



# Early Childhood Education and Biculturalism: Definitions and Implications

*New Zealand Journal of Teachers' Work, Volume 14, Issue 1, 8-20, 2017*

---

CHRIS JENKIN

*Auckland University of Technology*

## ABSTRACT

*The New Zealand early childhood curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1996) is presented as a bicultural curriculum, namely one honouring an equal relationship between Māori and non-Māori. This article examines definitions of biculturalism, drawing on research into the implementation of early childhood curriculum in mainstream centres in Aotearoa New Zealand, initially conducted in the context of a Doctoral thesis (Jenkin, 2010). I also explore the relationship between bilingualism and biculturalism. An appreciative inquiry approach underpinned the inquiry into definitions of biculturalism. The outcomes of this qualitative research study suggested that definitions overlapped and intersected 'conventional' Māori-Pākehā<sup>1</sup> perspectives. This finding contradicted initial researcher assumptions. This article reflects on the themes arising from definitions provided by the participants to an early, previously unreported 2003 investigation, and concludes that the term, 'Tiriti-based curriculum' better captures the notions of partnership and power sharing endorsed by the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi) than the term 'bicultural' does.*

## CONTEXT

At the outset, I will clarify certain terminology and my positioning as a researcher. Whereas 'bicultural practice' in New Zealand refers to Māori and Pākehā working in parallel, 'Tiriti-based practice' incorporates a deliberate intention to share power as a political obligation stemming from Te Tiriti o Waitangi. I would argue that the term 'Tiriti-based' is preferable especially within educational services because it directly references Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Ritchie & Rau, 2006),

While the use of the term, 'mainstream', could be seen to marginalise early childhood education services such as language nests, Montessori, Steiner and Reggio, the intention in this article is to focus on those services and centres that

---

<sup>1</sup> Original settlers of British descent

do not offer a special character philosophy. The use of 'mainstream' is thus considered an appropriate description of these non-special character services.

As a Pākehā researcher, my worldview is, arguably, Pākehā-centric. That notwithstanding, I am motivated to provide a counter to the dominant Pākehā socio-economic and political perspective. As Ritchie and Rau pointed out, what is required is "a transformation of the western dominated early childhood discourse to...one validating of other cultural paradigms" (2008, p. 83). Part of this transformation is to be aware of who I am and thus how I position myself in this research. Thus, I need to be constantly alert for my monocultural views.

## APPRECIATIVE INQUIRY AS A THEORETICAL APPROACH

In general, appreciative inquiry explores the topic under investigation from a strength-based perspective, considering and reflecting on times participants were successful in their practice (Hammond, 1998; Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2003; Yoder, 2005). It is this strength-based approach as a theoretical framework in my thesis Jenkin (2010), which underpinned the exploration of definitions of biculturalism from the literature. Analysing the literature in this way thus enabled thinking about Tiriti-based curriculum through the lens of facilitating positive change, while also providing a way of recognising positive development. Appreciative inquiry as a theoretical framework provided a source of optimism, yet facilitated constructive critical analysis.

## METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The definitions I investigated came from two main sources: literature perused for my thesis (Jenkin, 2010) and data from a small survey. An earlier investigation (Jenkin, 2010) of the implementation of the New Zealand national early childhood curriculum, *Te Whāriki*<sup>2</sup> (Ministry of Education, 1996), included an examination of definitions of biculturalism. I derived data from an anonymous, qualitative survey conducted with 76 early childhood educators (Jenkin, 2009), which was distributed at the Eighth New Zealand Early Childhood Convention in 2003. Hoek and Gendall (1999) noted, "the logic of survey research is that many people answer the same question so that the researcher can see what patterns might exist within the kinds of answers given" (p. 176). This article draws largely on previously unreported data from one of the qualitative questions in the survey.

By categorising the literature into those authors that saw 'biculturalism' as position of strength from the point of view of an appreciative inquiry approach and the rest, it was possible to see a trend through the authors' ethnicity. What emerged was that those who were opposed to the notion of 'biculturalism' were generally Māori (Bishop, 1996; Durie, 2001; O'Sullivan, 2007; Smith, 1990) and those who were optimistic, or saw biculturalism as a strength, were non-Māori (Banks, 1988; Connell, 1989; Ritchie, 2002; 2003; Wilson, 2002). This finding has led me to question the adjective, 'bicultural' and has led to my preference and advocacy of the term 'Tiriti-based' instead. An overview of the literature that led to this decision follows.

---

<sup>2</sup> The woven mat

## LITERATURE

### Definitions of biculturalism

Surprisingly little recent New Zealand literature exists to update definitions of biculturalism, particularly in the field of education. Māori scholars have argued that constructs of biculturalism continue the colonisation of Māori, but these issues have not been picked in either official discourses for example in the new *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 2017) or in the work of most Pākehā scholars with the exception of Ritchie (Ritchie & Rau, 2006). Many non-Māori authors and organisations have viewed biculturalism positively, as a partnership between Māori and the Crown (Banks, 1988; Metge, 1990; Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare, 1988; Spoonley, 1995). On the other hand, Māori scholars (Durie, 2001; Johnston, 2001; O'Sullivan, 2007; Smith, 1990), regarded biculturalism as yet another form of colonisation and appropriation of indigenous culture and language.

Internationally, biculturalism has been defined as the ability to develop and maintain competency in both cultures (La Fromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 2000), while Banks (1988) described a bicultural person as one who is “as comfortable within the adopted culture as he or she is within his or her primordial or first culture” (p. 38). These definitions, while useful, lack insight into the power relations inherent in biculturalism.

An early local definition that initially resonated with me was from the Ministry of Social Development, which defined biculturalism as “understanding and sharing the values of another culture” (Ministerial Advisory Committee, 1988, p. 20). I eventually rejected this definition also, as it too failed to indicate the underlying political nature of biculturalism. In contrast, the Anglican Church Bicultural Commission described biculturalism as “the ambition of establishing Māori and Pākehā as groups of equal standing rather than one being subjugated by the dominance of the other” (1985, p. 19, as cited in Spoonley, 1995, p. 94). This definition more successfully captured the political sense of the term, later echoed by Bishop (1996), who had regarded biculturalism as part of “central government’s sequential policies of assimilation, integration, multiculturalism, [and] biculturalism” (p.12).

The steady move in early childhood education from the 1980s towards bicultural pedagogy culminated in 1996 with a national curriculum, *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996). Surprisingly, given that it lays claim to being the *first* bicultural curriculum, the document does not include a definition of biculturalism. One was later provided: “a concept that implies the interactions, relationships, and sharing of understandings, practices, and beliefs between two cultures; in New Zealand, the term generally refers to Māori and non-Māori” (Ministry of Education, 1998, p. 86). This definition does not, however, explicitly incorporate the power relations inherent in biculturalism either. Setting aside for the moment questions of embedded power relations in the notion of biculturalism, it is important to consider how biculturalism may be implemented in the early childhood sector. One pathway is language.

### Configuring links between language and culture

To implement the underpinning bicultural basis of *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996) teachers may focus on becoming bilingual as a step toward

becoming bicultural. Scheffler (2008) noted, however, certain constraints in adult second language acquisition:

*What has to be stressed is that an adult learner needs to master this very complex system under various constraints. These external and internal constraints relate...to the time that a learner can devote to the process of learning, the amount of exposure that he or she gets, the quality of teaching that he or she receives, the level of motivation that is present and the strength of the affective barriers that need to be overcome. (pp. 293-294)*

To be bilingual “primarily describes someone with the possession of two languages” (Wei, 2000, p. 7). Nevertheless, in verifying if a person is bilingual there are several factors that need to be considered. These include deeming what level of fluency is required in both languages and whether or not only speaking is relevant. Wei (2000) questioned whether being able to write, read and/or understand another language renders a person bilingual. A further relevant factor in determining if a person is bilingual relates to the matter of who makes the decision that an individual is bilingual - themselves or another (Wei, 2000). Importantly though, “to a large extent ‘bilingualism’ always implies some degree of ‘biculturalism’ for the individual, since learning a language involves acquiring many aspects of the knowledge, beliefs, skills and experiences that identify the culture that has produced the language” (Corson, 1990, p. 160).

It must be noted, first, that the relationship of ‘culture’ to the languages an individual may command, is complex. Second, nevertheless, if early childhood education teachers seek to facilitate biculturalism, then they should also be aware of the imperatives of seeking to become bilingual, notwithstanding the difficulties for adults in second language acquisition (Scheffler, 2008). There are, nonetheless, several international strategies suggested in the past that may prove to be helpful in the implementation of Tiriti-based, power sharing, curriculum. These strategies can be adapted by early childhood teachers, particularly those encouraging the acquisition of te reo Māori<sup>3</sup>. The Western Canadian Protocol for Collaboration in Basic Education (1999) developed a bilingual programme or framework for children from kindergarten to Grade 12, and noted that “bilingual education strives to provide intensive language learning environments, with the potential for high academic achievement and enriched cultural experiences that maximise student opportunities for learning” (p.1).

Stiles (1997) and Holmes (1991) compared indigenous language programmes in Aotearoa New Zealand and other countries. Stiles (1997) compared the Cree Way in Quebec, Hualapai in Arizona, Te Kōhanga Reo in Aotearoa New Zealand, and Punana Leo in Hawaii. She concluded that success in achievement could be attributed to having a theoretical foundation for the curriculum, a degree of home and community involvement, written resources for teachers and intertwining culture and language. These strategies were most effective when programmes commenced at preschool. It is interesting to note that

---

<sup>3</sup> Māori language

Stiles' conclusions are similar to strategies recommended for implementation of *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996). Holmes (1991) examined bilingual early childhood programmes in Aotearoa New Zealand, Wales, and amongst indigenous people in the United States. Using the Welsh strategies as a blueprint, Holmes (1991) suggested "extensive 'prime-time' TV and radio in Welsh" (p. 5), and Welsh language being offered in all schools. These strategies are useful for implementing bilingual programmes in Aotearoa New Zealand, and have now in some manner been put into practice. There are currently two television channels available in te reo Māori and in addition, early childhood centres (Ministry of Education, 1996; 2017) must incorporate te reo Māori curriculum into their programmes. Whilst television channels incorporating the use of te reo can be used as a resource for teachers wishing to improve their te reo, there are challenges in implementing the bicultural curriculum (Jenkin, 2010; Ritchie, 2002, 2003) Furthermore as Holder (2016) contended, there is an increasing lack of understanding over the difference between biculturalism and multiculturalism.

### **The place of the multicultural curriculum**

A problematic shift that challenges a focus on the implementation of a Tiriti based curriculum is the growing legitimisation of multiculturalism (Heta-Lensen, 2005; Holder, 2016; Jenkin 2010). This shift is paralleled by the view that Tiriti-based programmes could override the cultural integrities of other ethnicities. A likely cause for the growth of this viewpoint is globalisation, and the concomitant increase of ethnic diversity in enrolment in early childhood education services in Aotearoa New Zealand (Chan, 2011; Duhn, 2008). Whilst the importance of valuing children's home cultures cannot be overlooked, neither should the importance of understanding and honouring political obligations to a Tiriti-based curriculum (Jenkin, 2010).

Indeed, *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996) "supports the cultural identity of all children, [thus] each early childhood education service should ensure that programmes and resources are sensitive and responsive to the different cultures and heritages" (p. 18). Despite this support from the Ministry, Duhn (2008) pondered whether "*Te Whāriki* shies away from addressing the complexities of multiculturalism in favour of outlining biculturalism. This is a reflection of the wider political climate - discourses of multiculturalism in New Zealand are overlaid by bicultural issues" (p. 30). One result of this changing discourse, however, is that early childhood teachers are arguably becoming confused in their understanding of the bicultural curriculum, which some believe is intended to incorporate all the cultures present in Aotearoa New Zealand (Holder, 2016).

Replacing a Tiriti-based curriculum with a multicultural one may arguably be presented by those seeking to undermine a bicultural state, as an easier way forward, or as Spoonley (1995) noted, as "a soft option politically" (p. 93). Yet, the establishment of a strong Tiriti-based curriculum could actually lead the way to incorporating multiculturalism (Spoonley, 1995). Working towards a robust Tiriti-based curriculum rather than one based on multiculturalism should be seen as a priority in this country (Connell, 1989) because Te Tiriti o Waitangi demands that Māori and Pākehā are honoured as treaty partners. It does not mean the value of other cultures is ignored, but that rights and obligations under Te Tiriti are the first priority. The crucial point for early childhood practitioners is that Tiriti-

based curriculum is woven into programmes at all centres regardless of the ethnicity of the children attending. As the Ministry of Education stated, “New Zealand is increasingly multicultural. Te Tiriti/the Treaty is seen to be inclusive of all immigrants to New Zealand, whose welcome comes in the context of this partnership” (2017, p. 3).

## **DISCUSSION**

The sense of unequal power sharing in conventional definitions of biculturalism and reference to the power structures that underpin theories of biculturalism (Durie, 2001; Johnston, 2001; O'Sullivan, 2007; Smith, 1990) provide cause to reconceptualise the notion of biculturalism. This is especially so in light of recent research suggesting mainstream early childhood practitioners are uncertain regarding the implementation of the bicultural curriculum (Holder, 2016). Reflection on these matters led me to return to some previously unreported data arising from a 2003 study, the findings of which may continue to be pertinent today.

When survey respondents were asked in 2003 to provide their definitions of bicultural practice and why it was important, they offered a rich perspective that included Te Tiriti o Waitangi: partnership and power sharing; the need for equal engagement with the two languages (te reo Māori and English); and the right of Māori to make autonomous decisions. From the data, early childhood practitioners were clear about what they considered important to include in a definition of biculturalism. In the following, responses that represent the themes described above are provided.

### **Te Tiriti o Waitangi: partnership and power sharing**

The view that “Te Tiriti o Waitangi is the founding document of partnership and we are charged to build and maintain tikanga<sup>4</sup> Māori and te reo in our centre alongside of the European base” (R. 121), emphasises the obligation of those in Aotearoa New Zealand to commit to biculturalism. The idea of partnership within Te Tiriti (Ministry of Education, 1996; New Zealand Royal Commission on Social Policy, 1988), was echoed by R. 405 who noted the importance of “acknowledging what has come from the treaty - equal partnership. Working to be inclusive of both Māori and Pākehā perspectives to understand the needs of the individual.”

Respondents were clear that power sharing and an equal partnership should be encompassed in a definition of biculturalism, as explained by the following respondent: “A bicultural early childhood centre reflects a true partnership between Māori & Pākehā that is based on mutual respect and understandings and a desire to protect the uniqueness of Aotearoa/New Zealand” (R. 1). Respect is integral to partnership as is authenticity, although interestingly R. 5 was the only respondent to include spirituality as a consideration: “Two cultures Māori /Pākehā coming together as equal partners in a partnership with authentic representation physically emotionally and spiritually”.

---

<sup>4</sup> Customs, practices which are correct procedure

## Te reo Māori and English

For many participants, a definition of biculturalism included both te reo and English: “an acknowledgement of the two ways of ‘being’/living/doing things that have equal value status and importance. *Te Whāriki* is a good example—both languages; room for both views and interpretations” (R. 404). The implication of this response embodies the view of equal power, acknowledging the value of both te reo Māori and English, which was also elaborated by another respondent, stating that in defining biculturalism it was important “for all teachers to be able to talk in Māori with confidence and understand tikanga so that the European and Māori aspects can be given equal weighting” (R. 2).

This vision seems a long way off, however, as Williams, Broadley & Lawson Te-Aho (2012) and others (Holder, 2016; Jenkin, 2016; Ritchie & Rau, 2006) have noted that achieving even basic te reo in mainstream centres is a challenge. Furthermore, early childhood teachers who may be new learners to te reo Māori, inevitably encourage tokenism. As they grapple with their developing skills, typically they begin with greetings and farewells, commands, colours and numbers. In their centre practice, however, employing commands in te reo for ‘listen’ ‘sit down’ and ‘come here’ to direct children, inadvertently portrays te reo as ‘bossy language’ and its use appears tokenistic (Ritchie, 2007).

## Māori decision making

Bishop (2001, p. 203) advocated for an approach “based on Māori aspirations and Treaty guarantees for the revitalisation of Māori language, culture and identity as part of creating new power relationships based on self-determination”. Respondents noted the value of this approach: “Recognition of Māori right to self-determination” (R. 202), while another respondent highlighted the need for a more Māori-centred perspective: “Recognising rights of indigenous people to actual expression of decision making in all aspects of life, while acknowledging the rights and responsibilities of the other peoples in New Zealand society” (R. 132).

The following sums up what many wrote: “Māori culture and European are expressed equally. Māori language and tikanga [are] given equal status, and relationships [are] built with local tangata whenua<sup>5</sup> who are consulted about centre decisions” (R. 8).

The above selected practice-based views align more closely with the construct of Te Tiriti-based practice that has emerged in the literature more recently, and demonstrates the participants’ recognition of the importance of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, equity and power sharing, and their acknowledgement of the rights and worldviews of both Māori and the Crown. It may, therefore, be more useful for early childhood education teachers to reframe their understandings (and expression) to sit within a Tiriti-based framework rather than a bicultural frame as this will:

- Forefront teacher responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi
- Make issues of power-sharing more explicit

---

<sup>5</sup> Māori: People of the land

- Provide a mechanism for teachers to consider and reconcile tensions that have surfaced between the bicultural and the multicultural stances, so that Tiriti-based curriculum and multicultural practices can co-exist.

Despite creeping confusion in current times over the distinction between biculturalism and multiculturalism as noted in Holder's (2016) research, arguably, early childhood practitioners wish to continue to implement and upskill themselves in the Tiriti-based aspects of *Te Whāriki*, despite the challenges with implementation (Jenkin, 2010). When centre staff persevere in developing relationships with whānau Māori and local iwi, the ideals of partnership and shared decision-making will become more viable (Jenkin, 2010; Ritchie, 2003).

Finally, the updated version of *Te Whāriki*, launched on 12<sup>th</sup> April 2017, provides examples of practices, several of which include ideas to enhance Te Tiriti-based practice and provide overdue support for teachers to implement Tiriti-based curriculum. Of concern though, as previous research (Heta-Lensen, 2005; Ritchie, 2002; Ritchie & Rau, 2006; 2008) has specified, consultation with Māori, must have the effect of safeguarding Māori people and culture from the potentially damaging impact of monocultural teachers. To continue to champion a *bicultural* early childhood education and curriculum, may be tokenistic at best, and perpetuate negative dominant Pākehā attitudes over Māori at worst.

## CONCLUSION

The literature and the previously unreported survey responses considered in this article suggest definitions of biculturalism that strongly emphasise equal power sharing. This evidence aligns with the concern of some at the lack of equal power sharing within the conventional discourse regarding the bicultural framework (Bishop, 1996; Durie, 2001; O'Sullivan, 2007; Smith, 1990). Given this tension between the perception these authors have of biculturalism and the official intent of biculturalism (as promoted, for example, by the New Zealand early childhood curriculum, *Te Whāriki*), it may legitimately be questioned whether early childhood educators should continue to promote this 'bicultural' curriculum. Use of the term, 'Te Tiriti-based curriculum' instead has more relevance to Aotearoa New Zealand, as Te Tiriti o Waitangi is about power sharing in its intention.

It is also crucial to distinguish clearly Tiriti-based curriculum from the multi-ethnic or multicultural programmes. Tiriti-based curriculum should always be implemented regardless of the ethnicities of the families involved in the early childhood centre. With regards to the multi-ethnic curriculum, it is important that those cultures represented in the centre are also included in the programme, and as Holder (2016) suggested, that early childhood educators be equipped to be clear on the difference. A positive advocacy for a Te Tiriti-based curriculum is one way to transform the currently unequal power relations between Māori and the Crown, a task that early childhood practitioners would do well to take up.



Manuscript Submitted: March 9, 2017

Revised Manuscript Received: June 25, 2017

Revised Manuscript Received: August 9, 2017

Revised Manuscript Accepted: September 5, 2017

## REFERENCES

- Banks, J. (1988). *Multiethnic education, theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Bishop, R. (1996). *Collaborative research stories: Whakawhanaungatanga*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: The Dunmore Press Ltd.
- Bishop, R. (2001). Changing power relations in education: Kaupapa Māori messages for mainstream institutions. In C. McGee & D. Fraser (Eds.), *The professional practice of teaching* (2nd ed., pp. 201-219). Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press Limited.
- Chan, A. (2011). Critical multiculturalism: Supporting early childhood teachers to work with diverse immigrant families. *International Research in Early Childhood Education*, 2 (1), 63-75. Retrieved from <http://unitec.researchbank.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10652/2249/irece2011-vol2-no1-chan1-1.pdf?sequence=1>
- Connell, S. (1989). *Beyond guilt: A handbook on racism* Wellington, New Zealand: Continuing Education Unit, Radio New Zealand.
- Corson, D. (1990). *Language policy across the curriculum*. Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.
- Duhn, I. (2008). Globalising childhood: Assembling the bicultural child in the New Zealand early childhood curriculum, Te Whāriki. *International Critical Childhood Policy Studies*, 1(1), 82-105.
- Durie, M. (2001). *Mauri ora. The dynamics of Māori health*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Hammond, S. (1998). *The thin book of appreciative inquiry* (2nd ed.). Plano, TX: Thin Book Publishing Company.
- Heta-Lensen, Y. (2005). *Ko te whānau te kupenga o to matauranga. The kaupapa of whānau: An approach to mainstream educational management* (Unpublished Master's thesis, Unitec, Auckland, New Zealand).
- Hoek, J., & Gendall, P. (1999). Survey research. In C. Davidson & M. Tolich (Eds.), *Social science research in New Zealand: Many paths to understanding* (pp. 176-187). Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson Education.
- Holder, R. (2016). *Te kōrero Māori ki ngā tamariki I roto I ngā karu o ngā kaiako hou: Speaking te reo Māori to children: From the perspective of early childhood teachers* (Master's thesis, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand). Retrieved from <http://aut.researchgateway.ac.nz/handle/10292/10211>
- Holmes, T. (1991). *Indigenous bilingual ec programmes in Aotearoa, Wales and the U.S: Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)*. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED346972>
- Jenkin, C. (2009). Bicultural meanings: What do practitioners say? *New Zealand Research in Early Childhood Education*, 12, 95-108. Retrieved from <http://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;res=IELHSS;dn=056719746123981>
- Jenkin, C. (2010). *Supporting Tiriti-based curriculum delivery in mainstream early childhood education* (Doctoral thesis, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand). Retrieved from <http://aut.researchgateway.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10292/1378/JenkinCJ.pdf>

- Jenkin, C. (2016). Investigation of teacher education delivery of bicultural education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education* (6). 41(6) 180-196. Retrieved from <http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol41/iss6/10>
- Johnston, P. (2001). "Watch this spot and whose in it": Creating a space for indigenous educators. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 26(1), 11-18.
- La Fromboise, T., Coleman, H., & Gerton, J. (2000). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. In K. Keough & J. Garcia (Eds.), *Social psychology of gender, race, and ethnicity* (pp. 125-134). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Metge, J. (1990). *Te kohao o te ngira. Culture and learning*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare. (1988). *Puao-te-ata-tu (daybreak)*. Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Social Welfare. <https://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/publications-resources/archive/1988-puaoteatatu.pdf>
- Ministry of Education. (1996). *Te Whāriki: He whāriki mātauranga mō ngā mokopuno o Aotearoa: Early childhood curriculum*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (1998). *Quality in action /Te mahi whai hua: Implementing the revised statement of desirable objectives and practices in New Zealand early childhood services*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (2017). *Te Whāriki: He whāriki mātauranga mō ngā mokopuno o Aotearoa: Early childhood curriculum*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media. Retrieved from <https://education.govt.nz/assets/Documents/Early-Childhood/Te-Whariki-Early-Childhood-Curriculum.pdf>
- New Zealand Royal Commission on Social Policy. (1988). *The Treaty of Waitangi and social policy: Discussion booklet No 1: Royal Commission on Social Policy*. Retrieved from <https://www-msd-govt-nz.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/about-msd-and-our-work/publications-resources/journals-and-magazines/social-policy-journal/spj11/treaty-of-waitangi-an>
- O'Sullivan, D. (2007). *Beyond biculturalism. The politics of an indigenous minority*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.
- Ritchie, J. (2002). "It's becoming part of their knowing": A study in bicultural development in an early childhood teacher education setting in Aotearoa New Zealand. (Doctoral thesis, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand). Retrieved from
- Ritchie, J. (2003). Bicultural development within an early childhood teacher education programme. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 11(1), 42-56.
- Ritchie, J. (2007, June). Presentation to OMEP. Presented at the meeting of the Auckland Chapter, OMEP, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Ritchie, J., & Rau, C. (2006). *Whakawhanaungatanga: Partnerships in bicultural development in early childhood care and education*. Retrieved from [http://www.tlri.org.nz/pdfs/9207\\_finalreport.pdf](http://www.tlri.org.nz/pdfs/9207_finalreport.pdf)

- Ritchie, J., & Rau, C. (2008). *Te Puawaitanga: Partnerships with tamariki and whānau in bicultural early childhood care and education*. Wellington, New Zealand: Teaching and Learning Research Initiatives.
- Scheffler, P. (2008). The natural approach to adult learning and teaching of L2 grammar. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching (IRAL)*, 46(4), 289-313.
- Smith, G. H. (1990). *Taha Māori: Pākehā culture*. In J. Codd, R. Harker, & R. Nash (Eds.), *Political issues in New Zealand education* (2nd ed., pp. 183-197). Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Spoonley, P. (1995). *Racism and ethnicity* (2nd ed.). Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Stiles, D. B. (1997). Four successful indigenous language programs (Publication no. ED 415 079). Retrieved from ERIC Document Reproduction Service <http://eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED415079.pdf>
- Yoder, D. (2005). Organizational climate and emotional intelligence: An appreciative inquiry into a "leaderful" community college. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 29(1), 45-62.
- Wei, L. (2000). Dimensions of bilingualism. In L. Wei (Ed.), *The bilingualism reader* (pp. 3-25). London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Western Canadian Protocol for Collaboration in Basic Education. (1999). *The common curriculum framework for bilingual programming in international languages kindergarten to grade 12*. Retrieved from <http://www.wcp.ca>
- Williams, N., Broadley, M.-E., & Lawson Te-Aho, K. (2012). *Ngā Taonga Whakaako: Bicultural competence in early childhood education*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ako Aotearoa National Centre for Tertiary Teaching Excellence.
- Whitney, D., & Trosten-Bloom, A. (2003). *The power of appreciative inquiry: A practical guide to positive change*. San Francisco, CA: Barrett-Koehler Publishing Inc.
- Wilson, K. (2002). The Treaty of Waitangi: Preparing beginning teachers to meet the expectations of the new professional standards. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 8, 27-42.

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

### CHRIS JENKIN

*Auckland University of Technology*



Chris has had over forty years' experience in education, initially as a primary school teacher and then in early childhood education. Chris has a longtime interest in equity and her current research focusses on tertiary education providers and the bicultural curriculum. Her doctoral thesis investigated the implementation of the bicultural early childhood curriculum.