fatialofa, C., Frater-Mathieson, K., Kim, H., Vong, C., & Woolf, V. (2011). Culture is always present: A conversation about ethics. In K. Crocket, M. Agee, & S. Cornforth (Eds.), *Ethics in practice: A guide for counsellors* (pp. 28–32). Wellington, New Zealand: Dunmore Publishing.
- Anderson, H., & Gehart, D. (2007). *Collaborative therapy: Relationships and conversations that make a difference*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ariki, T. (2008). Papa panui. Retrieved from http://www.maori.org.nz/papapanui/archives/viewthread.php?TOPIC_ID=4656
- Au Yeung, H. (2016). Article review: Lang, S. K. W. and Gardiner, B. D. (2014). As they like it—culture-centred counsellor education in the context of Aotearoa New Zealand: A play on bicultural pluralism. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 44, 477–483. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03069885.2013.824949>
- Bell, A., Elizabeth, V., McIntosh, T., & Wynyard, M. (Eds.) (2017). *A land of milk and honey? Making sense of Aotearoa New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.
- Belsey, T. (2001). Foucauldian influences in narrative therapy: An approach for schools. *Journal of Educational Enquiry*, 2(2), 72–92.
- Bidois, E. (2006). Maori perspectives. Hearing Voices Network Aotearoa NZ. Retrieved from. <http://hearingvoices.org.nz/index.php/en/different-perspectives/maori-perspective>
- Black, T., Bean, D., Collings, W., & Nuku, W. (Eds.) (2012). *Conversations on Mātauranga Māori*. Wellington, New Zealand: NZQA.
- Boulton, A., Simonsen, K., Walker, T., Cumming, J., & Cunningham, C. (2004). Indigenous participation in the 'new' New Zealand health structure. *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy*, 9(S2), 35–40.
- Came, H., Cornes, R., & McCreanor, T. (2018). Treaty of Waitangi in New Zealand public health strategies and plans 2006–2016. *New Zealand Medical Association Journal*, 131(1469), 32–36.
- Came, H. A., & da Silva, S. (2011). Building political competencies for the transformation of racism in Aotearoa. *Kotuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online*, 6, 113–123. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1177083X.2011.615332>
- Cornforth, S., & Crocket, K. (2011). Situating ethical practice in philosophical storylines. In K. Crocket, M. Agee, & S. Cornforth (Eds.), *Ethics in practice: A guide for counsellors* (pp. 33–42). Wellington, New Zealand: Dunmore Publishing.
- Crocket, A. (2010). Pākehā counsellors considering their positioning: Towards postcolonial praxis (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/10289/4803>
- Crocket, K., Davis, E., Kotzé, E., Swann, B., & Swann, H. (2017). *Moemoeā: Māori counselling journeys*. Auckland, New Zealand: Dunmore Publishing.
- Crocket, K., Flanagan, P., Alford, Z., Allen, J., Baird, J., Bruce, A., ... Swann, H. (2013). Supervision and culture: Meetings at thresholds. *New Zealand Journal of Counselling*, 33(1), 68–86.
- Drewery, W. (2005). Why we should watch what we say: Position calls, everyday speech and the production of relational subjectivity. *Theory and Psychology*, 15, 305–324. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354305053217>
- Drury, N. (2007). A pōwhiri poutama approach to therapy. *New Zealand Journal of Counselling*, 27(1), 9–20.
- Durie, M. (1998). *Whaiaora: Māori health and development* (2nd ed.). Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M. (2001). *Mauri ora: The dynamics of Māori health*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M. (2007). Counselling Maori: Marae encounters as a basis for understanding and building relationships. *New Zealand Journal of Counselling*, 27(1), 1–8.
- Dyche, L., & Zayas, L. H. (1995). The value of curiosity and naiveté for the cross-cultural psychotherapist. *Family Process*, 34(4), 389–399.
- Elkington, J. (2011). Pūrākau states of human development: A framework for social services. *Toroa-te-Nukuroa*, 6, 30–39.
- Fine, M. (1994). Working the hyphens: Reinventing the self and other in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 70–82). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Flintoff, V. J., & Rivers, S. (2012). A reshaping of counselling curriculum: Responding to the changing (bi)cultural context. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 40, 235–246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03069885.2012.678290>
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. London, UK: Penguin.

- Fyers, A. (2018). Treaty of Waitangi: What was lost. Retrieved from <https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/104100739/treaty-of-waitangi-what-was-lost>
- Glynn, T. (2015). Bicultural challenges for educational professionals in Aotearoa. *Waikato Journal of Education, Special 20th Anniversary Collection*, 103–113.
- Hayward, N., & When, N. (2004). *The Waitangi tribunal: Te Roopu Whakamana i te Tiriti o Waitangi*. Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books.
- Herrmann, K. (2016). *An exploration of Ngāi Tūhoe aspirations for self-determination in relation to statutory child welfare: Current situation and change options*. (Unpublished Master's thesis). Unitec Institute of Technology, New Zealand. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/10652/3755>
- Hohepa, M., Smith, G., Smith, L., & McNaughton, S. (1992). Te kohanga reo: Hei tikanga ako i te reo Māori: The kohanga reo as a context for language learning. *Educational Psychology*, 12, 333–346. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0144341920120314>
- Hoskins, T. K., & Jones, A. (2017). Non-human others and Kaupapa Māori research. In T. K. Hoskins, & A. Jones (Eds.), *Critical conversations in Kaupapa Māori* (pp. 49–64). Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers.
- Hutchings, J., & Lee, J. (Eds.) (2016). *Decolonisation in Aotearoa: Education, research and practice*. Wellington, New Zealand: NZCER Press.
- Huygens, I. (2007). Processes of Pākehā change in response to the Treaty of Waitangi (Doctoral thesis). Hamilton, New Zealand: University of Waikato.
- Jones, A. (2017). Dangerous liaisons: Pākehā, Kaupapa Māori and educational research. In T. K. Hoskins, & A. Jones (Eds.), *Critical conversations in Kaupapa Māori* (pp. 179–195). Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers.
- King, M. (2003). *The Penguin history of New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books.
- Lang, S. K. W., & Gardiner, B. D. (2014). As they like it—Culture-centred counsellor education in the context of Aotearoa New Zealand: A play on bicultural pluralism. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 42(1), 73–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03069885.2013.824949>
- Madsen, W. C. (2007). *Collaborative therapy with multi-stressed families* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- McIntosh, T., & Workman, K. (2013). The criminalisation of poverty. In M. Rashbrooke (Ed.), *Inequality: A New Zealand crisis*. Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books.
- McLeod, J. (2000). Introduction. In M. Payne (Ed.), *Narrative Therapy: an introduction for counsellors*. London, UK: Sage.
- Ministry of Education (2010). *New Zealand Curriculum Update (16)*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.
- Network Waitangi (2016). *Treaty of Waitangi: Questions and answers*. Christchurch, New Zealand: Author.
- NZAC (New Zealand Association of Counsellors) (2002). *Code of ethics: A framework for ethical practice*. New Zealand, Author: Wellington.
- NZAC (New Zealand Association of Counsellors) (2016). *Programme accreditation standards (section 3(c) curriculum)*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.
- NiaNia, W., Bush, A., & Epston, D. (2016). *Collaborative and indigenous mental health therapy: Tātaihono—Stories of Māori healing and psychiatry*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Penetito, W. (2009). Place-based education: Catering for curriculum, culture and community. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 18, 5–29.
- Poata-Smith, E. (2013). Inequality and Maori. In M. Rashbrooke (Ed.), *Inequality: A New Zealand crisis*. Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books.
- Sampson, E. E. (2003). Unconditional kindness to strangers: Human sociality and the foundation for an ethical psychology. *Theory and Psychology*, 13, 147–175.
- Somerville, M. J. (2010). A place pedagogy for “global contemporaneity.”. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 42(3), 326–344. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2008.00423.x>
- Stenson, M. (2004). *The Treaty: Every New Zealander's guide to the Treaty of Waitangi*. Auckland, New Zealand: Random House.
- Taylor, R., Crocket, K., & Kotzé, E. (2017). Maniaroa: Noho marae. In K. Crocket, E. Davis, E. Kotzé, B. Swann, & H. Swann (Eds.), *Moemoeā: Māori counselling journeys* (pp. 192–203). Auckland, New Zealand: Dunmore Publishing.
- Te Ara – The Encyclopedia of New Zealand (2006). *Māori peoples of New Zealand: Ngā iwi o Aotearoa*. Wellington, New Zealand: David Bateman.
- Te Wiata, J. (2006). *A local Aotearoa New Zealand investigation of the contribution of Māori cultural knowledges to Pākehā identity and counselling practices*. (Unpublished Master's thesis). University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/10289/2329>
- Te Wiata, J., & Crocket, A. (2011). Te Tiriti and ethics in dialogue: A unique call to partnership? In K. Crocket, M. Agee, & S. Cornforth (Eds.), *Ethics in practice: A guide for counsellors* (pp. 21–27). Wellington, New Zealand: Dunmore Publishing.
- Turia, T. (2003). Tribal health policy in New Zealand. *British Medical Journal*, 327(7612), 456. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.327.7412.456>
- Unitec Institute of Technology (2011). *Unitec's Māori success strategy*. Unpublished internal document.

- Waititi, C., Kotzé, E., & Crocket, K. (2017). The house speaks . . . We speak back to the house. In K. Crocket, E. Davis, E. Kotzé, B. Swann, & H. Swann (Eds.), *Moemoeā: Māori counselling journeys* (pp. 181–191). Auckland, New Zealand: Dunmore Publishing.
- Waldegrave, C., Tamasese, K., Tuhaka, F., & Campbell, W. (2003). *Just Therapy—a journey: A collection of papers from the Just Therapy team, New Zealand*. Adelaide, Australia: Dulwich Centre Publications.
- Webber, M. (2008). *Walking the space between: Identity and Māori/Pākehā*. Wellington, New Zealand: NZCER Press.
- White, M., & Epston, D. (1990). *Narrative means to therapeutic ends*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Wynyard, M. (2017). Plunder in the promised land: Māori land alienation and the genesis of capitalism in Aotearoa New Zealand. In A. Bell, V. Elizabeth, T. McIntosh, & M. Wynyard (Eds.), *A land of milk and honey? Making sense of Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 13–25). Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES



Susan Crozier is a counsellor and community social care manager at Hospice West Auckland in Tāmaki Makaurau, Aotearoa New Zealand. Following completion of her PhD in Women's Studies from the University of Auckland, she worked in learning and teaching at various universities in New Zealand and the UK. She then trained as a narrative therapist and taught on the counselling programme at Unitec. She now works with people at end of life and those who love and care for them.



Nigel Pizzini is a narrative therapist in private practice and lecturer in counselling at Unitec Institute of Technology, Tāmaki Makaurau, Aotearoa New Zealand. Raised in the Waikato and with careers in youth work, education, and therapy, grappling with biculturalism and honouring te Tiriti in social practice and education has long occupied his attention. Partnering with tangata whenua and respecting bicultural relations has been an important factor in his approach to this work. In 2017 Nigel joined the teaching team at Unitec, where he aspires to contribute to the development of the next generation of social practitioners in Tāmaki Makaurau, Auckland and beyond

How to cite this article: Crozier S, Pizzini N. Engaging with indigenous knowledge to shape a bicultural counselling programme in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Psychother Politics Int*. 2020;18:e1515. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ppi.1515>