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Abstract

This paper considers the importance of the Treaty of Waitangi (1840) to Higher Education in New Zealand and how this influences the educational experience of hospitality, tourism and event management students. The paper reviews the literature on cultural diversity, internationalization and curriculum development, the role of culture in educating domestic and international students, and how the acculturation Higher Education students experience as part of their studies might lead to a deeper understanding of culture and identity in the hospitality workplace. The gap in the literature concerns how a higher education curriculum can assist in the development of cultural awareness and an understanding of historical commitments. The paper therefore identifies a number of key principles which are regarded as essential to the identity of those living in New Zealand/Aotearoa. The paper then goes on to illustrate how these principles could be applied to Higher Education. It suggests that these principles enshrined in the Treaty of Waitangi are also worth considering when creating an inclusive curriculum which supports all hospitality, tourism and events management students, irrespective of ethnic background, culture or upbringing. Finally, this paper proposes a matrix of ‘hooks’ - tools which academics can use to ensure their lectures address the needs of all learners. This matrix is developed from a study of the educational goals of the Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (ToW), the founding document of this country. This research adds value by creating an awareness of the diverse environment in which academics and students operate, thereby enabling students to develop a cultural sensitivity to the international hospitality industry they will be employed in on graduation.
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Resumen

Este artículo analiza la importancia del Tratado de Waitangi (1840) para la Educación Superior en Nueva Zelanda, y cómo influye la experiencia educativa de los estudiantes de hospitalidad, turismo y organización de eventos. El artículo examina los trabajos publicados sobre diversidad cultural, internacionalización y desarrollo curricular; el papel de la cultura en la educación de estudiantes locales e internacionales, y en qué forma la aculturación que experimentan los estudiantes de Educación Superior como parte de sus estudios puede dar lugar a una comprensión más profunda de cultura e identidad en el sitio de trabajo del ámbito de la hospitalidad. Existe una brecha en los trabajos publicados sobre este tema alrededor de en qué forma un plan de estudios de Educación Superior puede ayudar al desarrollo de una conciencia cultural y una comprensión de los compromisos históricos. El artículo identifica por lo tanto varios principios clave que se consideran imprescindibles para la identidad de aquellos que viven en Nueva Zelanda/Aotearoa. El artículo procede entonces a ilustrar cómo se pueden aplicar esos principios a la Educación Superior. Propone que vale la pena tener también en cuenta estos principios, consagrados en el Tratado de Waitangi, a la hora de diseñar un plan de estudios inclusivo que respalde a todos los estudiantes de hospitalidad, turismo y organización de eventos, sin importar su raza, cultura o educación. Por último, este artículo propone una matriz de ‘guias’ o herramientas que los académicos puedan utilizar para asegurar que sus clases satisfagan las necesidades de todos los estudiantes. Esta matriz ha sido desarrollada a partir de un estudio de los objetivos educativos de los Principios del Tratado de Waitangi (ToW), el texto fundacional de este país. Esta investigación resulta innovadora al crear una conciencia del ambiente diverso en el que operan estudiantes y académicos, permitiendo por lo tanto a los estudiantes desarrollar una sensibilidad cultural en relación a la industria internacional de la hospitalidad en la que se desempeñarán a partir de su graduación.
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Introduction

This paper reflects on the role that a national culture may have on the way in which tertiary education establishments select, organize and present information and course material to its student body. It aims to identify how in New Zealand the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi) – ToW- which was signed on 6 February 1840 by representatives of the British Crown (Captain William Hobson) and a number of Māori Chiefs is reflected in the classes/papers/modules that are taught. The paper gives a brief overview of the political developments which occurred between 1840 (when the Treaty was signed) and 1985 (when the Treaty of Waitangi Act formally brought the ToW into New Zealand law). This is necessary because the paper then proposes a conceptual model based on the Principles which inform secondary education provision in New Zealand. This model is illustrated with some examples from classes delivered at AUT’s School of Hospitality and Tourism and suggestions are then made for further research. This paper does not set out to discuss issues of Māori access to or representation in higher education in New Zealand, which are important issues but outwith the scope of this paper.

While the Treaty gave the European settlers (known as Pakeha) rights to settle, it also gave the Māori people rights and guaranteed them protection. It was (for its time) arguably a very far-sighted partnership agreement, although it has more often been honoured in the breach than the observance. In the 170 years since the Treaty was signed there has been much debate about the exact meanings of the three ‘Articles’ which made up the Treaty, and in particular the translation and meaning of ‘kawanatanga’ or ‘government’ and ‘rangatanga’ or ‘self-management’. These have been interpreted in various ways by different political groups since the ToW was signed. In 1985 the ‘Treaty of Waitangi Amendment Act’ ensured that the ToW was brought into New Zealand law (Orange, 1987; Walker, 2004; Moon, 2006).

This historical background is important because it sets the scene for the kind of education which New Zealand is committed to delivering at both school and tertiary levels. The next section considers the impact of the ToW on New Zealand’s education system.

Background to the study

New Zealand, Education and the Treaty of Waitangi

One may ask ‘what has the Treaty of Waitangi got to do with Education?’ and the reply would be ‘a considerable amount’. The Treaty gives certain rights and obligations to both parties, Māori and the Crown. It guarantees Māori people their taonga – ‘treasures’ such as their native language Te Reo Māori and education. In this section the NZ pre-tertiary education system is summarized because that seems to have found a way to incorporate the Principles of the ToW into the daily operation of the school better than tertiary education providers have managed to do (MOE, 2010).

Education in New Zealand commences with some form of early childhood education for ages 0-5 offered by Playcentres, Kohanga Reo Centres (the Māori language is used as a teaching tool, immersing students in the language), licensed Early Childhood Centres (usually privately owned), Chartered Early Childhood Centres (state funded) and ages 3-5 Kindergartens.

The next stage of education follows the three-tier model which includes primary schools, followed by secondary schools and tertiary education. The years are numbered from 1 to 13 with Primary School up to year 6, intermediate school finishing at year 8 and secondary school is the remaining five years of schooling.

The third stage, third level, and post-secondary education is Tertiary education or Higher education (HE). Higher education is taken to include Undergraduate education leading to the award of a first degree. A Bachelor’s degree is usually an academic degree awarded for an undergraduate course or major that generally lasts for four years, but can range from two to six years depending on the region of the world.

State-owned tertiary institutions consist of universities, colleges of education (teachers colleges), polytechnics (institutes of technology) and wananga (a type of publicly-owned tertiary institution that provides education in a Māori context). In addition there are numerous non-state-owned private training establishments. The tertiary institutions offer Undergraduate, Postgraduate and some provide programmes in specialized areas up to Doctoral level.

The School Charters states the school curriculum should provide for learning which: helps students to understand and be confident in their own culture, to be sensitive to the cultures of other people, and to appreciate the heritages of Aotearoa-New Zealand. New Zealand is very much made up of a multicultural society (although the ToW speaks specifically of a ‘bi-cultural’ nation) and as such, quality education needs to be delivered through a variety of National Common Curriculum Principles.

A number of these principles are detailed below together with an explanation of how they are operationalised:

- Accessibility – regardless of ethnicity, religion, or gender categories, curriculum shall be designed to be available to all students.
- Non-racist – The curriculum will honour the promises of the Treaty of Waitangi to the Māori People on
Maori Language and Culture. It will recognise and respond to the aspirations of all people belonging to the different cultures which make up New Zealand Society.

- Success – Students will be extended and challenged to strive to do their personal best, however, no students will be given learning tasks that are not achievable.

- Lifelong learning – providing a foundation of learning will help students prepare for learning that is to come. Learning how to learn is a continuing process.

- Quality practice – a high standard of teaching, programmes and materials is provided to equip the students.

- Quality planning – Organisation and everyday practices are consistent with the aims of the programme. Evaluation of learning should therefore be an integral part of curriculum planning.

- Co-operatively designed – representation of students, parents, whanau (extended family) and teachers in the development of the curriculum.

- Curriculum review – to ensure the curriculum is responding to the needs of communities and cultures, to the need of New Zealand society, to new understandings of how people learn.

- Inclusivity – students should feel part of a learning environment where it enables their active participation and be learner-friendly. The curriculum should take into account the needs and experiences of all students, including their background knowledge and existing ideas, as well as the diverse character of the community.

- Enablement/Empowerment – to empower students to take responsibility for their learning, setting their own goals (with teacher involvement), organising their own studies and activities as well as evaluating their own learning and achievements.

While these Principles are clearly embedded in the pre-tertiary sector, this paper suggests that tertiary education providers should consider if they could use help to provide evidence that they too are actively incorporating the ToW. Te Puni Kokiri has a range of publications and fact sheets (Te Puni Kokiri, 2010), but very few appear to specifically address the tertiary education sector. The one that does focuses on Maori graduates rather than on the institutions from which they graduate, and groups hospitality, tourism and events graduates together in ‘food, hospitality and personal services’ for the purpose of statistical reporting.

The next section considers some of the generic literature on education and diversity before reflecting briefly on the impact of culture and learning styles.

Literature review

Education and diversity

While this paper has so far considered the unique bi-cultural relationship which underpins the creation and identity of New Zealand and its peoples, as academics we have a responsibility to consider lessons and experiences which can strengthen our teaching and the way in which we develop our students into independent thinkers and good citizens who can then contribute to the development of a better society. Danowitz, Hanappi-Egger and Hofmann (2009:590) remind academics that the curriculum has the potential to be ‘a locus and transmitter of values’. Chan (1999:294) points out that ‘education in China is designed to foster the country’s cultural values as well as improve the skills of the Chinese people’. If the Chinese people use education to build up the cultural identity, then perhaps there is some merit in considering how education can help to remind the peoples of New Zealand of their responsibility to maintain and develop a people who are aware of their own and respect other cultures. This explicit goal of strengthening a country’s cultural identity through education is therefore an interesting one for us to consider in New Zealand. This section will therefore review some of the literature on internationalization of education and reflect on what this means for New Zealand and its stated position as an internationalized society. If academic literature has identified examples of culturally-sensitive education practices (for example in dealing with large groups of overseas students), then perhaps there are lessons in there for New Zealand’s tertiary education sector.

Hing (1997) identifies education and curriculum development as one of the five critical themes in academic research in the Asia Pacific region. There is a considerable academic literature on higher education, cultural diversity and the challenges facing academics and institutions that are trying to support students with sometimes very different expectations. Charlesworth (2007) forecasts that there will be three million students studying outside their own country by 2010, rising to over five million by 2025. 20% of these will be looking to study some form of management at degree level. Prugsamatz, Pentecost and Ofstad (2006) suggest a figure of 7.2m with Asia (China and India) accounting for 70% of this. Biggs (2003) is very critical of those who suggest that teaching different cultures requires different approaches and particular ‘tricks’. Instead, he argues, academics too often use a student’s culture or nationality as an excuse for the failure of poor pedagogy. He suggests a three level process where level 1 is a ‘blame the student’ approach, level 2...
is a recognition that students are all different and may benefit from accommodation of those differences, and level 3 moves away from a ‘deficit model’ altogether and welcomes different learning modes and models. This he refers to as ‘teaching as educating’. Someone who uses a level 3 approach will allow students to record lectures, speak slowly, avoid colloquialisms and jokes, provide visual materials to support learning, and try to pair up students of different cultures. These approaches will, he argues, help all students, not just those of a different culture to the dominant one. He also points out that those same students who ‘won’t talk in class’ then will not stop talking over coffee outside the classroom or in group work. Carr, McKay and Rugimbana (1999) and Farr and Wharton (2006) also point out that many of the students whom lecturers identify as having ‘problems’ came to the country where they are studying as academically strong students and go back to their own countries and cultures and hold challenging positions in business. They also suggest that students’ behaviour in the classroom may have more to do with a lack of the family support they are used to, and an immersion in a system which often values ‘risk-taking and self-direction’ (Farry and Wharton, 2006:25). Race (1999) argues that many of these issues can be addressed or at least minimised with a good induction programme, availability of material for students to take away and reflect on, and recognition of the pressures of family and religious traditions on students. Race (1999) urges academics to celebrate successes in their lecture theatres and classrooms. All of these examples and suggestions could be used to improve the experience of students from different nationalities and cultures, and if such approaches are planned into curriculum development then the result may be a more inclusive curriculum which values diversity and cultural awareness. Much of the literature in this area focuses on the perceived differences in learning styles between different groups of students. While this paper specifically focuses on the bi-cultural structure of New Zealand, a better understanding of how students of different cultural groups are accommodated in a dominant culture (for example Chinese students in UK institutions), may help to identify constructive curriculum development opportunities in New Zealand.

Culture and learning styles

There is a considerable literature on the relationship between culture and learning styles, and what this means for educators (Sulkowski & Deakin, 2009). Charlesworth (2007) argues this has implications for hospitality management education as she found a link between a student’s cultural background and their preferred learning style. However her research also showed that over the course of this longitudinal study these differences became less noticeable. Charlesworth (2007) argues that student learning style preferences research can be divided into a number of broad groups:

1. Education-centred based on Kolb’s Experiential Learning Model focusing on the individual needs of students in the classroom
2. Personality-based studies using the Learning Styles Questionnaire leading to classification of students into activist, reflector, theorist and pragmatist.

Others have warned that despite the popularity of these tools and their apparent usefulness, there is relatively limited empirical evidence that would enable the authors to claim generalisability of their ideas. Charlesworth (2007) discusses the challenges of teaching ‘Confucian Heritage Culture’ (CHC) students in an Australian context but also notes that research has found students who arrive with a ‘reflector’ preference changing to a more ‘activist’ learning style in order to achieve high grades. Lashley and Barron (2006) also study this region although they claim the cultural mix is not that dissimilar from the UK’s Higher Education sector. They claim that hospitality and tourism management courses are particularly attractive to international students precisely because of the global nature of the industry which they are seeking to join. Chan (1999) provides a very useful and informative ‘emic’ insight into the Chinese learner. Other researchers have used Hofstede’s cultural dimension model to suggest why different groups behave differently in class and in group work. A US study found an increasing number of students moving to a ‘pragmatist’ as they learned what their lecturers were looking for. Charlesworth’s (2007) study found that even if groups of students stayed within their preferred learning styles, there was usually some evidence of ‘convergence’ across different national groups. Barron and Arcodia (2002:15) suggest that developing an accessible curriculum is a good thing but warn not to ‘promote stereotypical views of the strengths and weaknesses of international students’.

Curriculum development and cultural diversity

Heams, Devine and Baum (2007) discuss the impact that cultural diversity among both employees and customers can have. They suggest that educational institutions need to reflect this in their curriculum development due to the ‘dynamic surge in pan European migration’ (Heams et al., 2007:350). They argue that it must be the responsibility of educators and management ‘to assure that indigenous staff understand and respect the cultural differences of international workers’ (Heams et al., 2007:351). They also note that the USA and Australia have a ‘more established tradition of managing cultural diversity’ and that useful lessons could be learned by looking at their experiences. As well as teaching new entrants about the host culture, there is also a need for training programmes on cultural diversity for the ‘host’ community or the benefits of multicultural experiences may be lost. Lashley and Barron (2006) warn that a failure to explicitly address these cultural differences may lead
to an unsatisfactory experience both for the international students and for the domestic students whom they share a lecture theatre with. There is some debate as to whether it is better to embed such ‘cultural diversity’ awareness within each module or whether it is better to have a stand-alone module which addresses the topic. This is perhaps similar to the debate on the teaching of ethics to business students. Hearns et al. (2007) provide a useful framework showing where and how such issues could be incorporated within the curriculum.

**Student expectations and culture**

- Sulkowski and Deakin (2010) warn that there is a paucity of research into the experience of international students. Prugamsatz et al. (2006) is one of the few studies into what creates the expectations against which international students measure their perceptions of education overseas. In the context of this paper that could include students learning in a culture different to the one they grew up in. They point out that students of a different culture to the host one achieve relatively fewer first class honours degrees. Using Hofstede’s classifications they report that students who are,

‘the opposite to the British culture, hence highly power-distant/collectivist compared to low power-distant/individualist, are most likely to face difficulties in relation to classroom interaction, interaction with lecturers and peers…’ (Sulkowski & Deakin, 2010:111).

They warn that there is insufficient empirical evidence to create cultural profiles which educationalist can then develop support structures and mechanisms for. They also warn of the dangers of stereotyping, something the authorities in New Zealand would need to be very conscious of. Townsend and Lee (2004) and Barron and Arcodia (2002:17) warn of the ‘problems associated with dislocation, culture shock and loneliness’. Holmes (2005) found that international students were more likely to form support networks with other international students than with the ‘home’ students. This also raises the interesting issue of whether it is the responsibility of the student or the institution to accommodate or work to reduce cultural differences. Lashley and Barron (2006) suggest that students learning in a culture other than their own do (over time) adapt to the dominant learning culture, suggesting that a satisfactory outcome is more to do with the student than the institution. The ‘cross-cultural competence of staff members’ (Sulkowski & Deakin, 2010:113) was also noted as very important for success, and that the critical points of conflict were often around the areas of supervision and assessment. Their solutions included a recommendation to explicitly address the differences in culture and expectations in induction programmes as this would then ‘surface’ the assumptions and norms which so often go on to cause difficulties at assessment time. It is worth noting that they are explicit that the host institution should not necessarily sacrifice their national and cultural ‘distinctiveness’ in order to accommodate the expectations of international students. This certainly resonates with the attitude of some academics that these international students have come overseas precisely to experience a different culture to the one they would be a part of ‘back home’. They urge that the best intentions of accommodating cultures might,

‘…defeat the objective of promoting and celebrating diversity by treating each student as an individual and lead to segregation rather than an inclusive learning environment.’ (Sulkowski & Deakin, 2010:114)

Barron and Arcodia (2002) sound a word of warning that Asian students adopting a more ‘activist’ style of learning might actually inhibit the reflective, deep-learning approach many lecturers are trying to develop in students who must become life-long learners to succeed in the 21st century. Lashley and Barron (2006) suggest that the use of models such as Kolb’s and Honey and Mumford’s models of learning help students to understand how they learn rather than merely focusing on what they learn. Barron (2002) suggests strategies academics can adopt when teaching Asian students in Australia, and concludes by saying that if academics ensure they are aware of any issues and challenges their students are facing then they will be in a better position to address them.

In this paper so far the authors have hopefully provided a fairly extensive review of the literature on education, internationalization and culture. However, the intention of this research was to look at the implications of trying to create a curriculum for hospitality, tourism and event management students within a specific culturally aware context. As has been shown so far, there is considerable literature on students studying in a culture other than their own, and the challenges that result for both students and education providers. The gap in the literature that this paper attempts to address is to do with how academics can create an educational environment which welcomes students of all cultures and ethnicities whilst at the same time respecting the host culture and norms.

This paper therefore now goes on to propose a model which attempts to map experiences of students in Higher Education in New Zealand onto the principles drawn from the Treaty of Waitangi which explicitly commits to the creation of a bi-cultural environment. The link into the preceding literature is therefore not so much to do with ensuring overseas students can access the curriculum and understand the assessment methods, but instead to ask how an educational culture can incorporate the cultural identity and societal norms of the host culture. This is particularly challenging in the context of New Zealand and the commitment to a bi-cultural approach is enshrined in the Treaty of Waitangi. What follows is a framework which should allow academics to reflect on
their teaching practice and curriculum development, and whether their practice upholds the Principles discussed earlier in the introduction to this paper. The examples are not necessarily ‘best practice’ but the authors feel they do demonstrate a commitment to the goals of the ToW. They should provide a tool to assist in demonstrating how staff are addressing the ToW in their teaching. A draft proposal of what such a model might perhaps look like is presented in Table 1. The ‘Principles’ are summaries of the ones discussed at the start of this paper in the section on the ToW and New Zealand’s secondary education sector. The examples are provided from colleagues at AUT’s School of Hospitality and Tourism and taken from classes across hospitality, tourism, culinary arts and event management. They are not designed to be examples of ‘best practice’, but merely illustrations to encourage others to review and reflect on their own teaching within the context of the Treaty.

**Table 1  The model and some examples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Examples within a tertiary education setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Providing students with a Paper Study Guide outlining learning outcomes, class content, assessment requirements, deadlines and marking guidelines. Online course material and instructions on uploading assignments. Copies of lecture slides, tutorial material and self-directed learning workbooks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-racist</td>
<td>Utilise international names in examples or assessments. Arrange group work to ensure a mix of ethnicities and backgrounds. Encourage non-native students to contribute examples from their cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>Encourage students to ask questions in class. Emphasise the importance of work experience to a better understanding of the theoretical concepts discussed. Acknowledge good contributions in class or assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifelong learning</td>
<td>Encourage students to reflect on diversity in the workplace and how this affects the product or service offering. Learning about others and their cultures enriches our own lives. Develop independent learners and reflective practitioners. Gain an understanding of different learning styles. Encourage students to be aware of and utilize any support services that are available (e.g. Maori liaison, Pasifika student support, the Chinese Centre, Te Tari Awhina).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality practices</td>
<td>Encourage the sharing of best practice, identify colleagues with particular skills (e.g. groupwork, peer assessment, ICT skills, industry liaison), mentoring, moderation, team teaching, building ‘communities of practice’ with similar interests (e.g. TRINET, an online community of hospitality and tourism academics).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality planning</td>
<td>Five-yearly reviews, collaboration with other lecturing staff, Student Evaluations of Papers (SEPs), reflective exercises with students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operatively designed</td>
<td>Ongoing monitoring and evaluation of programmes that includes input from students, moderators, monitors, external advisory panels, employers, professional bodies, Iwi and other interested groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum reviews</td>
<td>Semester reviews by teaching teams, Programme Leaders, Board of Study, Examination Boards, Heads of Department, Head of School and external bodies and individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusivity</td>
<td>Sharing personal experiences of diversity issues, being empathetic to a cultural issues that may arise in the lecture theatre, providing students with a non-threatening environment to discuss student backgrounds and perceptions of the management issues diversity affects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling and empowering</td>
<td>Empowering students to take responsibility for their own learning. Encouraging students to set their own goals and deadlines with support from academic staff. Include self-marking assessments to encourage self-reflection and evaluation of strengths and weaknesses. Supporting students in recording achievements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Obtained from this study
The question that arises from the examples shown in Table 1 is whether these are only relevant to the commitment New Zealand’s educational institutions are expected to demonstrate to the goals and principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. This was the researchers’ starting point. However, could it be argued that these are examples of good educational practice wherever the host culture one is teaching in? While these principles are drawn from the founding document of New Zealand/Aotearoa, would it not be possible to argue that all students, irrespective of their background, ethnicity or culture would benefit from academics who had considered the above principles in the creation of their courses and assessments? Is it therefore possible to argue that the ToW as envisaged by Captain William Hobson in 1840 was actually a very far-sighted (Utopian?) goal of what education could deliver for a people? While the way in which the Treaty has been (dis?)honoured since it was signed has given rise to hardship, bitterness and resentment on all sides, the authors of this paper would suggest that the principles above do more than merely comply with the requirements of the Treaty. All academics would, surely, like to receive student feedback that explicitly stated that they felt their lecturers delivered these aspects in their lectures? The development of such a culturally-sensitive approach might also be better in terms of producing culturally aware graduates for the workforce. With major events such as the Rugby World Cup arriving in New Zealand in 2011 and discussions for a national convention centre being raised, it is important that New Zealand’s tertiary sector can produce graduates who demonstrate awareness of, commitment to and passion for what it means to be a ‘Kiwi’.

Conclusions and opportunities for further research

New Zealand is in an almost unique situation. While there are other developed countries where two languages are enshrined in legislation (Belgium, Canada, Finland), there are very few examples where two such different cultures are brought together. However, rather than seeing this as a hindrance and a straight-jacket, it has been argued that this experience (for all its failings and shortcomings) of delivering a bi-cultural education puts New Zealand in an enviable position in terms of being able to deliver a welcoming but challenging, relevant but academically rigorous curriculum for all its students. In particular, the researchers believe that international students who come to New Zealand in large numbers from China, India and other countries will also benefit from the principles which support New Zealand’s tertiary education. The fact that the Treaty of Waitangi underpins the very identity and essence of what it means to be a citizen of New Zealand (a Kiwi) means that it also has an impact on the education of future generations. Educators therefore have a responsibility to instill a sense of partnership and mutual respect between Maori and Pakeha. As Heams et al. (2007:355) state, our goal as educators should be to ensure ‘intercultural competence, or effectiveness’. There is some research (Wade, 1999) showing that students can be very powerful change agents if their lecturers expose students to these issues and concepts. However, Danowitz et al. (2009:601) point out that,

‘Curriculum development is embedded in power structures where co-operation, competition, specific rules, norms and value systems play a critical role.’

It may therefore be difficult to make changes to one aspect without addressing wider issues. Despite this challenge, Charlesworth (2007:142) advises that even though it may seem difficult to fulfill these goals:

‘As business education goes beyond the traditional training in technical skills to the acquisition of knowledge it will be necessary for employers to both understand how best to provide such learning situations and how best to allow the employee to succeed.’

Lashley and Barron (2006:565) remind the academic community that ‘educators also need to plan teaching and learning activities in a way that recognizes student learning preferences and the educational practices that best aids student learning.’

By proposing this reflective educational framework on the basis of the Treaty of Waitangi’s Principles, the authors hope that this will provide students in New Zealand with the opportunity to succeed on a global and culturally diverse stage. We would encourage colleagues lecturing in institutions across the world yet represented here in New Zealand. Using Kolb’s Learning Cycle principles, we have an opportunity to gather examples of where they address the goals we are working towards and learning preferences and the educational practices that best aids student learning.

Another opportunity for further research is for collaborative research with academics operating within a particular ‘political’ paradigm, whether that is set by government, by religious leaders or by any other dominant stakeholder groups. How do these impact on the content, delivery or assessment of teaching in your institution?

The researchers welcome your thoughts.
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