

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

HISTORY THE YOUNG SHOULD LEARN?

To what extent did the teaching of History in New Zealand post-primary schools, measured by examination questions, their content, and teacher activity, reflect changes in New Zealand between 1945 and 1988?

A thesis presented in fulfilment of the requirements

for the degree

of

Master of Arts in History

at

Massey University

Edward William Body

2011

INDEX

Abstract	I
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Why teach the past? Who teaches?	
The context of the teaching.	
What to teach? What not to teach?	6
Chapter 2: Social Studies and History: balancing act, competition, or irrelevant – opening or closing doors?	20
Chapter 3: Syllabus and examinations: continuity or evolution?	32
Chapter 4: At the chalk face: teachers, pupils, resources.	56
Chapter 5: Post-1988: <i>Tomorrow's</i> Schools, NCEA	66
Conclusion	69
Appendix 1	79
Bibliography	81

ABSTRACT

The study of History in New Zealand post-primary schools between 1945 and 1988 covers a period of changes in national life demographically, socially, politically, economically, and especially in regard to views on Maori/Pakeha relations. Whether those changes were reflected in the way History was taught and examined is considered through analysis of official and local syllabuses and examination questions.

In order to provide a setting for the analysis, reasons for teaching the subject are considered, together with any constraints placed upon that teaching by influences of politicians and parents outside the classroom. The way in which students absorb history from their parents, their peers, the media, and their community, as well as being taught it in the classroom, is considered in order to provide a benchmark for the relevance of History as a subject. In particular, as fresh interpretations of the past, together with developing controversies over Maori/Pakeha relations, the place of the Treaty of Waitangi, the role of women in society, and other community concerns appear, the question arises as to whether these became part of History as a subject.

Attention is given to the way in which the new subject, 'Social Studies' was accepted by teachers, parents, schools and politicians, and how it introduced students to History. External examinations provide a source for assessing their connection with societal changes and concerns. In particular how long did it take, if at all, for Maori/Pakeha relations as debated in society to be included in questions asked in the examinations?

Former teachers provide information as to teaching methods, the way changes were incorporated in local curriculum, and resources used. An assessment is made of student reaction to Social Studies and History as classroom subjects. Although the study concentrates on the period between 1945 and 1988, the exercise concludes with a brief review of the Social Studies/History curriculum since 1988 noting continuity or otherwise from the period studied.

INTRODUCTION:

In 1945, as the result of a report by a Committee appointed by the Labour Government, a core curriculum for all New Zealand post-primary schools was established. In 1989 following another Government enquiry, *Tomorrow's Schools* became the format in the education system. The National Certificate of Educational Achievement followed soon after. The introductions of the core curriculum and *Tomorrow's Schools* set the boundaries for this Thesis.

Two subjects included in the core curriculum were Social Studies and History. During the period 1945-1988 New Zealand as a nation experienced political, demographic, economic and social change. The question is - did the teaching of History in post-primary schools during that period, and the examination of the subject, in any way reflected some or all of those changes? In particular Maori/Pakeha relations came under intensive community debate. Analysis of questions asked in external examinations will determine the extent to which History taught corresponded to community concerns and controversy. As revised views of the history of Maori/Pakeha relations, and the role of the Treaty of Waitangi, came under intensive scrutiny during the period, it will be argued that the curriculum and examinations took some time to reflect these topics. Other areas of national debate, such as the role of women, and historic ties with Great Britain, were equally slow in being reflected in History as a subject.

It will also be argued that community ethos within which young people live plays an important role in providing evidence of the past. Therefore teaching History in the classroom has a wider purpose than presenting 'facts' for regurgitating in examinations. How students were equipped to assess, challenge and question differing interpretations, and thus to understand the past so 'both the mind of the learner and the knowledge itself are transformed',¹ will also be considered in order to determine how satisfactorily changes or continuity of topics and methods assisted students to live in community. In this context, reasons for teaching History, and teaching methods, become important parts of the discussion, as does student reaction to the subject.

1 John A. Codd, 'Knowledge, Qualification and Higher Education: A Critical View' in Mark Olssen and Kay Morris Matthews (eds), *Education Policy in New Zealand: the 1990s and Beyond*, Palmerston North, The Dunmore Press, 1997, p. 134

The study will first note reasons for teaching History, and recognise that young people living in community absorb memories and interpretations of the past from the way that community organises itself. History taught overseas will be observed to provide helpful examples of the way a nation's collective memory is handled, and how those examples related to New Zealand.

Within the core curriculum, Social Studies was included for students in their first two years at post-primary school. How the subject was accepted or resisted by teachers and schools, and why any resistance appeared, will be analysed. The purpose of Social Studies will be considered, in particular as to how History was to be reflected within the subject, and examples of teaching methods will be recorded.

Over the period there were four national sets of external examinations – School Certificate, University Entrance, University Bursary and University Scholarship. Topics examined in each will be analysed to compare them with changing or continuing societal concerns and attitudes. As reasons for teaching History changed, how examinations include those reasons in the questions asked and the way answers were expected to be given, will be assessed.

A questionnaire was sent to some who taught during the period and their responses will provide information regarding teaching methods, resources, topics taught and their personal reasons for being a History teacher. Because Social Studies also included Geography, the views on both Social Studies and History of some former Geography teachers have been provided. Teachers were asked to give their opinion on student views of History, and some other sources have also provided the views of students and former students.

There is a brief chapter recording the purposes for teaching History in secondary schools since 1988, noting whether the topics taught reflect earlier attitudes to New Zealand history and/or if they relate to 21st century societal attitudes and concerns.

A number of governmental and departmental reviews regarding education in general and Social Studies/History in particular, were prepared during the period. The report of the Thomas Committee (1944) established the outline of the subjects (Social Studies

and History) for all post-primary schools. The report of the Currie Commission (1962) confirmed the direction begun by the Thomas report. In 1976 a Departmental report on secondary education recommended less standardisation of education and recognition of the differing needs of students. The Curriculum Review (1987) continued that direction, with schooling being more intentionally student focussed. Each of these reviews and the action following their recommendations affected Social Studies and History but did not necessarily affect the topics taught within the subjects.

A major consideration of Social Studies as a subject was the series of essays in Roger Openshaw (ed.) *New Zealand Social Studies: Past, Present and Future*.² 'From the outset the new subject attracted innovative teachers. Nevertheless, within the secondary schools . . . social studies experienced considerable difficulties.'³ Essayists noted the "official Goal" of citizenship as a reason for Social Studies and the battle for acceptance of the subject, a conflict which has still not been resolved. Beyond the theory of the subject, the way topics attracting controversy in the community, such as 'peace education', 'second wave feminism', Taha Maori, Maori/Pakeha relations and the role of the Treaty of Waitangi, created practical difficulties in the classroom were reviewed, emphasising the challenges those who taught Social Studies faced. Phoebe Meikle, a strong advocate for Social Studies, challenged teachers to assess their aims and ensure their teaching would connect classroom and community in the life of their students.⁴ Opposed to the subject, Evison challenged the Thomas Committee's premise that History and Geography could be 'profitably integrate',⁵ a view with which, as will be noted in this Thesis, a view with which many teachers agreed. Shuker,⁶ and Couling,⁷ contend that an important reason for opposition to Social Studies was the conservatism of teachers as a group. A Department of Education *Survey of Social Studies Subjects* provide details of topics included by schools as well as information on teacher, student and parent support or disagreement with the subject

2 Roger Openshaw (ed.) *New Zealand Socials Studies: Past, Present and Future*, Palmerston North, the Dunmore Press, 1992

3 Ibid p. 7

4 P. Meiklem 'What is Social Studies? Opening address at South Island Refresher Course, 1959, *New Zealand Post-Primary Teachers' Association Journal*, Vol. VI.4 and 5, 1960

5 H.C. Evison, 'History or Social Studies? Difficulties of Integration', *Post-Primary Teachers' Association Journal*, vol X.5, June 1963

6 Roy Shuker, 'The Failure of Social Studies, 1946-66: A New Zealand Case Study in Curriculum Change', *Journal of Educational Administration and Development*, vol. XIII.2, 1981

7 D.E. Couling, *The Secondary School Teacher in New Zealand 1945-2000: Teacher Identity and Education Reform*, MA Thesis, Massey University, , 2005

and its topics.⁸ Openshaw's report of interviews with a number of Social Studies teacher reflects their views on the way the subject was commenced, the lack of a national syllabus, teacher initiatives, and 'the prevailing gap between syllabus rhetoric and classroom reality'.⁹

A study of the development of curriculum edited by McCulloch included matters relating to Social Studies and History, as did Shallcrass' essays on New Zealand educational practice. While Sheehan's thesis on History as a secondary school subject is mainly concerned with the period post-1988, it contains several chapters regarding the major changes in New Zealand socially, culturally and economically. As Maori history prior to European settlement, Maori/Pakeha relations and the role of the Treaty of Waitangi, together with women's history, were all matters intensively debated in the community, Sheehan set them in the context of classroom curriculum. He also provided views on why British history, particularly that of the Tudor/Stuart period, was retained as a significant part of the New Zealand History curriculum.¹⁰ A series of essays edited by Olssen and Matthews is also mainly concerned with post-1988 education, but consideration of the difference between 'knowledge' and 'understanding' does relate to developments in the Social Studies and History curricula which required students to develop skills of analysis, questioning, identification of relevance, and understanding the relationship between historic actions and their effect.¹¹ The teaching of recent and controversial national history in New Zealand is provided with a benchmark by overseas studies such as Foster and Crawford, with a series of questions, comparisons and attitudes for the local scene.¹²

This thesis goes beyond curriculum development and debate about the matters such as the correctness or otherwise of Social Studies as a pre-cursor for teaching History and considers two particular aspects. First, did classroom Social Studies/History and community controversies, such as Maori/Pakeha relations, the Treaty of Waitangi, the

8 *Report on the Social Studies Subjects Survey 1981-82*, Wellington, Department of Education, 1987

9 Roger Openshaw, (ed.) *Schooling in the 40's and 50's: An Oral History: Social Studies, Reading, Mathematics*, Palmerston North, Massey University 1991

10 (William) Mark Sheehan, *'Defending the High Ground': The transformation of the discipline of history into a senior secondary school subject in the late 20th century: A New Zealand curriculum debate*, DPhEd. Thesis, Massey University, 2008

11 Mark Olssen and Kay Morris Matthews, *Education Policy in New Zealand: the 1990s and Beyond*, Palmerston North The Dunmore Press, 1997

12 Stuart J. Foster, Keith A Crawford, *What Shall We Tell the Children?: International Perspectives on School History Textbooks*, Greenwich Connecticut, Information Age Publishing, 2006

role of women in society, connect in any way. This is assessed by analysis of questions asked in the four external examinations sat by secondary school students, School Certificate, University Entrance, University Bursary and University Scholarship. The second aspect is the views of some former Geography and History teachers regarding the way History was taught, reasons for teaching it, student reaction, topics taught, difficulties encountered, views on Social Studies, and, again the relevance of what was taught to student life in society.

CHAPTER ONE WHY TEACH THE PAST? WHO TEACHES? THE CONTEXT OF THE TEACHING. WHAT TO TEACH? WHAT NOT TO TEACH?

In any presentation of history there must be selection – what to include, what to omit. Some lessons from the teaching of History in other countries highlight possible reasons for the inclusions or omission of events, and therefore assist in directing attention to what was included or excluded from New Zealand classroom History history and why it was excluded. Classroom activity may appear to offer 'authority' both in teacher and teaching, and there is a threat of that perceived 'authority' being used for indoctrination of students. What is taught in the classroom is always subject to criticism and challenge from outside sources – parents, society, politicians – and this is another reasons for considering what is, or is not, taught. As the classroom is not the only, nor necessarily, the major place in which young people receive information about, or attitudes toward, that past, the context in which the young move daily requires to be noted. What of its past New Zealand as a community wish to retain or forget affects classroom History.

Two dates set the boundaries of this exercise. In 1945 the common core curriculum for all post-primary¹³ schools was adopted following the report known as the Thomas Report¹⁴, and in 1989 *Tomorrow's Schools*¹⁴ became the format of education in New Zealand.

In 1921 the Chief Inspector of Primary Schools had a pragmatic purpose for teaching History in schools. '[The highest aim of history is to teach children] those principles that would lead them to become citizens of a great empire'.¹⁵ Beverley Southgate considered several reasons for studying History – for its own sake; to gain transferable skills; to understand that learning does not provide total knowledge; to gain the ability to continue questioning and to doubt; to learn to communicate; to learn to separate emotion from knowledge; to achieve impartiality as far as possible whiled at the same time acknowledging that everyone has a pre-disposed agenda; to

13 From 1965 all secondary schools, technical schools, technical high schools and district high schools were 'deemed to have been established as a secondary school'. Clause 82, Education Act 1964

14 *The Post-Primary School Curriculum: Report of the Committee appointed by the Minister of Education*, Wellington, Department of Education, 1959

15 T.B.Strong, 'The Inculcation of Patriotism', *Education Gazette*, 1921, quoted in Roger Openshaw, (ed.) *New Zealand Social Studies: Past, Present and Future*, Palmerston North, Dunmore Press, 1992, p. 19

be objective while acknowledging subjectivity.¹⁶ This suggests the need for all to recognise that the final word on the past can never be said, written or taught, because there is always that which we do not know we don't know, as well as new information which may change conclusions. It also suggests we all need to recognise the way in which the present delineates the past in the terms of the present. Whether as the subject 'History' or 'Social Studies', 'the underlying objectives . . . have remained virtually unchanged. Despite curriculum changes, “desirable” citizenship values are pre-selected and promoted in much the same way as in the past'.¹⁷ As Southgate wrote '[G]ood history teaching is the enemy of the undemocratic, the bigoted, the irrational and the cruel'.¹⁸ Introducing the Core Curriculum following the Thomas Committee report, the Department of Education quoted Alexander Pope, “The proper study of mankind is man” as the theme of Social Studies (and its neighbour, History), 'teaching children how human beings live together in society', expanding that by stating 'the object of social studies is training in democracy'.¹⁹ The Thomas Committee in setting Social Studies as a common core subject in Forms Three and Four with History in Forms Five to Seven as a School Certificate subject, declared the aims to be:

[T]o assist in the development of individuals who are able to take their part as effective citizens of democracy; to develop pupils' understanding of human affairs and to open up wide fields for personal exploration. The Social Studies course should not be regarded merely as a means to the introduction of pupils to social duties and responsibilities; it should . . . provide scope for and itself help to create individual interests of many kinds²⁰. . . . [T]o develop children's understanding of the interdependence of people; to set before children . . . ideals such as brotherhood, truth, justice, tolerance, courage, and responsibility to others; to help every child . . . to understand some of [his communities'] shortcomings and be ready to help make them still better places to live in'.²¹

History is taught within the overall purpose of the educational system, one of the aims of Secondary Schools within that system being defined in a 1976 Report as '[T]o preserve and transmit our cultural heritage, preparing students for the New Zealand

16 Beverley Southgate, *Why Bother With History?*, Harlow Essex, Pearson Education, 2001, p. 115-119

17 Eric Archer and Roger Openshaw, 'Citizenship and Identity as “Official” Goals in Social Studies' in Roger Openshaw (ed.) *New Zealand Social Studies*, p. 19

18 Southgate p. 164

19 *New Zealand Education Gazette*, 1 July, 1944

20 *The Post-primary School Curriculum: Report of the Committee Appointed by the Minister of Education in November, 1942*, Wellington, Government Printer, 1959, p. 27

21 *Ibid* p. 232

way of life'.²² 'One of the major tasks of schools in a society like ours is to provide students with the knowledge and the critical attitude which will enable them to play a full part in democratic life'.²³

Warning of the danger of assessing the value of a subject by the way it aided a child to pass School Certificate,²⁴ Meikle was in tune with the Thomas Committee when she stated 'people, not time and place, should be the centre of social studies', adding the 'educational aim must be concerned with the preservation and improvement of democracy in New Zealand because that is the best way to preserve and protect a "good" way of life. Social Studies should not be preparation to 'get through geography and history [School Certificate] examination's'.²⁵ Within twenty-five years, Social Studies (History and Geography) was being advocated for commercial (trade) reasons, it being:

[E]ssential that we acquire more knowledge of other people and cultures, a greater sensitivity to their attitudes and views, and a clearer understanding of our role as individuals, as members of various social groups, and as citizens in an 'international world [and] the ultimate goal is to help children realise that each of us is a single cell in a body of three billion cells. That body is humanity'.²⁶

A similar reason is suggested to study history in the the 21st century is "To know the past can illuminate the contours of the present is to be better equipped to make intelligent judgments about critical public issues".²⁷ The Department of Education survey of Social Studies noted community agreement with the 'aims' of the subject: '90 to 95+% agreed with "Help children to understand and respect the way of life of different people and cultures"; 90-94% "Prepare children to take a questioning interest in the affairs of the country"; 80-94% "Prepare children to be aware of social influences and the effects they have on people"; 80-94% "Prepare children to contribute to life in their community"; 70-94%; "Help children respect our past achievements, our traditions, and how to learn from them"; 70-89% "Help children to

22 *Towards Partnership: The Report of the Committee on Secondary Education*, Wellington, Department of Education, 1976, p. 11

23 Ivan Snook, 'Democracy, Education and the New Right' in Olssen and Matthews, p. 370

24 Phoebe C. Meikle, 'What is Social Studies?' *Post-primary Teachers' Association Journal*, July, 1960, p. 12

25 Phoebe C. Meikle, *Post-primary Teachers' Association Journal*, May 1960, p. 11

26 Colin Knight, 'Social Studies as Part of Today's Curriculum', *Social Studies Observer*, Vol. 17, No. 1, June, 1984, p. 20

27 John Tosh, 'A Great Degree of Value', *History Today*, January 2010

understand our political system and how to take part in it”²⁸ In 1987 the Curriculum Review Committee defined knowledge required to be offered as that which 'helps students to understand and be confident in their own culture and in the culture of Aotearoa/New Zealand, and to be sensitive to that of others'.²⁹ Following the *Curriculum Review*, the Director General of Education set up an inquiry as to 'what might be the body of historical knowledge to which *all* New Zealand children should be exposed', introducing the enquiry by stating '[T]here is a growing awareness among New Zealanders that, essential to our sense of identity, is a greater understanding of our past as a people – a past which has brought New Zealanders from different cultural backgrounds into a continuing relationship with each other'.³⁰ Within its response the Enquiry Group stated '[T]he study of history can help to develop [skills] recommended by the Curriculum Review, namely “locating and acquiring knowledge, constructing new ideas, clarifying existing ideas; reflection and evaluation; analysis, logical organisation and presentation of thought; . . . associating, reasoning . . . [problem solving] which are highly prized in the wider world”'.³¹ The Currie Commission noted social reformers stressed the relationship between education and citizenship, arguing for 'a greater emphasis on the work of the school upon training for social and civic responsibility'.³² But reviewing the use of teaching history for moral purposes, Joseph A. Diorio concludes that:

Because it was contentious, history could not readily promote social harmony, and because its contentiousness was inherently intellectual, neither could history serve as a vehicle for accpetive development. Historical study became recognised as the province of the individual student . . . , placing it outside the interest both of those who had advocated exemplar moral training and those who argued for social integration through the social studies.³³

On the other hand, reviewing post-Second World War German history, Falk Pingel's states: 'It is not lack of knowledge of the facts [of National Socialism and the Holocaust] that is the problem but imparting the desired moral message' and further,

28 *Report on the Social Studies Subjects Survey 1981-82*, Wellington, Department of Education, 1987, p. 138

29 *The Curriculum Review: Report of the Committee to Review the Curriculum for School*, Wellington, Department of Education, 1987 p. 12

30 *History in the Schools: Report to the Director General of Education*, 1986 , p.iv

31 *Ibid* p. 2

32 *Report of the Commission on Education in New Zealand*, Wellington, Government Printer, 1962, p. 21

33 Joseph A. Diorio, 'The Decline of History as a Tool of Moral Training', *History of Education Quarterly*, vol. 25, No. 1 Spring– Summer, 1985, p. 98

'Contemporary teaching should address the deeply held beliefs of neo-Nazis and right-wing radicalism and should incorporate and not just try to show the catastrophes caused by National Socialism'.³⁴ It is appropriate to ask how this approach relates to racial bigotry in New Zealand? Pingel's advocacy of history assisting children who, through their history studies feel guilty about the past,³⁵ learn the difference between 'guilt' and 'responsibility'³⁶ has relevance to New Zealand's teaching of Crown and Pakeha actions within the Treaty of Waitangi. 'By and large, [Pakeha youth] are denied real and living connection with their own past. They are made to feel guilty for land grabs and confiscation which they might only partially understand'.³⁷ Codd contends that the concept of knowledge requires 'an intentional process of learning in which both the learner and the knowledge itself are transformed. This is what is meant by understanding'.³⁸

German teachers often offered the purpose of teaching National Socialism and the Holocaust as 'prevention'. '[H]umanistic values should be strengthened in young people and an emphasis placed upon ensuring that there is no repetition of what happened in the past'.³⁹ A review of history teaching in the United States of America makes a similar point.

Text books are socially constructed cultural, political and economic artefacts. . . . [F]or the most part [they] never were intended to promote reflective thought, to stimulate critical analysis, or to celebrate cultural diversity. The function of history in American schools essentially has been to instil in the young a sense of unity and patriotism and veneration for the nation's glorious heritage.⁴⁰

The question remains, how valid is indoctrination as part of a school curriculum? Sage recalled a discussion on building values into [the Social Studies syllabus]. '[His view was] you can't teach values but you *can* identify and teach *about* the values of

34 Falk Pingel, 'From Evasion to a Crucial Tool of Moral and Political Education: teaching National Socialism and the Holocaust in Germany, in Stuart J. Foster and Keith A Crawford, *What shall We Tell the Children: International Perspectives on School History Textbooks*, Greenwich Connecticut, Information Age Publishing, 2006, p. 145

35 Peter Wells, *Somebody's Darling: Stories from the Napier Cemetery 1855 – 1917*, Napier, Hawke's Bay Museum and Art Gallery, 2000, p. 16

36 Pingel, p. 147-148

37 Wells, p. 16

38 Codd p. 133-134

39 Pingel, p. 148

40 Stuart Foster, 'Whose History? Portraits of Immigrant Groups in U.S. History Textbooks, 1800-Present' in *What Shall We Tell the Children?* p. 157

others . . .but there was a great fear of indoctrination by teachers'.⁴¹ Discussing the Thomas Committee aim that 'pupils be trained to become purposeful and effective citizens of a democracy', Gorrie asks, 'Should teachers deliberately attempt to train adolescents toward a particular ideology? Many teachers fear this task as one close to indoctrination, jingoism, or blind advocacy of existing evils in one's own society. [However] the main thing . . . is to show merits and demerits in our type of democracy, to contrast it with other established ways of life and do this in balanced, objective fashion'.⁴² In response to the suggestion that neo-Marixists accused Social Studies of being something of a liberal compromise, Zepke agreed that 'it [was], or it [could] be. [F]rom a critical point of view it [did] support the status quo and it [did not] actually lead to change'.⁴³ 'Politicians suspect social studies because it involves pupils in inquiring into controversial issues and teaches them to question decisions made by governments'.⁴⁴ .

'[M]uch of what is called "history" in schools is no such thing. National history particularly is an easy façade for straightforward government propaganda. How is history to be distinguished from indoctrination in compulsory courses for young people'?'⁴⁵

The Cambridge University History Curriculum,⁴⁶ set out its aims:

[T]o stimulate interest in and enthusiasm about the past; promote the acquisition of knowledge and understanding of human activity; ensure that the candidate's knowledge is rooted in an understanding of the nature and use of historic evidence; promote an understanding of the nature of cause and consequences, continuity and change, similarity and difference; provide a sound basis for further study and the pursuit of personal interests; encourage international understanding; encourage the development of linguistics and communication skills.⁴⁷

41 Ian Sage, in Roger Openshaw (ed.) *Schooling in the 40's and 50's: An Oral History*, Palmerston North, Massey University, 1991, p. 42

42 A.M. Gorrie *The Teaching of Geography and History: with special reference to the concept of Social Studies*, Christchurch, Whitcombe and Tombs, 1964, p. 22

43 Zepke in *Schooling* p. 45

44 "They would prefer pupils to be taught historical and geographical facts'. Knight p. 21

45 'Scrutiny of the overall framework within which national history occurs supplies some clues. How far the skills of history are taught to even the youngest pupil is another important indicator'. Anne Low-Ber, 'The Eclipse of History in New Zealand Schools', *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, vol. 21.2, November 1986, p. 119

46 In 2011 48 schools use the Cambridge syllabus <http://www.acsnz.org.nz/acsnzschoools.cfm> 15 April, 2011

47 *Cambridge IGCSE History Syllabus Code 0479 for examination in June and November 2011*, University of Cambridge International Examinations, p. 6

The New Zealand Curriculum records the National Certificate of Educational Achievement Certificate Social Science as 'how societies work and how people can participate as critical, active, informed, and responsible citizens' and gives reasons for studying Social Science (which includes History) as:

[S]tudents [developing] the knowledge and skills to enable them to better understand, participate and contribute to the local, national and global communities in which they live and work, engage critically with social issues; and evaluate the sustainability of alternative social, economic, political and environmental practices.⁴⁸

The Currie Commission emphasised that while schools have an important role in education, they are but 'one of many influences'. It stated its belief that 'the primary source of [physical, social and moral development of young people] lies outside the school, in the educative influence of family, of contemporaries, of the community at large with all its organised and un-organised activities'.⁴⁹ 'Though friends, parents, teachers and others can offer guidance, ultimately each student must make his, or her own way in the world. Each is part of New Zealand society and the international community. Learning and growth do not take place in isolation, but in the flux of living'.⁵⁰

In considering the teaching of history in schools 1945-1988 it is important, therefore to note many of the other ways outside their classroom in which young people received impressions of their heritage. Every day the young were surrounded by signs and symbols which emphasise New Zealand's place as a part of the British Commonwealth. There was the national flag with its replica of the Union Jack, coins with the image of a British monarch, the national anthem played in picture theatre with the audience standing, the annual royal birthday holiday, royal tours in 1953-54, 1974 and 1986 of Queen Elizabeth II (Queen of New Zealand); in Palmerston North streets named after royalty (Victoria, Albert) or the royal representative (Fitzroy, Ferguson, Featherston), the Coronation Hall in Main Street. In that city its Maori past was recognised in Te Awe Awe Street, the suburbs of Hokowhitu, Awapuni, Takaro, with the Manawatu River as its boundary.

48 *The New Zealand Curriculum: for English-medium teaching and learning in years 1-13*, 2011, Ministry of Education, p. 30

49 Currie Commission, p. 22

50 *Towards Partnership* p. 25

Signs and symbols of the state's welfare legislation and public care for people were visible every day in the form of public hospitals, state houses, milk in schools,⁵¹ a neighbour 'on the dole', the widow over the back fence receiving the Widow's Pension, an uncle on the sickness benefit or Workers' Compensation, grandparents collecting 'the pension', their mother receiving 10/- per week family benefit, perhaps father being entitled to a War Pension. Community attitudes were absorbed by the overheard conversation about the boy next door was 'adopted', the girl in the class who had suddenly 'gone to Auckland', the single mother down the road on 'the DPB' and the publicly expressed social outrage at the moral impropriety (even sinfulness) of 'girls who got themselves into this position'. An annual day off school for Labour Day celebrating the 40 hour week legislation was more of the nation's social history. Meanwhile the daily attendance at school spoke of education which was free and compulsory, from Primer One to age 15, with provision for a further free place education following that age.

The regional Anniversary Day holiday and, after 1973, Waitangi Day⁵² holiday had historic connections with the nation's democratic traditions, which were also reflected in local body and parliamentary elections,⁵³ their mother (and sister if she was over 21)⁵⁴ having a vote, court-houses and police stations. Reflection on a comment from a Pakeha young person who attended a multi-cultural school, 'sighing deeply and saying what a terrible thing it was that "we"- the Pakeha – had no culture. Of course we seem to have no culture because it is all around us. Its the frame of the window through which we look'.⁵⁵

By law, state education in New Zealand must be 'secular' but there was no dearth of reminders of the country's religious (particularly Christian) heritage. In every city and town there was a multiplicity of Church building, with usually at least two in small villages; in primary school children generally receive 'Bible in School' lessons, in post-primary school assemblies hymns were sung and the *Bible* read (often by a

51 Commenced 1937, suspended 1967

52 1973 New Zealand Day, 6 February became a national holiday, renamed Waitangi Day 1975

53 As part of Labour Party policy to help workers to vote, elections in 1946 and 1949 were held Wednesday when businesses and schools were required to close. In 1951 elections returned to Saturday

54 Reduced to 20 in 1969 then 18 in 1974

55 Wells, p. 10

prefect). Convent and Marist schools represented Christian denominationalism. Crosses in cemeteries, on public memorials and, in later years, at the site of road-side tragedies while religious rites - baptisms, weddings, funerals - were practised in all communities and the public holidays of Good Friday, Easter and Christmas were replete with messages of (at least) the purported faith of New Zealanders. Fireworks on the Fifth of November annually celebrated an alleged plot by Roman Catholics to overthrow Protestant rule in England, and marking of the years by BC and AD may have gone unquestioned but were further representations of youths' religious heritage.

Other 'memorials' to the country's past would be passed every day on the way to school; hotel names (Empire, King George, Pioneer, Masonic), statues to national or local figures in city or town squares, Chinese market gardens or fruit and vegetable shops, the Industrial Revolution (Ford motorcars), aeroplanes overhead, the bicycle the young rode to school, a new refrigerator or washing machine in the home. The past was absorbed in family views, peer comment and various media entering the home. 'Through ceremonies and celebrations, arts, architecture, and artefacts, monuments and memorials, media and family practices, different groups send powerful and often contradictory messages about the meaning of the past'.⁵⁶ It is not suggested young people (or their parents) were aware of the legacy of the past these things represented; they were part of the atmosphere (like air breathed) which provided the young with the facts, fallacies, myths and legends making up the nation's collective memory, a memory into which the classroom history lessons tried to place 'information'. As was noted in reflecting on the German situation, 'Schoolbooks and lessons are by no means the only media and often not the most important media that transmits knowledge [of the past]'.⁵⁷

History in the classroom has a 'canon' – an 'authorised version' - with the recognition that teaching history has boundaries formed by the national conscience, collective memory, 'information which society expects students to know',⁵⁸ and politics. An example of the latter was concern expressed by the National Party to a reference to that party (a cartoon) in the 2004 National Certificate of Educational Achievement

56 Linda Levistik, 'Crossing the Empty Space: Perspective Taking in New Zealand Adolescent's Understanding', O.L. Davis, Jr, Elizabeth Ann Yeager, Stuart Foster, (eds) *Historical Empathy and Perspective in Social Studies*, Lanham Maryland, Rowan and Littlefield, 2001

57 Pingel p. 146

58 O.L. Davis, 'Preface' in *What Shall We Tell The Children?*, p. xiii

Level 1 History examination. This led to an enquiry by, and report from, a Parliamentary Select Committee which, among its conclusions, stated '[Two political parties] believe that the wording of the question was inappropriate and agreed with the Secondary Principals' Association that it had the potential to challenge the emerging political and social beliefs of students'.⁵⁹ The Report went on to say that it was not the history syllabus as such which was the cause of the problem, but 'it did note the statement made by the independent checker that in the first instance, the question . . . "did raise eyebrows" because of the reference to the National Party'.⁶⁰ Clearly as the History subject must include a consideration of political action, it runs the danger of offending politicians, particularly in presenting 'recent' history. Not only politicians, but communities and nations have parts of their past they would rather leave in the past. 'The collective memories of nations are scarred by their past and what they decide to celebrate or forget about their history says much about how they wish to be seen by themselves and others'.⁶¹ In Japan, for instance, reference in history textbooks to 'war-time sex slaves' was required to be deleted, a move supported by many of the public, on the basis that 'Victimised women in Asia should be proud of being comfort women for brave Japanese warriors'.⁶²

In Germany:

It is true . . . that the National Socialist era is becoming increasingly strange and distant to pupils. To many of them it is incomprehensible that a civilised society could be in favour of organised mass murder. These pupils no longer see National Socialism as a part of their own world, as a part of contemporary history. To them this period belongs to a history, like the Kaiserreich or other phases of German development, with which they feel no involvement. They find it difficult to compare the barbarous activities of the National Socialist era with racist behaviour today.⁶³

Equally, some of New Zealand's past was a challenge to classroom teaching.

I can recall . . . the challenge of teaching topics and themes that were "close too

59 *Inquiry into the setting of National Certificate of Educational Achievement examination questions: Report of the Education and Science Committee, Forty-seventh Parliament, (Hon. Brian Donnelly, Chairperson) August 2005 p. 7*

60 *Ibid* p. 7

61 Keith Crawford, 'The Critical Importance of History Textbooks' in *What Shall We Tell the Children?*, p. 49

62 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Japanese_history_textbook_controversies, 3 January, 2011

63 Pingel, p. 143

home”. Race relations in south Africa was often a more comfortable topic than race relations in New Zealand. Having to examine your own place and the values and behaviours of your own people can be challenging. Students are often wanting to find out who are the “good guys” and are quick to judge accordingly. I often wonder if we avoided certain topics that might upset our school community and for that reason chose the safe options that examined other people's history in off shore settings.⁶⁴

In asking 'whose history gets told'? Stuart Foster writes:

Through much American history, the content of textbooks principally has been determined by a white male, Protestant, middle or upper class which has often sought to construct an idealized image of American values and American characters. Accordingly schoolbooks have championed the capitalist system, endorsed traditional lifestyles, urged unquestioned patriotism, and preached reverence to the “Western tradition”. Coursing through American history textbooks is the strain of unceasing progress and of manifest destiny, a respect for individual rights and recognised authority and a reflective suspicion of collectivist ideals. The function of history in American schools essentially has been to instil in the young a sense of unity and patriotism and veneration of the nation's glorious heritage⁶⁵.

In the developing nation of Israel a similar pattern can be seen. 'Despite the existence of diverse populations, there was only one curriculum that would achieve a united citizenry. The emphasis of history textbooks was on creating a national collective memory, not on developing critical thinking among students'.⁶⁶

Discussing the selection of what is taught, James Marshall wrote:

Central to a consideration of curriculum are questions about what counts as knowledge, how it is defined and controlled, and whose knowledge is selected for inclusion – who decides and on what basis? What counts as important knowledge also defines as what is seen as not worth knowing and, consequently the interests of different gender, class and ethnic groups may be may be unequally represented in what is included in the curriculum.⁶⁷

64 Martin Davison (Pakuranga College Auckland) introduction to an English study on 'Teaching emotive and controversial history' The report noted a number of constraints currently act[ing] as barriers: unlikely to succeed where little attention paid to learning objectives and ideas associated with similarity and difference; time pressures, teachers encouraged to play safe, few incentives to take risks; teachers feeling students lack maturity to grasp certain issues, avoiding causing offence; many students do not want to see the subject complicated and problematical; possible negative impact on students who may feel alienated and disconnected, tendency to introduce stories of disasters, technological and economic inferiority and brutality to motivate students that can result in people in the past being seen as inferior. 'Teaching emotive and controversial history', URL <http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/classroom/teaching-emotive-and-controversial-history>, (Ministry for Culture and History, updated 31-July-2007, 3/10/2011

65 Stuart Foster, 'Whose History?', in *What Shall We Tell the Children?*, p. 157

66 Dan Porat, 'Reconstructing the Past, Constructing the Future in Israeli Textbooks' in *What Shall We Tell the Children?* p. 201

67 James A Marshall, 'The New Vocationalism' in Olssen and Matthews, p. 304

In what way does New Zealand's tradition of pioneer settlers bringing a work ethic and English tradition of 'civilisation' which has provided the basis of 'the New Zealand way of life' relate to the above themes of idealism, patriotism, reverence to tradition, unceasing progress, manifest destiny, individual rights and recognition of authority and how was all this reflected in textbooks and the history curriculum? Again it is valid to ask about the 'creation of collective memory, not developing critical thinking', in the history classroom context of New Zealand schools.

What is said of school text books stands true for the teaching of History in general, particularly as textbooks, a standard feature of the New Zealand history class room for much of the review period, are often perceived by students to be the 'official' national view of the past. 'The view of the past as "our heritage" in schools suggests a socially acceptable "authorised" version, an assimilation of the past to a comfortable present with little room for alternative views: a negation of genuine historical education'.⁶⁸

For the centennial celebrations of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi the government produced a series of magazines surveying the 100 years of national life. In an article readily available to school children it reported:

From one of these islands the Polynesian sea rover, Kupe, set sail about 950 A.D. He discovered New Zealand and returned to his homeland, reporting that he had seen there definite signs of human habitation ... Much later, perhaps about 1150 AD. a chief named Toi set out from Tahiti to search for his grandson who had been blown out to sea. He sailed to Rarotonga. From there he followed Kupe's instructions to keep a little to the right of the setting sun by day and to steer by Venus at night. Toi finally landed at Whakatane. He was joined by his grandson who in turn had set out to search for the searchers. Toi and his people intermarried with the native people already in New Zealand. They lived on forest products and fern roots. They evidently kept in close touch with their kin in Tahiti from whence the great fleet of Polynesian canoes set out for New Zealand about 1350 AD., the people on board knew exactly where their destination was.⁶⁹

Authors of a book available to later students of history at Avondale College provided a different account of the arrival of Maori. Under the heading 'The Great New Zealand Myth' they wrote:

68 Low-Beer p. 119

69 'The Maori', *Making New Zealand: Pictorial Surveys of a Century*, Wellington, New Zealand Department of Internal Affairs, 1940, vol. 1, pt. 2 p. 3

For generations New Zealand school children were taught [the above] version of Maori discovery and settlement, . . . [and, after outlining the version] The 'fleet' Maori in turn conquered the Moriori and Toi's descendants and established a vigorous martial culture. The vessels had an English parallel; the Maori have their own Norman conquest with 1350 the equivalent of 1066. It is however myth, not history. {going on to give reasons for that statement}⁷⁰.

Also for the centennial celebrations, the National Film Unit produced a dramatised review, particularly for use in schools. It presented the signing of the Treaty as a reasonably harmonised occasion, going on to portray English pioneer families 'with axe and saw out of the virgin forest they fashioned their first homes in the new world' later continuing to describe how 'the virgin land became cultivated'. But, in this seemingly progressive setting there came 'the icy coldness of the wind that gathered the clouds of war heard in the land'. Without any reason being given in the film, rebellious Maori warriors are shown making murderous raids upon pioneer farms. A white missionary is shown telling Maori, 'Before the white man came there were killings [but] no good came of it'. Rural families are warned, 'The Maori are coming – get into town' and the commentary continues, 'War drums sounded from the land in the North'.⁷¹ Images presented by these official productions became the basis of history for generations of school children.

In race relations the concept of 'integration' or 'amalgamation' which had been the policy of succeeding governments in New Zealand in the 19th and the first half of the 20th century, remained a popular view for many of the population. William Buller's stated that:

[R]ace relations in New Zealand . . . were an example to the whole world. . . . Maori had accepted their defeat in war without bitterness, . . . they had full civil rights and, far from being stripped of their land, they retained "5,000,000 acres of the cream of it."⁷²

Despite the rise of Maori activism, this understanding of race-relations remained for many. They had heard the concept repeated in the 1940 film in a statement by a

70 Tom Brooking and Paul Enright, *Milestones: Turning Points in New Zealand History*, Lower Hutt, Mills Publications, 1988, p. 20

71 *One Hundred Crowded Years 1941* Produced by New Zealand National Film Unit

72 W.L. Buller, 'The development of the South Pacific', reprinted from *The British Empire Review*, January, 1901, p. 9-12, quoted in Alan Ward, *A Show of Justice: racial 'amalgamation' in nineteenth century New Zealand*, Australian National University Press, 1978, p. 308

Maori leader (unnamed and undated, probably mid-1930s) declaring:

Another of New Zealand's problems relates to our forebears. How best they can adapt to the way of life brought by the Europeans – a problem which both our races are united to solve by good will, by mutual effort and by co-operation. The impact of Western culture a hundred years ago called for drastic and intelligent adjustment in the life of our Maori people. [After a period of misunderstanding] happily these debates are now past and our two races live side-by-side together. However, in some matters we must retain our individuality – our carving and weaving, our music and dancing. These are an expression of something we can never give away.⁷³

That this attitude of integration remained is seen in excerpts from a speech delivered by a political leader in 2004.

[The] dangerous drift towards racial separatism in New Zealand, as the development of a new entrenched Treaty grievance industry. We are one country within New Zealand, not simply a society of Pakeha and Maori where the minority has a birthright to uphold. [The speaker then quoted Lt.-Gov. Hobson at the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi] He iwi tahi tatou – We are one people. . . . Those who said a hundred years ago that New Zealand possessed good race relations by world standards were not wrong. . . . None of us were around at the time of the New Zealand Wars. None of us had anything to do with the confiscations. There is a limit to how much any generation can apologise for the sins of its great-grandparents.⁷⁴

Reasons for teaching History to young people have been variously expressed. However a repetitive purpose was the desire to provide a future population which would be patriotic and fervent in the maintenance and defence of 'the New Zealand way of life'. This 'way' was reflected in its form of democracy, its loyalty to an affirmed inheritance of civilisation handed down over centuries from ancient Greece and Rome, through Europe's experiments and Britain's experience. All of this was seen as brought to New Zealand by the nation's pioneers in the nineteenth century, and which was perceived to be the basis for political and social developments. There was an awareness, particularly by history teachers, that this purpose carried the danger of indoctrination. However, despite the classroom being a place of 'official teachers, official textbooks and official teaching', there appear to be only a few accusations of extremism. The teaching profession has also been prepared to question its own

⁷³ *One Hundred Crowded Years*

⁷⁴ Don Brash, Leader of the National Party in a speech to Orewa Rotary Club, 27 January, 2004, www.scoop.co.nz. 15 April, 2011

motives by asking whether history is being taught for the benefit of other than students. Overseas example of the teaching of history directing attention to what of New Zealand's past is taught, what is omitted, and how history is offered to assist the young to cope with events in the past about which the present makes new assessments. Sources outside the classroom provide impressions of the past for young people, and meld with, or challenge that which formal teaching provides. .

CHAPTER TWO: SOCIAL STUDIES AND HISTORY: BALANCING ACT, COMPETITION, OR IRRELEVANT – OPENING OR CLOSING DOORS?

Social Studies, added to the core curriculum as a new subject in 1945, was not universally accepted by schools, Geography and History teachers, or by parents and community leaders. The subject was intended to provide a new direction for the teaching of topics included within its bounds. Some schools presented the subject, developing their own syllabus, while others did not include it at all in their timetable. Its perceived threat to the teaching of history in schools will be analysed and possible reasons for its failure to be universally accepted will be considered.

A visiting English researcher reported encountering the following view, 'In New Zealand we don't have history, we have Social Studies instead'. She noted people assumed when she asked about History in schools they thought she was interested in the Fifth to Seventh Forms and not in the basic general education.⁷⁵

In recommending Social Studies be part of the core curriculum in Forms 3 and 4, the Thomas Committee noted 'Social Studies do not yet occupy the place in the curriculum to which we think they are entitled'.⁷⁶ To establish the subject the committee recommended 'that History, Geography, and Civics . . . as well as certain new material derived from first-hand study of community life . . . be regarded as one subject and learned as such'.⁷⁷ The Committee's preference was for Social Studies to be part of the curriculum for Forms 3 – 6. However, because it would be difficult, if not impossible, to examine the subject as the Committee proposed that it be studied, and because making it an examination subject would 'not on the whole encourage either the general attitude and methods we think desirable or the experimentation that is so necessary' the Committee made an alternative recommendation. Stating that it would be 'unfair to many pupils if Social Studies were excluded altogether from the list of options [for School Certificate examination]' the Committee compromised by recommending that Geography and History be retained as a separate option'.⁷⁸ The

⁷⁵ 'When I asked senior officials in the Department of Education whether Social Studies included some history, the answers were ambiguous; "not really", or "You are raising an interesting question". No one affirmed that history is taught, nor could I acquire precise information what topics are commonly covered, at what age and stage and what resources are used' Low-Beer, p. 113

⁷⁶ Thomas Report p. 27

⁷⁷ Ibid p. 29

⁷⁸ Ibid p. 55

prescription for History should be limited to 'British history from the Middle Ages to the present day . . . to be seen as a phase in the development of Western civilisation'. . . In the syllabus for Social Studies the Committee had suggested a 'survey of the history and culture of the Maori people and their relationship with the Europeans. Such a survey should take account of both pakeha and Maori viewpoints where they are apt to differ'.⁷⁹ A study of School Certificate and University Entrance examinations set out later in this thesis will show if this suggestion was followed, particularly as to how well viewpoints of both Maori and Pakeha were presented and in what way they became 'history not to be taught'.

The direction proposed by the Thomas Committee was to turn Social Studies from a teacher or 'subject' centred course to 'pupil' centred. '[T]he Social Studies course [should] take as its starting point the interest and problems of the pupils themselves'. That the Committee was earnest in its proposals is clear. 'Too often in teaching, say, a [geographic] region . . . the teacher plods through a logical series of cause and effect . . . and only arrive at the end if at all at what should be the starting off point i.e. how man lives and works'. A plea was made for the use of 'real books', written by people with conviction 'in contrast to the poorer sort of textbook with its colourless recital of prodigious information'. What is also clear is that the Committee did not expect its recommendations to meet with universal acceptance. 'We realise that the proposals . . . while not novel in theory or unknown in [practice], would if carried into effect sometimes involve drastic departures from current procedures, and though we are strongly in favour of it we have no wish to force it on any school that is not convinced of its merits, or at least sufficiently attracted to it to consider it worthy of a serious trial'.⁸⁰ Study of the teaching of Social Studies in the years after the Thomas Report show the Committee's concern regarding implementation was justified.

At a 1963 Social Studies in-service course, a presenter introduced his subject by quoting the Secretary of Industries and Commerce (W.B. Sutch) in a submission to the Currie Commission, "Social Studies has failed almost completely as a post-primary subject", as evidence that 'in the view of some people, Social Studies has yet to prove itself.' The presenter then quoted the Department of Education's submission to the Commission that "It has been fairly difficult for the traditional teacher of History to

79 Ibid p. 32

80 Ibid p. 29-30

adapt himself [sic] to the concept of Social Studies; and even the modern highly-skilled Geography teacher has found the task either too complex or quite incompatible with his ideas of vigorous Geography teaching". Evison offered 'three difficulties' which he, as a History teacher, had found [in the Department's] Social Studies syllabus. The first difficult was 'integration of History and Geography . . . breaking down the subject between History and Geography had taken the idea too far'. The second difficulty – 'The Social Studies Syllabus . . .[which] I find [to be] the most formidable difficulty of all'. The third difficulty – 'The Education Department's Policy on Social Studies [which has] given insufficient guidance and assistance to those attempting to teach the Social Studies syllabus'. Evison concluded the first part of his presentation:

It seems to me that our New Zealand Social Studies starts with the false premise that history and geography can be profitably integrated and goes on to erect a fallacious and complicated syllabus without making any serious attempt to show how to make it work. To me as a history teacher, the Social Studies of the Departmental syllabus is a bizarre and cumbersome apparatus, which lacks the one merit possessed by those formerly devised by Heath Robinson: it doesn't work'.⁸¹

A limited survey in 1947 found 'one-third of schools (surveyed) retained separate History and Geography papers in the Third Form', (the author concluding) 'the subject was vague and a difficult one in which to make conscious progress'.⁸² On the 1950s, Shuker reports Gorrie suggesting 'that within a few years many teachers amended the prescription by dividing it into more purely historical and geographical studies'.⁸³ The 1962 Commission Report noted that in Social Studies 'Experimenting has been widespread and often imaginative, but it would not yet be true to say that any generally accepted pattern of matter and method has emerged'.⁸⁴ Shuker disagreed with the Commission's conclusion and quoted a survey showing "social studies was still largely taught as history and geography" and a second showed "one-third of . . . teachers surveyed preferred to deal with history and geography as separate subjects rather than as part of social studies". Shuker offered two reasons for these results.

81 Evison, H.C. 'History or Social Studies? Difficulties of Integration' *Post-Primary Teachers' Association Journal*, vol. X, 5, June 1963, p. 23-25

82 M.A.. Campion, *The Teaching of History in New Zealand Schools*, MA Thesis, Victoria University, 1947 quoted in Roy Schuker, 'The Failure of Social Studies, 1946-66: A New Zealand Case Study in Curriculum Change', *Journal of Educational Administration and Development*, vol. XIII.2, 1981, p. 37

83 A.M. Gorrie, quoted by Shuker, p. 37

84 *Report of the Commission on Education in New Zealand*, Wellington, 1962, p. 267

'Firstly, teacher's confusion or disagreement with the Thomas Report's aims of social studies, and secondly, the restrictive influence of the School Certificate examinations'.⁸⁵

A former history teacher, writing of the 1970s notes:

Social Studies was, I think, a difficult area to define. In some schools there was an emphasis on dividing it equally between a selection of Historical and a selection of Geographical topics, perhaps half a year on each. I tried to teach it as a number of different topics – about 6 a year . . . [and] I think this did provide a reasonable balance. I did find however that with some of my staff there tended to be a big emphasis one way or other depending on their subject area.⁸⁶

Even in the 1980s at an Independent Girls college, Social Studies was divided into the separate subjects of History and Geography. 'I was able to study History in my Social Studies classes while the Geography teacher taught Geography in her Social Studies classes'.⁸⁷

Another who condemns the concept of Social Studies is Teacher L.:

Form 3 and 4 Social Studies is a waste of time. In the early 1970s, the thematic approach was introduced . . . whereby Social Studies was to be a study of sociology – back then sociology was very popular. Social control and social change were seen to be the core of historical and environmental learning in studying humanity. So any particular history was seen as just that – of no importance other than to reveal social control or change. The attempt to fit older history studies into this model has not helped students understand history'.⁸⁸

Couling offers two pragmatic reasons for any 'failure' of Social Studies. One was the 'threat that the general education [proposed by the Thomas Report] seemed to offer the general academic subjects'. The second was the collective identity and collective conservatism⁸⁹ of secondary teachers as a class, thus 'Implementation of the Thomas recontextualisation' (sic) never stood a chance'.⁹⁰ 'One of the problems about formal

85 Shaker p. 37-38

86 Teacher J. response to author's questionnaire - see Appendix I

87 Teacher M. response to author's questionnaire.

88 Teacher L. response to author's Questionnaire

89 The term 'conservatism' carries the sense 'of conservatory nature'. *Pocket Oxford Dictionary*, 1955

90 'While many teachers may never have been sympathetic to [the Thomas Report concepts], the growth of secondary schools and the teaching shortage meant that teachers faced larger classes, and a growing number of students with little interest in academic content. [Greater need] for classroom

education is its conservative nature; we nearly always educate our children for the world we know or know now'.⁹¹.

On the other hand, in a presentation to a 1959 Course, Phoebe Meikle stated:

[T]he [Thomas] Report's aims and recommendations demanded for their realisation teachers who think about their jobs; teachers who want to know where they're going, and why, and how; teachers whose answers to these questions are strongly rooted in the good soil of ideas and principles blended realism and teachers who see children as people, and not only as the recipients of information about subjects.⁹².

Later in her address, Meikle noted that under parental pressures 'and in the name of equality' Third and Fourth Form pupils are strongly 'stuffed' with facts they can regurgitate in Fifth Form School Certificate History and Geography examinations'.⁹³.

'Following the Second World War Social Studies was an attempt to counter-act the 'conservative pedagogical techniques, . . . the rigid lines between subject disciplines and . . . the cultural bias which many educational liberals believed lay at the heart of the pre-war secondary school'.⁹⁴ Advocates of the integration of Geography and History into the one subject, Social Studies, also presented this as the 'natural' way for students to learn of the connections between their physical environment and their historical and social setting. An example comes from Christchurch Boys' High School:

[The syllabus] desires to give the individual a comprehensive and realistic view of his community – his part in that society, the place of the society in the world, and an understanding of the processes through which his society had evolved and is continuing to evolve. If the pupil is to understand his society,

control and growing pressure from parents for examination success provided further justification for teachers to adopt the role of an academic expert imparting knowledge. This accorded perfectly with the image of teachers embedded in the collective identity of secondary teachers, so the implementation of the Thomas Report [concepts] were not only widely resisted; they failed.' D.F. Couling *The Secondary School Teacher in New Zealand 1945 – 2000: Teacher Identity and Education Reform*, MA Thesis, Massey University, 2005, p. 120

91 Jack Shallcrass, *Educating New Zealand: essays in education*, Wellington, A.H. & A.W. Reed, 1967, p. 11

92 P. Meikle 'What is Socials Studies? Opening address at South Island Refresher Course, August, 1959, *New Zealand Post-Primary Teachers' Association Journal*, vol. VI, 4, May 1960, p. 10

93 Meikle *New Zealand Post-Primary Teachers' Association Journal*, vol. VI, 5, June 1960, p.11

94 [Rilda] Gorrie was later to claim that the character of the subject [Social Studies] could be regarded as a reaction to the limited and excessive formal pre-war history and geography teaching'. Roger Openshaw, 'The Battle for Social Studies in the New Zealand Secondary School 1942 -1964' in Openshaw, Roger (ed.) *New Zealand Social Studies*: p. 56

he must be directed back through history to study the formation and changes in the structure of society from the time of the most ancient of civilisations up to modern times. Ultimately this will lead to a study of problems facing the individual's society to-day.

The pupil would record the result of his own private and class work. The social and political conditions of the changed and changing physical environment of the school's region together with the social, political and economic factors which brought it to the present day would be the subject of that research.⁹⁵

Gore High School had a similar syllabus for Third Form Social Studies. In the second term five forty-five minute periods per week were set aside, the work being divided into two sections, one considering geographical factors of the school's region and the other the region's history, with 'special attention . . . paid to the geographic factors influencing the course of history'. For instance one section was the study of 'the ancient Maori', their arrival and settlement in New Zealand and the other section considered the physical landscape in which Maori lived and the way it provided food, clothing and settlement conditions.⁹⁶ For both these schools, and in others who followed a similar, if not identical syllabus, the purpose of the course and the means of learning was pupil centred, with teacher support.

The integration of Geography and History in 'Social Studies' was not universally accepted, nor was it judged to be a success by all:

New Zealand social studies has never been 'value free'. Neither, save in a limited sense, has it encouraged genuine open-ended enquiry . . . Far too many people in social studies remain antihistorical in outlook. Far too often the response to any enquiry concerning the nature of social studies is the simplistic assertion that "social studies is about people", rather than about structures, pre-selection or inculcation. . . . [S]ocial studies falls short of the earlier history programmes which at least provided knowledge (although laced with patriotic rhetoric) which *could* be and sometimes *was* employed in an individual's later life.⁹⁷

Jim Lewis said some thought of Social Studies as 'airy fairy, that its content lacked any

95 Third Form Social Studies syllabus, Christchurch Boys' High School, *The New Zealand Education Gazette*, vol. XXV, 2, (Supplement), 15 February 1946, p. 41-43

96 Third Form Social Studies, Gore High School, *The New Zealand Education Gazette*, vol. XXIV, 12, 1 December, 1945, p. 335-337

97 'The widespread contemporary understanding of social studies embodies a "rise-and-triumph" scenario which has social studies "progressing" from the rote learning and overt values inculcation of an undesirable past to the "objective" pedagogy of the 1990s' Eric Archer and Roger Openshaw, 'Citizenship and Identity as 'Official' Goals in Social Studies' in *New Zealand Social Studies*: p. 29

centrality or any structure'. For himself, Lewis contended that it was not a discipline but 'a programme for learners [thus] it was itself "centrality". . . on an educational basis'.⁹⁸ Prof. R.C.J. Stone made the point that 'the idea that Social Studies was a philosophy that cancelled out any idea of the disciplines and the over-riding concerns of contributing subjects, that it was more than just concerned with people, but was concerned with the development of appropriate attitudes and desirable intellectual skills, we had not yet fully grasped. History graduates were much more likely to fall into line than the geographers".⁹⁹

In the late 1940s and early 50s some school timetables offered History as an alternative for students 'who were regarded as not up to taking mathematics [therefore] the subject had a kind of "second class citizen" status'.¹⁰⁰ Departmental figures for July 1983 for schools are as follows

	<u>Form III</u>	<u>IV</u>	<u>V year 1</u>	<u>V year 2</u>
History	20	32	146	252
Social Studies	385	384	35	16 ¹⁰¹

It is clear that while nationally Social Studies was predominate in Forms 3 and 4, by Form 5 (School Certificate year) that subject had been separated into two parts, History and Geography, suggesting that the concept of Social Studies as pupil-based did not fit schools preparing pupils for external examinations. The subject was only part of the core curriculum in Forms Three and Four , and not part of the School certificate examination. This examination was a credential which parents saw as important for their young peoples' future working life. Hence parents wanted their children to be prepared for the examination as early as possible in their school years, something which Social Studies was not seen to be doing.

A teacher commented that after the Thomas Report there were (sic) 'a lot more [Social Studies and History] programmes for pupils who were obviously not going to go on into the sixth form or the university track', but the subject figures quoted above

98 Lewis in *Schooling* p. 33

99 .Stone in *Schooling* p. 25

100 Stone p. 21

101 Figures provided by Records and Statistics Division, Department of Education, Wellington, unpublished, quoted by Low-Ber, p. 121

indicate that provision for Social Studies was relatively small after Fourth Form.

The Thomas Report also made a link between Social Studies and English, the same teacher commenting that in 1964 as Head of Department, in the teaching team, teachers of English also taught Social Studies and 'gave the social studies aspect more life than the traditionally trained historian or geographer. One of the best teachers I had . . . was a librarian who was on the staff, who knew books and was interested in people'..¹⁰²

Kings College (Auckland) and Auckland Grammar School, among others, separated History and Geography but called it collectively 'Social Studies'. In other schools there was some tension between Geography and History teachers, each feeling threatened by the other.¹⁰³ Ray Fargher suggested that in the 1950s there were three camps - "extremists" [wanting] to create a totally new discipline called "social studies", [making] a total break with the past; "conservatives" who [believed] history and geography should continue to be taught separately; [and] the indeterminate mid-range [seeing] social studies as a synthesis of some of the elements of history and geography . . . with the emphasis on people'.¹⁰⁴ As a former Head of Department, Teacher P, reflects 'The balance between history and geography was achieved, or not achieved, by the attitude of the individual HOD. I found that historians did not like teaching geography and geographers did not like teaching history. That generalisation is valid despite the usual inclusion of both subjects in a teacher's university degree. Were it not for the mandatory teaching of soc.stud. as an HOD I would have offered solely, geography and history at all levels of the secondary scale'.¹⁰⁵ Charles Herbert reflected that '[Y]ou have the conservative historians and . . . you have the . . . new geographers, irrespective of age, whom the historians looked upon as upstarts, because here were these geographers pushing their discipline, wanting to get recognised as an academic discipline on equal terms with history. So these two were pushing their claims and social studies got squeezed out in the middle'.¹⁰⁶

102 Lewis in *Schooling* p. 31

103 Stone p. 21-22

104 Ray Fargher in *Schooling* p. 26

105 Teacher P, response to author's Questionnaire

106 Charles Herbert in *Schooling* p. 10

Another Head of Department notes that 'Because geographical areas more easily fitted the themes and geography teachers were trained in environmental issues [which] were easier for non-specialists to teach, geographical areas tend to dominate the areas of study'.¹⁰⁷ Stone contended that the teaching of geography in schools was strong because:

[A]lmost all those teaching the subject were recent graduates. . . . They had so firm a view of the nature and purpose of [geography which was] so ingrained in their whole approach to teaching the social sciences that . . . they were often using geography in the social studies programme . . . as a preliminary to doing School Certificate geography. I felt that [social studies] was being used in a way that sometimes did violence to . . . the contributing disciplines. It was not that I was opposed to the concept of social studies, nor did I believe that in its modern form it was dull, but I felt that it could be improperly used as a tool for social engineering, even sometimes that it could teach misconceptions with fiendish effect.¹⁰⁸

Another view of Social Studies was that it was considered to be 'just an introduction to history and geography in senior school rather than a concept of a totally separate subject. I suspect that [in 1949 social studies] was pretty much just a bit of history and a bit of geography. . . . [T]hat would be understandable given the age of the people who were teaching. They found their anchor in their university subjects, whether they were history or geography'.¹⁰⁹ Fargher, affirmed that as regard to Social Studies, Dr. Beeby was correct in stating "no matter what innovation or new approach was decided on [by the Department of Education], you could be certain teachers would go on teaching the way they felt comfortable, [Teachers] never opposed the change, but merely quietly subverted it".¹¹⁰

Some saw Social Studies as not very imaginative. 'It [Social Studies] was pretty arid [although] a number of teachers enlivened that by trying to project into it the material things that related to life. . . . We tried to [give] kids living in the 1950s in . . . Wellington a feel for the world. . . . [Y]ou followed the syllabus slavishly. You were doomed to a boundless end and [sic] chalk and talk. In civic studies [within social

107 Teacher L, response to author's questionnaire

108 Stone p. 23

109 Fargher p. 26

110 '[T]eachers take a new idea then reshape it in a form with which they are familiar. . . . [In 1949], certainly among the older generation of teachers . . . it would very much be taking notes still. But . . . as a social studies teacher of the third and fourth form you had to try and get the students to see relationships to a greater extent.' Fargher p. 27

studies] there was learning about the structure of government which was a pretty hard thing to convey to a 13 and 14 year old'.¹¹¹ In an attempt to make Social Studies more pupil centred a committee was established to prepare a revised syllabus. Ian Sage's response to the question, '[Did history and geography teachers] see [the new syllabus] as excessively sociological or anthropological in orientation?' was:

I think it was more theoretical than that. . . . [I]t was seen as an attack on their traditional securities. . . . [A] fair number of people . . . saw this as an undermining of real and valued study. . . . [T]hey felt it was too liberal, too airy fairy, too non-consequential. [Their opposition came in two ways]. First they saw it as a threat, and second they never really addressed themselves at the deep level to what it was supposed to be all about. I know that in many schools . . . at the time, the issues were never really addressed. It was just opposed per se'.¹¹²

Social Studies as a separate subject came under attack from time to time. In 1984 Colin Knight defended the subject, declaring that its goals 'could not be objectively evaluated in terms of immediate outcomes [because the goals were] the development of a compassionate understanding of people, . . . [and] the ability to solve unfamiliar problems taking account of values and feelings as well as rational processes'.¹¹³ The opinions of former teachers of Social Studies varied. 'Social studies was to be a form of sociology. . . Social Control and Social Change were seen to be the core of historical and environmental learning in studying humanity. [A]ny particular history was seen . . . as of no importance other than to reveal social control or change. The attempt to fit older history studies into these models has not helped students understand history. One could choose any area as an example of these themes and ignore any sense of historical development . . . [Any HoD] may choose whatever convenient area of history or geography to fit the themes'.¹¹⁴ . In 1980 72.2% of Heads of Departments were teaching Social Studies and Geography, and 36.1% teaching History and Social Studies.¹¹⁵ Ken Prebble comments on the original intention of Social Studies to include History, Geography and Civics. '[G]eography] held more appeal for young people than history and civics. . . . [K]ids were not

111 David Francis in *Schooling* p. 36.

112 Sage, p. 42

113 'The idea that social studies can make a major contribution to understanding between countries and to the achievement of peace, has stimulated many scholars to investigate the relationship between the knowledge that people gain of other nations and other people and their attitude towards them.' Knight, p. 23

114 Teacher L, response to author's questionnaire

115 Unpublished data collected as part of the survey of Social Studies subject 1980, Education Department, quoted by Low-Beer, p. 121

interested in national or local politics so civics took a back seat. While social studies was a worthwhile experiment, I do believe it should have been abolished long ago – particularly given that resources today are so much better'.¹¹⁶ Teacher R. makes a similar point. 'Social Studies tended to be taught to the bias of the the teacher, Geographer or Historian; attempts to introduce 'Civics' and 'Economics Studies' were largely flashes in the pan, unpopular (with teachers) and unsuccessful'.¹¹⁷ Ross Sutton saw Social Studies in 1968 as geography/history mix. 'Because of its vagueness, I taught a few new ideas such as the Civil Rights Movement in the USA, and Maori pronunciation, . . . also comparative religion. By the 1980s the whole curriculum was captured by the sociologists. [The curriculum] moved towards looking at people in different cultures – e.g. Japan and Nigeria. It completely shut out NZ history topics and any teaching of our discovery, development, were dropped'.¹¹⁸ Teacher A. saw Social Studies as a course which had possibilities but they were hard to achieve:

I felt it should have been possible to devise a viable integrated course of social studies (introducing other factors such as economics, ethnic, cultural and religious considerations), but practical requirements such as rotation of class sets, ordering and use of films, etc. made this difficult except on an ad hoc basis as opportunity arose. I tried to do this by having regular current affairs sessions, which had such advantages as using situations the students could see developing; making available a wider range of resources e.g. newspapers, radio, television, surveys and interviews; allowing experience in analysing and synthesising skills, and writing practice more relevant to students' own situations; interplay of individual and group work; plenty of discussion'.¹¹⁹

The subject 'Social Studies' as proposed by the Thomas Report and introduced by the Department of Education in 1945 was intended to be pupil-active rather than teacher-taught. As students researched Civics, Geography and History related to their community, it was hoped that they would gain an appreciation of the factors which had contribute to their welfare and place in New Zealand, its society, form of governance and heritage, and still did. Some History teachers supported the concept and developed programmes which centred upon students undertaking research projects introducing the young to their geographical and historical surroundings. Schools which endorsed the subject arranged their timetables to allow the research to take

116 Teacher P. response to author's questionnaire

117 Teacher R. response to author's questionnaire

118 Teacher S response to author's Questionnaire

119 Teacher A response to author's questionnaire

place.

But not all schools or History (or Geography teachers) were enthusiastic about Social Studies. Some schools continued to timetable separate Geography and History lessons. And there was a number of History teachers who saw the new subject as a threat to the traditional way in which History had been taught. It was not only History teachers who were not in favour of Social Studies as being more than a combination of Geography and History, for there were also Geography teachers endeavouring to establish the place of their relatively new discipline in schools. Beyond the effort to protect History as a separate subject and to develop the place of Geography, there were practical difficulties. Geography was much more interesting and apparently relevant to students than 'the facts' of history. Preparation, particularly for the practical work, demanded time which, for teachers coping with increasingly large classes was not always available. Appropriate equipment was not available counted against the subject also. Because Social Studies was intended to be a subject for which schools were encouraged to develop their own syllabus, the Department of Education did not provide definitive regulations and this was seen by many as another reason why the subject was not universally accepted. But the strongest opponents of Social Studies were many parents who viewed the subject as not preparing their daughters or sons to successfully sit School Certificate History examination, and thus obtain what was, to the parents, the important qualification of School Certificate .

CHAPTER THREE: SYLLABUS AND EXAMINATION: CONTINUITY OR EVOLUTION?

There was no national syllabus for teaching Social Studies in Forms Three and Four, schools teaching the subject generally developed them for their own environment. Therefore there was no common pattern in the way the subject was taught. The subject was also not externally examined. There were four sets of external examinations available to students studying History in Forms Five to Seven. They were School Certificate, University Entrance, University Bursary and University Scholarship. These will be analysed to see how, if at all, questions changed to reflect changes in the New Zealand environment between 1945 and 1988.

In establishing the curriculum for Social Studies the Thomas Committee's intention was that there be no set syllabus, but that, as previously noted, schools should 'be free to work out courses that are in harmony with their special aims and adapted to their local circumstances'. The Department of Education therefore did not provide a formal syllabus but advised schools 'within limits to draw up their own programme'. The Department's position was explicitly stated in 1955: '[T]hese notes are for guidance only and do not imply that there is no other method of dealing with the subject'.¹²⁰ While the intention of the Department in carrying through the Thomas Committee's concept of schools undertaking Social Studies in programmes which suited the needs of their students and community, did allowed some teachers to create learning processes which they found satisfactory, other teachers felt the failure to have a 'set' New Zealand programme made the subject difficult to present. Shuker explained:

[T]he failure of Social Studies as being the result of the 'openness' of the Thomas Committee and the consequent refusal of the Department to define a common syllabus. The Report had optimistically hoped that teachers would develop courses suited to the particular needs of their situation. This proved a false hope in view of teachers' confusion about the aims of Social Studies, and their conservatism and opposition to the new subject. This situation was compounded by the pressure brought about by the expansion of school rolls in the 1950s and the consequent shortage of teachers, and the increased emphasis given to the School Certificate examination with its restrictive effect on Social Studies'.¹²¹

120 *Regulations*, p. 3

121 Roy Shuker, 'Social Studies as Curriculum History' Openshaw Roger, (ed.), *New Zealand Social Studies*: p 43.

Not all schools or teachers opposed the subject nor did they neglect the freedom provided by the Department. James Cook High School Manurewa, told of '[A] new approach to teaching and learning social studies . . . which has begun to set classes alight in terms of output of original thought'. Freyberg High School Palmerston North, provided a period each week in Liberal Studies for each Sixth Form class. Southland College timetabled a Liberal Studies programme each week for Third and Fourth Form classes. A group of senior teachers at Taupo-nui-a-tia Taupo, discussed the development of a Liberal Studies programme; Takapuna Grammar School instituted a Liberal Studies programme for Sixth and Seventh Forms involving social education and a system of elective activities; Makora College Masterton, had a 'whole of school' time for Social and Liberal Studies, and some other school with similar approaches were Hillmorton School, Avonside Girls' High School (both in Christchurch) and Cambridge High School. After listing the work in each of these schools, Shallcrass commented, 'One of the most useful attributes of the new approach[es], apart from the way that it can spark ordered thinking, discussion and debate, is the fact that it teaches writing skills which are valuable through to form VII'.¹²²

While the Department did not provide a fixed curriculum for Social Studies, and some teachers felt unclear how to proceed, there appears to have been efforts made by teaching groups to assist teachers. One of these occasions was a Social Studies refresher course held in Feilding. One of the major presenters at the course was Phoebe Meikle and the course itself appears to have provided considerable help to teachers. 'That course was a gathering of people who had worked their way through the Thomas Report, but found . . . traditional timetables . . . and subjects . . . weren't meeting the aims of the . . . Report. They started to experiment . . . and there came a lot more relevant programmes for pupils . . . not going into sixth form or university'.¹²³ '[P]articipants [at the Feilding Refresher course] were busy sharing ideas about how they taught, were often such innovative and enthusiastic teachers themselves'. From the course developed the *Handbook on the Teaching of Social Studies* (1961).¹²⁴

122 'A New Learning Approach in the Social Studies' in *Secondary Schools in Change: papers collected by Jack Shallcras*, Wellington, Price Milburn for the New Zealand Post-primary Teachers' Association, 1973, p. 58-63

123 Lewis p. 31

124 Stone p. 23 Stone was editor of the *Handbook*

The general outline of the Social Studies syllabus remained reasonably constant for most of the period from 1945 to 1988. The 1945 Department of Education general syllabus defined the purpose of Social Studies to be: '(1) to take the main educational part in training pupils to become purposeful and effective citizens of a democracy; (2) to deepen pupils' understanding of human affairs and to open up a variety of fields for active personal exploration'. To achieve these aims there should be:

(a) study of the social life of the pupil's own community and of New Zealand as a whole; (b) study of the social life and organisation of the major peoples of the contemporary world, special attention to be given to the main parts of the British Commonwealth . . . (c) a general survey of the origins and growth of western civilisation. . . emphasis [to be] placed on civilisation, material and non-material succession, of social and economic systems and changes in outlook accompanying them'.¹²⁵

These purposes and areas of study were repeated in Departmental regulations at least until 1962'.¹²⁶ The syllabus guidelines for 1977 for Forms 1-4, was more specifically 'pupil-centred' and defined the subject as being '[A]bout people: how they think, feel and act; how they interact with other, and how they meet their needs and organise their way of life'. It defined the elements of the subject as 'knowledge, abilities, values and social action'. The general objectives should 'help students to develop . . . ideas and skills that will contribute to their understanding of themselves and their society; to think clearly and critically about human behaviour and values . . .; to apply their knowledge and abilities to the welfare of mankind (sic)'. The basic theme for Form 1 was 'culture'. Among the example studies suggested were: 'To investigate. . . aspects of life . . . in (a) a town centre in nineteenth century Britain; (b) a New Zealand settlement in the nineteenth century; (c) an Asian city of traditional importance'. The basic theme for Form 2 was 'interaction' and among suggested projects was an investigation of kinds of interaction between groups and with their physical environment, studying (a) a society with different ethnic groups, e.g. Fiji; (b) a former colony; (c) changing appraisal and use of physical environment e.g. Australia. Form 3's basic theme was 'social control', considering the way people in society organise themselves. The intention was to help discover the way human behaviour is involved in organising life. Among projects suggested was the investigation of varied formal and informal controls, 'such as beliefs, laws, rules and

125 Department of Education 'The Education (Post-primary instructions) Regulations: Syllabus of instruction and prescription for the School Certificate examinations.' 1945, p. 9-10

126 Department instructions and regulations 1949., 1955, 1962

customs [operating in] a Pacific Island community, a society with different ethnic groups, a society in the past, and a large contemporary state'. Form 4 basic theme was 'Social change', an understanding of which should 'lead to a better understanding of . . . choices available[to] individuals and groups. Students should question 'how and why do individuals and groups, in New Zealand and elsewhere, initiate and react to social change?' A suggested study was (a) social and welfare activities, e.g. Corso; (b) political activities e.g. protest movements; (c) the search for security, e.g. trade unions; (d) application of science and technology e.g. environmental pollution; (e) population mobility. e.g. urbanisation.¹²⁷

The 1977 syllabus for Social Studies had emphases on cultural settings as follows:: major emphasis on the Pacific Islands, Asia and the British Isles (all Form.3); New Zealand gener and the USSR (both F.3,4); some emphasis on New Zealand Maori, Middle East, Africa, Europe, South America and Australia (all F. 3,4); and Asia, the British Isles, North America and the Pacific Islands (all F.4). All areas were optional.¹²⁸

Information provided by the Social Studies Subject Survey related to the areas of knowledge, groups and people studied and the percentage of Pacific Island and Maori topics included in class work. It noted the percentage of lesson groups where particular areas of knowledge were a significant part of one or more lesson: relating to other families, groups and communities 15%; earn a living and use of resources 31%; community organisation 41%; influence by custom and tradition 14%; coping with challenge and change 44%; interaction with environment 14%; beliefs and aspirations 12%; enjoyment and use of leisure and communication through the arts 0%. Percentage of topics relating to the study of people were: New Zealand today 70%; New Zealand past 1%; distant in place beyond New Zealand 12%; distant in time and beyond New Zealand 5%; imaginary situations 1%; current events 3%. Only 1 percent of topics related to the Pacific Island and 1 percent to Maori.¹²⁹ A Second Half Year Social Studies Examination (1969) at St. Cuthbert's College Auckland contained only one question on New Zealand, and that related to

127 'Social Studies Syllabus Guidelines: Forms 1– 4, Department of Education, 1977

128 *Report on the Social Studies Subjects Survey 1981-82* Wellington,, Department of Education, 1987 p. 17

129 All figures in this paragraph relate to Form 4, *Report on Social Studies*, p 21-25

Parliamentary Government.¹³⁰

History and Geography replaced Social Studies in Forms 5-7. The cultural setting of New Zealand was a compulsory subject in the 1977 History syllabus for Form 5, the USSR compulsory in Form 6, and the British Isles in Form 7. No other topic was compulsory. Apart from the compulsory subjects the only other area to receive a major emphasis was New Zealand Maori in Form 5. Topics which receive some emphasis were: Asia, North America (F. 5,6,7), Middle East, British Isles (F. 5,6), Europe (F. 5, 7).¹³¹

The 1936 annual examination for Public Service Entrance and Senior National Scholarship conducted by the Department of Education contained questions on people from English history, the government of Ireland, Captain James Cook, discovery of gold in New Zealand, European activity in the Pacific, activities such as the Great Trek or the United Empire Loyalists, and Section B on political and social organisation in England (4 questions) and New Zealand industrial laws (1 question).¹³²

A pass by a student in the Proficiency examination at the end of primary school provided access to post-primary education.¹³³ The 1933 Proficiency examination contained a choice of questions regarding New Zealand's discovery or colonial history, a list of dates, New Zealand governance and taxation, people such as John Bunyan, Warren Hastings, Hone Heke, groups such as the Luddites or the Uitlanders, questions on the Tudors, on New Zealand colonisation, on the Industrial Revolution and an alternative section for candidates to give an account of any historic project undertaken by the student personally or with a group.¹³⁴

In 1945 the school leaving age was raised to 15 and the new School Certificate examination proposed by the Thomas Committee and adopted by the Department became for many pupils an opportunity to gain a formal qualification. Although the Thomas Committee recommended that 'School Certificate be awarded [to candidates .

130 St. Cuthbert's College Auckland. p.1-5

131 *Social Studies Subject Survey*, pi. 17

132 New Zealand Education Department, Public Service Examination, 1930, Alexander Turnbull Library, MS – paper – 7301-03

133 The Proficiency examination was abolished in 1936, John Ewing, *Development of the New Zealand Primary School Curriculum 1877-1970*, Wellington, New Zealand Council for Educational Research, 1970, pi. 275

134 Proficiency Examination 1933, Alexander Turnbull Library, MS-papers - 7218-3

. . who have completed] a course of not fewer than three years' it added a note to the recommendation: 'We think that the School Certificate should be regarded . . . as a four year course for most pupils, though there is an able minority which might without strain complete it in three years'.¹³⁵ Sitting the examination at the end of Form 5 became the norm but students at other levels also entered the examination.¹³⁶

The new School Certificate was seen by parents as an important qualification for their daughter or son to obtain prior to leaving post-primary school, no matter what their future employment might be. Employers accepted it as a mark of educational ability and schools sought to ensure that as many of their pupils as possible qualified for the certificate, presenting pass numbers as proof of the school standard.¹³⁷ As noted earlier, this pressure from parents and school meant that preparation to ensure as many pupils as possible gained the certificate began in the Third and Fourth Forms.

Between 1945 and 1988, Maori urbanisation, increased Pacific migration and the increase in national population were demographic changes within New Zealand. Second-wave feminism, concerns about perceived deterioration in sexual standards, challenges to involvement in overseas conflicts, protests over race-based sporting tours, anxiety about nuclear proliferation, closer relations with Asia and the Pacific, and changing ties with Britain, all divided the nation. Maori-Pakeha race relations, Maori land and cultural claims, the Crown's past Treaty actions and the role of the Treaty of Waitangi in current and future legislation, were matters vigorously debated at all levels of society – a society which became seriously divided. These provide a benchmark against which the teaching of History and the examination of the subject can be assessed as to whether the teaching and the questions did, or did not, acknowledge societal concerns.¹³⁸

From 1945 to 1955 the School Certificate examination contained a compulsory short-

135 *Thomas Report*, pi. 13

136 [Http://qualification-standards/results-2/secondary-schools-qualifications](http://qualification-standards/results-2/secondary-schools-qualifications), 28 June, 2011

137 '[T]he School Certificate] pass rate had once been 22 per cent. It is now close to the New Zealand norm of 50 per cent.' TEN. Worthington, Principal, Queen Elizabeth College, Palmerston North, *Manawatu Evening Standard*, 19 July, 1974, pi. 11

138 (William) Mark Sheeshan, *Defending the High Ground: The transformation of the discipline of history into a senior secondary school subject in the late 20th century: A New Zealand curriculum debate*, Massey University, PhD.Ed. Thesis, 2008 Chapter 10 'Avoiding painful realities? The place of Maori history in the school curriculum' concerns fresh interpretations of race relations in New Zealand.

answer section. Answers required ranged from a name, a date, a title, to a short phrase giving the title of a group or organisation. The number of answers required ranged from 22 in 1946 to 102 in 1950. The short-answer section provided 15 marks in the total History examination, which meant, if candidate were to gain a satisfactory pass, they needed to have a large store in their memory of 'facts' – dates, names, titles. Topic covered each year were: World leaders, British history, New Zealand events and government.

During the period questions asked regarding Maori were: 'What was the site of main Maori population' (1946); 'Why was Waka Nene important' (1948); 'Who do you associate with the battle of Orakau' (1951); 'Who was the Maori who sponsored the Taranaki Land League' (1954); 'What is the significance of the name "Orakau"' (1955); 'Which Maori chief was known as the "King Maker"' (1955). There were also questions on current New Zealand life, such as 'name the present Prime Minister of New Zealand' (1949), 'Who is leader of the present New Zealand Opposition' (1951). In addition to the compulsory short-answer question in 1950, candidates had to chose one topic each from three other compulsory sections (1) Great Britain, (2) Great Britain, Japan or world communication, (3) 19th century New Zealand or New Zealand social welfare. Candidates must then answer one question each from ten optional topics, (1 – 6) Great Britain, (7) Hitler and Germany, (8) United States of America today, (9) Africa, (10) New Zealand in the Pacific.

From 1957 there was no compulsory question. One of the options was a short-answer section similar to previous years. The other seventeen options were offered in two parts. Part (A) had 9 topics on Great Britain or New Zealand, and (B) eight topics – Colonisation, United States of America in the world, Russia or Turkey, Fascism, the Arab League, grab for Africa, Disarmament 1919-1930, League of Nations/United Nations. Within the New Zealand topic there was an option for candidates to write an essay on the Maori King Movement – the conditions from which it arose and its history. A similar format was followed in later years.

The 1958 Department of Education syllabus for the School Certificate examination stated, 'Part A: A general knowledge of the economic, political, and social history of Great Britain and New Zealand from 1837 to 1939 and Part B: A general knowledge of important events and movements in world history from 1870 to the present day,

including movements towards international co-operation and goodwill'.¹³⁹

In 1963 one of the School Certificate short-answer questions was 'How were the "hostile" Maori tribes punished after the Maori Wars?' Among other topics offered that year were white-Australia policy or apartheid in South Africa, international world organisations, the Cold War, and the rise of nationalism in Africa, Asia, India and Egypt. 1964 saw the Communist succession in China introduced as a topic, and within the New Zealand section candidates were asked to comment on one of the following: the effect of the Maori Wars (sic) on the Maori people in the twentieth century; the Young Maori Movement; reforms introduced to help Maori up to 1939; and the difficulties for Maori people still unsolved by 1939. There were questions in 1965 on the provisions of the Treaty of Waitangi, the condition of the Maori people from 1870-1939 after the Maori Wars, reasons for the Maori Wars, and a survey of the interests and policies of either New Zealand or Australia in the Pacific and South East Asia.

In 1966 the number of questions required to be answered was reduced to five with no short-answer option. Candidates were instructed that 'Answers must not be mere listings of facts but must be presented in essay form'. Among the options were seven questions each on New Zealand and Great Britain, and among options in the New Zealand section was a question on major attempts made to help Maori since 1900 on land ownership, education, the adjustment to city life, and a question on the term 'Welfare state'. In the world section, there was a question on Ghana and Indonesia.

There were twenty-two topics offered in 1967 and in the New Zealand section candidates were asked to name Maori movements, or obstacles to preserving Maori culture and customs. Candidates were instructed in 1968 not to waste time reading through any questions which were about topics they had not studied. There was an optional section on "objective answers" with only one correct answer to each question. Within this section was a question on "assimilation, integration, segregation". In the New Zealand section there was a question on New Zealand in the world since 1945, and one in which candidates were to discuss the statement that 'by the middle of the twentieth century Maori were in a more favourable position than ever before'.

¹³⁹ "The Education (Post-primary instructions) Regulations "syllabus of instructions and prescription for the School Certificate Examination", Department of Education, 1958, p. 24

The 1969 examination paper was 42 pages long. An index of topics was provided which candidates were instructed to use for finding topics they had studied. Instructions on the form of answers became more specific. 'Write essays in sentence and paragraph form. Do not make lists or tabulate'. Each question within each section had two parts – an essay and a multi-choice question, each part being required to be answered. A question within the New Zealand section was: 'The proportion of Maori passing School Certificate or University Entrance is much lower than that of Europeans. Which of the following is the best explanation: (a) Maori children are less intelligent than European children, (b) Maori parents often lack resources and facilities to encourage their children, (c) Maori children do not have the same opportunities in secondary schools as European children'? There was also a question requiring candidates to argue for or against special Maori seats in Parliament.

'Do you agree with the view that the preservation of Maori traditions, culture and social customs is vital if New Zealand is to become a harmonious multi-racial society' was a question in the 1971 School Certificate examination. In 1972 the size of the examination paper had been reduced to 20 pages. In the 'objective' section was the question, 'Which Maori leader lashed New Zealand's racial policies at the United Nations'? The essay section had the question, 'Discuss Government intervention re racial discrimination in national sports contacts arranged by national sporting bodies'.

Candidates were required to answer only four questions in 1977. Part A had four sections and within each there were contrasts provided between New Zealand and one other country; (1) Social welfare – New Zealand/ United States of America; (2) cultural interaction – New Zealand/ South Africa, (3) economic development – New Zealand/ Japan, (4) international relations – New Zealand in world since 1945/ origins of World War 2. Part B under 'government' compared Britain and USSR; 'leadership' compared China and Indonesia; 'conflict' compared Ireland and Palestine/Israel. In the New Zealand/ South Africa section, candidates were asked to compare the two countries' attitude and action toward native races, while contrasting New Zealand and the United States of America during the 1930s' Depression was the social welfare question. For every section stimulus material - cartoons, photographs, statements – were provided, contained in a paper which had spread to 82 pages. The same contrasts were provided in the 44 page 1979 examination paper. This time the New

Zealand/Unites States welfare question was related to the provision of state/government housing..¹⁴⁰

Students could obtain their University Entrance qualification by either accreditation or sitting the examination. In 1981 51% (14,155) of the total eligible candidates for University Entrance were accredited.¹⁴¹ In 1950 students sitting the examination were given three hours to answer five questions, at least one from each of four section. Section one covered Europe from the Vienna Settlement in 1848, the Crimean War, Germany by 1900, comparing the Great Powers 1900 and 1950, and the causes of the First World War; Section two covered questions on the French Revolution, American Civil War, nineteenth century England, Japan to 1940, and Russia pre-and-post revolution; Section three contained four questions on the British Empire/Commonwealth and one on southern/eastern Asia since 1939; and Section four required candidates to discuss either Alexander I, Bismark or President Masaryk, discuss 'Jingoism' or Fascism, compare the leadership of named British or American leaders, Gandhi, and 'Write an appreciation of any important book written since 1815 which was either itself a history or of historical importance'.¹⁴²

Various publications were produced to assist teachers and students prepare for the University Entrance examination. The books summarised questions over the previous years, contained information on notes on note-taking and essay writing, and a reading list of textbooks, biographies, articles and historical fiction. Among the historical fiction listed for the United States of America were Crane's *The Red Badge of Courage* and Mitchell's *Gone With The Wind*. No textbooks, biographies or historical fiction were listed for New Zealand. From 1951 to 1962, questions on Europe 1815 to the present day ranged from the term 'Nationalism', peasants in Western Europe in the nineteenth century, imperial expansion of the European powers, various events such as the Carlsbad Declaration, Treaty of San Stefano, Kellogg-Briand Pact, the nature of the Holy Alliance, European dictators 1918-1939, the League of Nations and the Concert of Europe, European powers in Africa, reasons for the First World War and its aftermath, causes of the Second World War. Questions on France from 1800 to 1900, its internal divisions, leaders, stability and/or instability.

140 School Certificate examination papers 1945 -1979

141 University Entrance Board *Newsletter to Schools*, 30 November, 1981, p. 3.

142 University of New Zealand, Entrance Examination, 1950

Similar types of questions related to Germany from the beginning of the nineteenth century to Hitler, Italy, Russia and Poland, Austria-Hungary and the Eastern Question over the same period. Questions on Britain were from 1815 to the then present, including her foreign relations. The British Empire/Commonwealth was examined from 1815 to the present with questions relating to many of the major members. The United States of America and Japan from 1815 to the present were also covered. Over the period there were only nine questions on Australia or New Zealand, with, apart from 1957, only one related question per year. Only in 1961 was there a compulsory short-answer question, 33 in all, ranging from leaders and actions in Europe from 1815, the British House of Lords, Woodrow Wilson and Roosevelt (presumably Franklin D.), peace treaties at the end of the First and Second World Wars, some dates, population statistics, current world leaders (including the present Prime Minister of New Zealand) and the meaning of some sets of initials.¹⁴³

A satisfactory pass in the University Bursary examination could provide additional financial support to students at University. Students usually sat the Bursary examination at the end of their second year in a Sixth Form or the end of the Seventh Form. Before considering the examinations themselves, it should be noted that there was a practical difficulty in determining the syllabus. A former university representative, who was convener of the Syllabus Advisory Group from 1983 to c.1988, said there were two major options, Great Britain - Tudors and Stuarts, or New Zealand pre-20th century. While there were plenty of primary sources for Great Britain, the number for New Zealand was insufficient to provide satisfactory material for students to study. It was therefore necessary to recommend to the Examiner that the concentration be on Britain.¹⁴⁴ Sheehan offers a different reason for the British topic. 'The British connection was an important factor in the shaping of the history syllabus. Several of the senior historians who played a played a major role on the [syllabus] committee had research interests that were based on early modern England'.¹⁴⁵

143 R.H. McLachan, *University Entrance, History Questions: classified by topics from examination papers 1951-1962, Whitcoul's Revision Series*, Christchurch, Whitcombe and Tombs, 1963

144 Robin Gwynn, Napier, formerly Massey University, oral interview with the author, 16 August, 2011

145 [As early modern England was a compulsory topic in 1970s syllabus] 'English historians were recruited to teach these areas and many of their students were teachers or trainee teachers. All shared the view that early modern England was the key to understanding the modern world and important in a New Zealand context. . . . In essence, historians who specialised in English (and

From 1971 to 1974 students were required to answer five questions in three hours. Part A of the paper consisted of fourteen questions related to Great Britain 1603-1815, from which at least two but no more than three questions should be answered. Part B was divided into five sections, with the remaining answers to be from any of the sections. Section 1 related to the Crusades 1095-1204; Section 2 covered the History of England 1272-1603; Section 3 the reign of Elizabeth the First; Section 4 the French Revolution, and Section 5 the United States of America 1919-1941.

In 1975 the number of questions required to be answered was reduced to four, two from Part A and two from any one option in Part B, the reduction suggesting fuller answers were expected. The areas covered remained the same as the previous years.¹⁴⁶ The Chief Examiner's report on the 1974 examination noted some improvement in answers but also some continuing problems. 'The general standard of performance seems to continue to rise slightly. There were relatively fewer candidates who made a complete mockery of the examination'. Noting 'there was still a considerable tail of those who tried but were clearly inadequate to the demands of [the examination]' the Examiner recommended schools more positively restrict entry to student 'seriously intending to go on to university and needing experience of examinations as well as hoping for financial help'. This suggests that rather than maintaining a large number of candidates for the examination for 'publicity' purposes, schools could provide alternatives for 'others in the growing seventh forms studying history' without the need for them to 'do so under the spur of an examination'. Regarding answers, the Examiner reported that 'probably 70 per cent [of candidates] could write legibly (mercifully more so than most university students), coherently and with some relevance of subject matter on historical questions'. A major fault noted by all markers was 'an inability effectively to relate what [the students] know to answering and arguing the question set'. Teachers needed to give more oral and written instruction and practice in analysis. Too many candidates recited 'various

to a lesser degree European) history) trained teachers in what was perceived to be the most valued base in the school curriculum. Many teachers in turn became enthusiastic proponents of various aspects of English or European history that they had studied at university. The demands of classroom teaching made it difficult for all but the most enthusiastic and committed to become familiar with new areas of historical research. Consequently the history teaching community in the 1980s was dominated by teachers who retained an abiding interest in English and European politics. Given the pressure for their students to achieve well in public examinations, and the public accountability of the senior school, Senior teachers were reluctant to abandon this'. Sheehan, *Defending the High Ground* p. 92-93

146 University Bursary Examinations 1971-1974, University Entrance Board

schools of thought' without providing assessment of differing interpretations. Teachers should plan to cover the whole syllabus during the year with adequate repetition, rather than concentrating on some parts, a factor which showed in the concentration on only some questions. With regard to essay technique the Examiner reported most candidates had a fairly adequate grasp, but 'some need reminding of the value of a conclusion as well as an introduction'.¹⁴⁷

The 1975 report of the Chief Examiner (Bursary) began by commenting on the students' writing skills. In addressing candidates the Examiner wrote 'First, you cannot spell' and gave examples. The Report continued: 'I also note that many of you have obviously never seen some of the words you use and therefore spell them not even phonetically, but as you pronounce, or rather, mispronounce them'. Examples of failures in literacy were reported, lapses in tense, and other grammatical errors. 'I think the situation which your scripts disclose is very serious. Obviously you are not reading nearly enough and you are certainly not paying due attention to what you read. Above all you clearly do not cherish your literate heritage, your civilisation, as you should . . . Its effect on your general ability to make any sense of the past is incalculable'. Clearly the Chief Examiner required that history should not only be accurately recorded, it should also be well written. The examiner is affirming that a reason for teaching history is to provide transferable skills and to use skills transferred from other areas of learning. With regard to the questions answered the Examiner again noted that there was unequal coverage of the periods examined; there was a continuing failure to argue alternatives, and to develop essays with introduction, exposition and conclusion.¹⁴⁸

The 1976 and 1977 examinations covered the same topics as the previous year, with the Chief Examiner reporting on the 1976 answers, 'To start on an optimistic note there

147 University Bursary Examination – History, Report of Chief Examiner, 1974, p. 1

148 'I come now to a new and very common horror which suggests that English grammar in New Zealand is on the point of collapse – a not surprising outcome in view of the abolition of the subject in schools for a generation past.' 'History is not merely a literary subject; it is also a very exact subject which makes great demands on one's ability to express fine shades of meaning, to say what one means rather than what one hopes someone else may suppose one means if he takes the time to work it out.' 'In the end it comes down not merely to hard work but to simple curiosity, an interest in history which makes you want to see round the corner, to find out what happened next. All this involves reading much more widely than seems common these days. For the plain fact is that your teachers cannot hope to teach you all that you should know. A student in whatever subject needs to do a great deal of work on his own account to be literate enough or knowledgeable enough to do well at this level.' University Bursary Examination – History, Chief Examiner's Report, 1975, p.

was some evidence of an improvement in spelling and grammar [but] the general standard still remains distressingly low'. With regard to answers, 'the most common feature was the weakness in social and economic history'.¹⁴⁹

From 1978 to 1987 there were changes in topics covered in the Bursary examination. Questions on Elizabeth I were included in the general topic of Great Britain 1558-1700, and new topics, World War II, modern Japan 1867-1945, and New Zealand 1769-1914 were included in Part B. Candidates were required to answer four questions, two from Part A and two from any one option of Part B. Although questions on New Zealand were included for the first time, for a few years there was only one question out of ten directly related to Maori activity.¹⁵⁰ The Chief Examiner's report for 1978 noted that, with regard to questions about Great Britain, 'The perennial problem remains: irrelevance, the prepared answers which did not really match the question, the inability of candidates to express themselves precisely and concisely. But this time with a new twist: the candidates excelled themselves (if at all) on Elizabeth's reign and faded out in the 17th century'. With regard to answers on New Zealand, the question on the Treaty of Waitangi was 'invariably poorly done. Candidates showed no knowledge of the legal status of the Treaty . . . on the whole, and had very little idea of how the Treaty was upheld'.¹⁵¹

2,250 candidates sat the examination in 1979, the Chief Examiner noting that 'the United States 1919-41 remains the most popular option, but the French Revolution and New Zealand options are those growing most rapidly. Overall the standard was reasonable. The main criticism [is] concerned with relevance (as ever) and too specialised an approach to topics'. The Examiner noted that candidates did appear to have some grasp of the land questions in relation to the Maori Wars (sic).¹⁵² The most popular options in the 1980 paper were again United States, the French Revolution and New Zealand. In the New Zealand section a question related to Maori Health, its decline and renewal. The Chief Examiner reported there were some very good answers, candidates appearing to understand the role of Maori leaders and especially Maori religious leaders and prophets, but some candidates resorted to platitudes about

149 'Some students . . . had gone so far as to actually look through their papers and correct the mistakes they recognised.' University Bursaries Examination – History, Chief Examiner's Report, 1976, p. 1

150 University Bursaries Examination – History, University Entrance Board, 1978 - 1999

151 University Bursaries Examination – History, Chief Examiner's Report 1978, p. 1-4

152 University Bursaries Examination – History, Chief Examiner's Report 1979, p. 7

diseases and demoralisation.¹⁵³

In 1981 2,279 candidates sat Bursary History. Figures over all examinations that year indicate that History retained its share of a generally stable Seventh Form market. There was no change in the popularity of options. The Chief Examiner again made a plea for teachers to cover the whole syllabus during the year. The question on Maori related to their attempt to retain their identity and the influence of certain groups within the race. This was the third most popular question within the option, with most candidates treating it as a survey of race relations. 'Sadly, a good many candidates who showed adequate knowledge of all four Maori movements failed to relate their material to the quotation'.¹⁵⁴

The Chief Examiner reported that in 1982 there was 'a noticeable improvement in the general standard of performance and the general level of attainment. The best were very good . . . [and] the middle ranks contained many well-prepared candidates who could produce competent straight-forward answers'. There was still a tendency to produce responses based on 'model answers'. 'Students need . . . to be trained to select from their stock of knowledge what is relevant to the actual question asked'. With regard to the New Zealand option, the Examiner reported that 'As in previous years, the majority of candidates are clearly preparing themselves on the period up to 1870 with comparatively few answers on the later period'. Question 1 in the section related to the influence of Christianity upon Maori in the 1830s. This was the most popular question in the section, with 'too many candidates unable to develop links between the sub-sections of the basic question. Many of the better candidates were able to refer to the viewpoints of leading historians on their topic'. This year there were two questions relating to Maori, the second regarding the main causes of the wars of the 1860s. This was another popular question with some candidates again showing historiographical awareness. Although the question was generally well answered, 'too many candidates were tempted into a narrative of what happened during the wars, rather than concentrating upon the causes'.¹⁵⁵

The 1983 examination contained four questions relating to Maori, 40% of the option.

153 University Bursaries Examination – History, Chief Examiner's Report, 1980, p. 7

154 University Bursaries Examination – History, Chief Examiner's Report, 1981, p. 1 and 10

155 University Bursaries Examination – History, Chief Examiner's Report, 1982, p. 1 and 7

The Chief Examiner noted ' Use of the *Oxford History* was evident, [and] teachers should read this scholarly work. . . . A thorough knowledge of Sinclair's *History of New Zealand* is no longer adequate for work on New Zealand history at this level'. The first question related to Maori quest for literacy in the 1830s and was not well done, with candidates confusing literacy (the ability to read and write) with fluency in speaking English. Question 2 related to the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, with many students hazy on the period between February and May. 'There was surprisingly little attempt to enter into controversy over the current (1983) meaning of the Treaty'. The third question related directly to race relations and purchase of Maori land in different periods. Although this was one of the best answered questions there was the failure to write about the increasing settler influence. Question 4 was to discuss the late nineteenth century European view that Maori were a dying race. 'There were some good answers, but also some bad ones; it was ill-advisedly attempted by some candidates who simply recounted the sorry tales of infectious diseases, blankets, and muskets from the 1820s and assumed that all this applied to the late nineteenth century'. Regarding the overall performance, the Chief Examiner reported 2,272 candidates sat the examination. 'The examiners were impressed by the very high standard of teaching, preparation and ability demonstrated by the more able candidates. A very disturbing feature of the results was the existence of a significant, though not substantial, number of students who do extremely well in one section of the paper and lamentably on the other'.¹⁵⁶

More questions relating to matters of debate in New Zealand in the 1980s appeared in the 1984 Bursary examination. There was a question relating to the role of women in New Zealand colonial society, and four relating to Maori: (1) European influence demoralising Maori, (2) New Zealand Company and race relations, (3) main causes of the wars of the 1860s, (4) loss of Maori land in the late 1800s. The Chief Examiner reported that New Zealand was becoming a major option for students, with generally good answers [although] some very poorly expressed answers made us wonder why the candidates had bothered to sit the examination'. Most emphasis was placed on pre-1850, [and] 'we gained the impression that not a great deal of work is now being done on the 1880-1914 [period]'. With regard to 'demoralising Maori' 'if candidates

156 'If anything, to our surprise, the majority of them seem to do better on Part A than Part B. Given that ability is not the issue, this phenomenon would seem to indicate, in some cases, an imbalance in teaching time and effort.' University Bursary Examination – History, Chief Examiner's Report, 1983, p. 9

knew the meaning of the word they answered well, [but] too many simply gave an extended account of the nature of early European contact'. For the New Zealand Company and race relations too many students 'started with lengthy accounts of how the Wakefield scheme operated' and failed to comment on relations between Maori and the Company. Regarding causes of the wars, most candidates failed to identify more than one, and 'most did not understand the point about sovereignty'. The question regarding loss of Maori land was 'Sadly . . . often not well answered. There were some superb answers, but several candidates made angry generalised statements with little or no evidence to support them.' Only 29 candidates discussed the role of women. Answers were of a good standard and some quite outstanding'.¹⁵⁷

There were no questions on the role of women in New Zealand in the 1985 Bursary examination. One question was on industrial unrest 1912-13, and three relating to Maori. The Chief Examiner considered the overall standard of answers in the New Zealand section 'did not appear to be as high as in previous years. . . . Too many candidates – obviously with prepared answers in their heads – wrote down all they knew about the general topic'. In terms of the particular questions, one on the impact of missionaries on race relations was very popular. 'There was too much of a tendency to treat missionaries as representative of all Europeans and to blame for all the problems that European contact brought'. Candidate general handled well the question on the divergent view held by Maori and European of land ownership. 'Some answers in a question regarding the influence of Maori prophets were thoughtful and perceptive, but some candidates had problems with the definition of 'prophet'. The question on industrial unrest attracted only 26 answers and candidates generally failed to note the development of social distress'.¹⁵⁸

There was a distinct change in questions in the New Zealand option in 1986. The number of questions expanded to 13; one question relating to the introduction of plants and animals and the influence of them upon Maori life; one on the emancipation of women, and one asked the candidate to devise a study of a family or local or regional history. One question was on the basic violence and instability of pre-Christian

157 'One of the most pleasing features of [the whole examination] was an awareness of historiographical debate and in most cases an ability to relate it to the question under discussion. However, students should be warned against bandying historians' names about merely in the hope of gaining additional marks.' University Bursary Examination – History, Chief Examiner's Report, 1984, p. 8-9

158 University Bursary Examination – History, Chief Examiner's Report., 1985, p. 7-8

Maori society. In the Chief Examiner's report of the overall examination it was noted that 'if the number of candidates in 1986 is anything to go by, there has been some slight increase of interest in History in New Zealand schools in the last year or two – (1985, 2,285 candidates, 1986, 2,385) [But] this is still a pretty small fraction – about a third – of the total numb of Bursary candidates.' Again the Examiner regretted that 'a large number of candidates seem barely literate. Many otherwise quite able candidates could not spell or, which is more likely, had never actually seen the word in print.' Relating to the New Zealand questions the Examiner began by commenting, 'It was . . . evident from the tone of many of the answers that their authors did not really like their country and indeed felt aliens in it'. Answers to the question about introduced species implied that 'Maori were happy as they were, that they had no need to totally change their lifestyle, and the pakeha (a rather odd, faceless figure with no culture of his own) soon destroyed the delicate balance of Maori culture'. Asked to tell what major lessons Maori learned from their contact with various Europeans, the response generally was 'Maori learnt adultery, whoredom, drunkenness and the art of killing'. Any skills they picked up were generally unnecessary. Regarding the influence of Christianity upon Maori, answers suggested that in general there was little, until the Maori had a "mania to read". In answers to questions relating to Maori land and the rise of Maori movements, the candidates usually blamed the Government, it leaders and Pakeha settlers in general. (Note, this is 1986 an there had been an increasing number of articles and books reviewing the 'land question' with much public and political debate.) With regard to female emancipation, 'the few who attempted it had 'no idea how it was achieved, except that the Temperance Movement had something to do with it.'¹⁵⁹

The 1987 questions on New Zealand had a change of emphasis with the question on wars in New Zealand now referring to the 'civil war of the sixties'. Of the other eleven questions, one related to the role of women in New Zealand life and politics before 1914 and one asked candidates to describe 'How far have you gone about your own local or regional study'? The Chief Examiner reported that there was an increase

¹⁵⁹ The Examiner noted some 'howlers' by candidates – 'Elizabeth did not want the Puritans to be educated and become clever.' 'Elizabeth wanted a church with pomp and scenery (sic) attached to it.' 'Henry VIII had many wives because he like to chop and change.' '[F]ar too many candidates were clearly not up to the standard which one might reasonably expect at this level. One hopeful came with a "crook biro" and could manage only a few despairing lines with a heavy marker pen. Far too many scripts were virtually illegible from the minuteness of the handwriting or the use of faded blue ink which could scarcely be read even in daylight.' University Bursary Examination – History, Chief Examiner's Report, 1986, p. 1 - 11

of over 1,000 candidates for the History examination over the previous year. The Examiner noted that 'while the increase is good for History, it has led to an increase in the size of the tail'. Too many candidates simply wrote all they knew without reference to the question. With regard to literacy, 'We were left with the impression that the top continue to write better each year while the middle and bottom group slide dangerously close to functional illiteracy'. Refereeing to the New Zealand option, the Examiner noted that this is now the most popular section among candidates, rising from 735 in 1986 to 1,232 in 1987. Candidates tended to see the Bay of Islands as the whole of New Zealand for the answer to the modification of Maori culture and economy. Only a handful of candidates answered a question relating to Maori military campaigns and most 'simply did not know enough'. Answers to a question on the Treaty of Waitangi were generally unsatisfactory and those on the 'civil war' were only partly full enough. As for the role of women, 'The panel was very disappointed to see how few attempted this fascinating subject'. The final comment from the Examiner was, 'Overall more attention needs to be paid to the growing literature on race relations and social history which is questioning much received wisdom and comfortable myths concerning our surprisingly complex and exciting past'.¹⁶⁰

From 1988 in the Bursary examination, the option of modern Japan no longer appeared and was not replaced by any other option. '[S]ixteen candidates from the same school had studied the defunct Japan option and were disconcerted to find that the exam paper had no Part B question for them. While we leave their teacher to struggle with his/her conscience, let this be a stern warning to all teachers (and their principals) to read every *Gazette* and all letters from the Universities Entrance Board'. 4,084 scripts were presented, 20 percent more than the previous year, 'reflecting the increased retention in Form 7 of students who might otherwise have left school to seek employment.' The two most popular options were New Zealand (37%) and USA (33%) with a 'sharp increase in World War II candidates'. Disappointment was again expressed at the standard of spelling, grammar, essay writing, basic historical understanding, and an obvious failure to read available literature. In the New Zealand option the questions were much more specific regarding pre-European Maori

160 Howlers recorded by the Examiner: 'Dudley wanted to marry Elizabeth so they could beget an Eire.' 'Jim Knox was a leading Elizabethan puritan.' 'By her settlement Elizabeth got exactly what she wanted; the Catholic Church band.' 'Once again Elizabeth would not be persuaded; she stood firmly on her indecisiveness and remained unmoved.' University Bursary Examination – History, Chief Examiner's Report, 1987, P. 9 - 10

life, the Treaty of Waitangi, wars in New Zealand and Maori religious movements.

'Overall, . . . the examiners took heart from the fact that . . . some very good answers and evidence of some exceptionally good teaching [showed] the marked improvement . . . in the level of knowledge of Maori society'. There was disappointment that few candidates attempted a question on women's suffrage.¹⁶¹

Students usually sat the University Scholarship examination at the end of their Seventh Form year and a satisfactory mark was important for entrance to some university courses and for increased financial support. Over the period 1967 to 1988 the pattern of questions remained the same as that for the University Bursary examinations, New Zealand, modern Japan and the United States being introduced as options in 1978, and modern Japan being removed in 1988, as in the Bursary papers. The 1974 Chief Examiner's Report expressed regret at the 'disturbingly high proportion of scripts (over 30%) well below acceptable pass standard'. '[T]eaching at this level needs to go further if the quality of answers is to be improved. Candidates appear to require more practice than they are being given in analysing issues, seeing the point of questions, marshalling information to maintain an argument, selecting the telling example to give substance to a statement, making soundly based generalisations and usefulness of factual material'.¹⁶²

The report on the 1976 examination noted the failure of teachers and students to place any emphasis on social and economic issues, having 'no notion of the mechanics of population growth', with answers being 'at first amusing, then embarrassing and finally alarming'.¹⁶³ A New Zealand option was introduced in 1978 with the Examiner reporting too many candidates provided 'prepared answers' which did not fit the questions, and candidates 'displayed no historiographical awareness' with an inability to cite authors in date order, to contrast ideas, with 'a general tendency to express

161 'The Chief Examiner [is dismayed] at the generally poor level of knowledge and understanding displayed, and alarmed at the sharp decline in standards of literacy and written expression [over the last eight years]. . . . We are witnessing the maturation of a disadvantaged generation who seem on the whole unable to think logically or express themselves coherently, let alone spell correctly. The rot has spread even to the best candidates.' University Bursary Examination – History, Chief Examiner's Report, 1988 P. 1-12

162 '[The ability to analyse, marshal arguments and find significant examples] are . . . the measure of true intelligence; . . . A few will develop them whether taught to do so or not, but their growth in many others can be encouraged by careful training. Teaching for Scholarships candidates could profitably be concentrated on developing these skills rather than on acquiring more information or covering ground at greater factual depth.' Entrance Scholarships – History, Chief Examiner's Report, 1974, P. 1

163 Entrance Scholarships – History, Chief Examiner's Report, 1976, P. 1

opinions without foundation'.¹⁶⁴ In contrast in connection with New Zealand, next year's Report noted 'pleasant surprise at the general standard of the scripts [which would be] slightly above Stage I. [S]tudents [were] for the most part well-informed, able to write cogent, relevant and literate essays [and] were familiar with the main texts [with] the best of them showing a nicely developed sense of historiography'.¹⁶⁵

The 1980 Scholarship Report expressed, among others, regret at the number of 'dull' students who attempted the examination, and that answers displayed 'too much emphasis on description and narrative rather than analysis and interpretation.' Pleasure was expressed that in the New Zealand option some candidates were 'familiar with some of the important monographs . . . or periodic articles'.¹⁶⁶ '[T]he best work [in 1983] conveyed wit, pleasure and a delight in skills effectively deployed [and] there is clearly some superb teaching at this level; a high level of dedication, resourcefulness and skills [despite] the onerous pressure on teachers' time and the emergence of the mixed-ability seventh form'. In the New Zealand option there were few signs of prepared answers and the Examiner noted that the *Oxford History* was very obviously used, providing stimulation of thought rather than replace it'.¹⁶⁷

1985 the Examiner lamented a 'decline from the recent past, both in terms of candidate numbers in proportion to the Bursary numbers and of the standard of work displayed. There was a greater number of brief, uncompleted or blank scripts, greater unevenness of standard within answers, a deterioration in grammar and spelling, more factual errors'. Only 41 candidates attempted the New Zealand option compared with 69 in 1984. 'This decline in quantity was unfortunately matched by a deterioration in quality. There were very few answers of first-class standard and disappointing few which even approached it'.¹⁶⁸

Acknowledgement of the pressure under which secondary school teachers worked was recorded by the Chief Examiner in the 1986 Report. After congratulating them for a 'job well done', the Examiner continued, '[Y]our classes are too big and . . . there is too little time for reading and research. Given current difficulties it is a miracle that

164 Entrance Scholarships – History, Chief Examiner's Report, 1978, P. 4

165 Entrance Scholarships – History, Chief Examiner's Report, 1979, P. 5

166 Entrance Scholarships – History, Chief Examiner's Report, 1980, P. 1 AND 7

167 Entrance Scholarships – History, Chief Examiner's Report, 1983, P. 1 AND 6

168 Entrance Scholarships – History, Chief Examiner's Report, 1985, P. 1

pupils have been so well taught. What pleased me more was the literacy of most candidates. All but a handful wrote well'. There was regret that knowledge of social and economic history was lacking and most candidates were weak on the history of ideas, especially theology. However answers to the New Zealand option were most disappointing. The Examiner spent some time in suggesting current articles, and books which would be helpful for students to study. Twenty-eight of the 238 candidates wrote on the New Zealand option and only one student answered a question on women. Again the Examiner recommended some current literature.¹⁶⁹

Far too many 1987 Scholarship scripts were illegible, letters badly formed, microscopic hand. One script had 'letters so tightly crushed together that [it] could be read only with a hand lens.' 'At the other end of the scale, . . . much of the work was legible, well-spelt, grammatical, stylish, well-informed, a genuine pleasure to read'. The Examiner noted no candidate had answered a question on resistance displayed by Waikato tribes during the 'Anglo-Maori War', (note the changed title) going on to say this was 'in spite of the numerous generally favourable reviews of Dr. Bellich's book on the New Zealand wars which it might be thought Scholarship candidates might at the very least have dipped into'. There was also surprise that answers to a question of how early written sources throw light on Maori culture 1769-1830, showed candidates had not read the primary sources of Banks, Cook or Marsden. The Report concluded with a reflection on the need to bring the examination up-to-date. '[T]he United States option ought to be urgently reconsidered. . . . The current restriction [to 1919-41 excludes] the World War II period, the Cold War and the Korean and Vietnamese episodes [which] is well nigh indefensible'.¹⁷⁰

Acknowledging that ideas on the past change, old ones being challenged, new ones developed, often with no agreement among 'experts' the 1988 Report recognised that '[S]ome teachers may not be as aware of the trends of contemporary research as other, therefore candidates should not be penalised for this. But [T]his is not to say that any answer will do. An acceptable answer must be based on an adequate knowledge of the period or topic studied, reveal an intelligent understanding of the matter and issue

169 'Keep up the good work. History is very much alive in the schools even if not exactly well. [The Examiner concludes with a lament]:.

Shed a tear for the disappeared unloved apostrophe,
 Now lost in the heady dust of antiquity
 And not one voice has been raised to protest this
 new iniquity.' (apologies to Charles Thatcher).

Entrance Scholarships – History, Chief Examiner's Report, 1986, p. 3

170 University Entrance Scholarships – History, Chief Examiner's Report, 1987, p. 1 and 5-7

raised by the question, be properly structured and coherently argued in good clear prose, and above all, answer the question asked and not some other that the candidate had expected to be asked'. In the New Zealand section the report noted questions on the role of women in the nineteenth century and the emergence of a sense of national identity did not receive the attention they deserved.¹⁷¹ With regard to the New Zealand wars (note the use of this title) there were 'some extraordinary good answers, most [displaying] familiarity with James Bellich's [books]'. Many candidates answering a question on the Treaty of Waitangi 'gave versions of the Treaty which suggest that the current debate about the meaning of the document has quite confused them',¹⁷²

The intention of Social Studies was to provide an opportunity for pupils to undertake research of their local area and beyond, to 'learn about people, the way they acted and responded to their world, so that the pupil would in turn become a responsible citizen'. Though expressed in different ways over the period these aims remained constant. As there was no national syllabus, in order to achieve the aims, schools who adopted the subject developed their own programmes. As already noted, it was this apparent lack of direction from the Department which created confusion for some teachers trying to present the subject. Some schools did develop programmes which attempted to satisfy the aim. A subject survey in 1981-82 indicates that, in class work, topics related to earning a living, community organisation and coping with challenge and change, received the most attention. Students saw these topics as relevant to their current situation and helpful for their future as adults. In studying people the most significant area was New Zealand Today, while New Zealand's past, the Pacific, and anything connected with Maori received scant attention.

In external examinations from Forms Five to Seven, School Certificate appears to be the one where questions take the most account of world and New Zealand developments. While each of the four sets of examinations had an emphasis on British history, over the period reviewed questions in School Certificate History did

171 Questions on the role of women related to the period pre-second-wave feminism, and the abortion debate. Unionism questions centred on early 20th century industrial unrest with no mention of the 1951 waterfront strike. New Zealand's social welfare legislation post-1950 was also not addressed in examination questions.

172 'Stage I university students seem to have the same difficulty. . . . Perhaps we should start with the document and build outwards from it to the more controversial discussions of its meaning.' University Scholarships – History, Chief Examiner's Report, 1988, P. 3 - 4

reflect more quickly, for example, the changing perception of race relations in New Zealand. In the 1940s and 1950s, the few questions asked about Maori usually emphasised their 'rebel' actions in the 19th century conflicts, but by the mid-1960s there were questions about the Treaty of Waitangi, its origin, the way its terms had been met by the Crown, and the place of the Treaty in 20th century New Zealand. A question as to why so few Maori did well at school reflected current community concern.. By the late 1970s New Zealand's action on race relations was set beside South Africa, providing an opportunity for students to make judgments upon race relations in two bi-cultural communities. To successfully answer these examination questions required classroom learning.

Over the period there were in the questions, recognition of other matters of tension such as the role of women and welfare challenges. As School Certificate examination was generally sat by pupils at the end of their Fifth Form year, this meant class-room preparation for the examination was being offered to 15 and 16 year olds, some of whom would leave school at the end of that year. Whether students sat the examination or not, the examination did direct those who studied History to consider the nation's past as it was being currently re-interpreted. In contrast it was not until 1978 that questions on New Zealand were first asked in the University Bursary examination, suggesting that an examination and therefore classroom learning that was provided for what may loosely be termed elite students had little or no connection with current New Zealand debates on its own history. With a few exceptions, when examinations did include questions on New Zealand they were generally not well answered in both Bursary and Scholarship examinations, appearing to indicate that from an education point of view New Zealanders still saw the British and pioneer heritage of most importance for the country's potential future elite leaders .

Confirmation of this may be seen in the mid-to-late 1980s, the Chief Examiner expressing the need for teachers and students to be aware of, and confident with, an increasing scholarly literature on New Zealand history, and current public debate on Maori-Pakeha relations. It does appear that while the examination which catered for the most students – School Certificate – did reflect the community contexts of its candidates, the other, more elite, examinations – Bursary and Scholarship - largely continued to reflect a pattern of concentration on the British tradition, and not on New Zealand's reassessment of its past.

CHAPTER FOUR: AT THE CHALK FACE: TEACHERS, PUPILS, RESOURCES.

A selection of those who taught Social Studies and History,(and some Geographers) present a variety of memories of their time in the class-room. Their reasons for teaching history varied, but there were some common methods of teaching. They also reflect a variety of opinions on the value of Social Studies as a subject, and on the changes to History topics included in the syllabus over the period. Their views on whether their students believed History as a subject useful also vary.

Teachers found it necessary to develop their own programmes for Social Studies.

Also because of the lack of thrust from the Education Department and the secondary schools, no one seemed interested in pushing social studies. Oh, they dabbled in it . . . but when men returned from the war, they were mainly historians from the past, and therefore they continued on those lines. And we found that with history teachers in particular, the older people were conservative. They liked to cling to history as they had known it in the past. The geographers were mainly younger people, or older people who had come into geography for the first time.¹⁷³

Some History and Geography teachers complained bitterly about the 1961 syllabus for Social Studies. They thought 'that history and geography had been reduced to nothing'.¹⁷⁴ 'They saw it as an emasculated third subject that was going to displace "real" history. Of course it is not. I mean if it is taught properly [social studies] helps with historical method. And gives some material as well. You get less content, perhaps only five facts where in history you get 10. But you would have done something with those facts, used them to think with'.¹⁷⁵ Of one school a teacher comments, ' [W]e had a reasonably balanced programme that reflected both history and geography [and] it seems quite clear that social studies was seen as a feeder subject for either history or geography'.¹⁷⁶ A former Head of Department, (a Geographer), reflected that the three-pronged approach (History, Geography and Civics) failed because 'kids were not interested in national or local politics, so civics took a back seat', going on to say: 'While social studies was a worthwhile experiment,

173 Herbert, in *Schooling*, p. 10

174 Chapman-Taylor, in *Schooling*, p. 13

175 Meikle, in *Schooling*, p. 18

176 Teacher W response to author's questionnaire

I believe that it should have been abolished long since'.¹⁷⁷ Another teacher commented, 'As a history teacher I was able to teach history to the 3rd and 4th forms, beginning with the Origin of Man. Later I was able to study history in my Social Studies classes while the geography teacher taught geography in her Social Studies classes'.¹⁷⁸ Another wrote:

Social Studies was a difficult area to define. In some schools there was an emphasis on dividing it equally between a selection of History and a selection of Geography. . . . I tried to teach it as a number of different topics – about six a year [covering such things as] Disasters (what were causes, what happened, how did they recover) or daily life in a particular time and environment. I think this did provide a reasonable balance. I did find however that with some of my staff there tended to be a big emphasis one way or the other depending on their subject.¹⁷⁹

However another former teacher wrote:

When I first began in 1968, Social Studies could be defined as a geography/history mix. Because of its vagueness, I taught a few new ideas, such as the Civil Rights Movement in the USA, and Maori pronunciation. In the early 70s I remember teaching about comparative religion. By the 1980s the whole curriculum was captured by sociologists and the curriculum moved towards looking at people in different cultures – discovery, development were dropped.¹⁸⁰

Another former teacher had this view of Social Studies:

Social Studies is a waste of time altogether! In the early 1970s the thematic approach was introduced . . . whereby Social Studies was to be a study of sociology. . . . Social Controls and Social Changes were seen to be the core of historical and environmental learning in studying humanity. So, any particular history was seen as just that – of no importance other than to reveal social control or change. . . . One could choose any historical area as an example of these themes and ignore any sense of traditional historical development of ours or others' cultural history.¹⁸¹

One teacher saw little consistency in the way Social Studies was taught in different schools and there was 'little thought to the skills that needed to be taught. . . . I believe that Social Studies should have made the study of New Zealand history and geography compulsory given that many students did not study history or geography in Forms 5-

177 Teacher P response to author's questionnaire
178 Teacher M, response to author's questionnaire
179 Teacher J, response to author's questionnaire
180 Teacher S, response to author's questionnaire
181 Teacher L, response to author's questionnaire

When teachers reflect on the way history was taught during the period there are different methods presented. '[H]istory in schools was pretty formal. The text books . . . and so forth were dull, uninteresting, and formal. Very few children enjoyed history. . . .History bored them stiff. And that was because there was so much rote learning of notes, so little understanding or attempt to stimulate critical thinking'.¹⁸³

That type of comment was repeated by a group of women and men, interviewed by the author, and reflection on their student days. The immediate reaction of all in the group was 'History was boring, irrelevant, having no apparent relationship to daily life or future employment'. One lady did comment that Social Studies had introduced her to her interest in Economics.¹⁸⁴ A teacher wrote, 'As a generalisation, I believe that not a large percentage of students were interested in history further back than WW2. I often wondered whether this was a function of the stodgy way that history was presented to them through the text book. Time-lines of British royalty . . . hardly inspired even the most ardent student'.¹⁸⁵ On the other hand, 'Because History was a senior option rather than a core subject most of the students who chose it were already converted. . . . I would revel in comments like "it may not be history (it always was!) but its damned interesting". There was always the occasional "is history going to get me a job?"'.¹⁸⁶

A teacher reflected:

After teaching School Certificate history classes for some years [I] became increasingly aware that, whatever else [I] was doing, [I] was not in any real sense teaching 'history'. Certainly [I] was cramming pupils with facts which in due course they would regurgitate in imperfectly understood and with varying degrees of inaccuracy; but they were getting little opportunity to develop such necessary qualities and techniques as a well developed sense of time, a habit of thinking about motives and influences, skill in consulting textbooks and other works, and an ability to collect, collate and draft information in a sensible note

182 Teacher Y response to author's questionnaire

183 Chapman-Taylor, in *Schooling*. 13

184 Interview Napier resident, June 2011

185 'I found that the sense of wonder or surprise was more easily engendered by the geographer rather than the historian'. Teacher P, response to author's questionnaire

186 'In the days before the loathsome straight-jacket ("how many credits for this?") of NCEA there were plenty of opportunities to "side-track" to areas of special interest, background to current events etc.. Postcards still arrive from ex-students in exotic places proclaiming their appreciation of my preparing them for the wider world.' Teacher R. response to author's questionnaire

form. . . . One major justification for the teaching of what is called 'history' . . . is that it provides an opportunity for establishing in the pupil's mind a reservoir of well ascertained information from which the history student will draw when seeking understanding of the past or when considering the problems of the present.¹⁸⁷

'Duplication [of notes] was by way of the antique Gestetner . . . and the messy meths-fuelled Banda.¹⁸⁸ Talk and chalk was the main teaching instrument [prior to the electronic age]'.¹⁸⁹ 'My teaching method was largely chalk and talk, with the emphasis on talk . . . Notes were usually mine from the board (often far too full). Research was for assignments and largely print-based'.¹⁹⁰ '[T]he main teaching method was note taking with a focus toward external examinations. Historical skills such as understanding points of view, bias, cartoon and document analysis, essay writing was taught'.¹⁹¹

In the 1950s I was teaching at [a school] where a great emphasis was given to writing skills which for some students were behind the experience level. For this reason History was regarded as a subject for bright students and was not nearly as popular as Geography. [At another school in which I taught in] the 1980s we started to introduce more research assignments and insisted on bibliographies and annotation.¹⁹²

'Initially note taking and discussion was used with an occasional individual or group newspaper created emphasising a particular area of interest. Later cartoons, map making, primary sources and research skills were emphasised'.¹⁹³ 'The textbook and written notes were a substantial part of instruction but to be fair so was class

187 '[S]chool children should be making this factual information part of their ever-growing stock of knowledge. . . . What may have appeared to the school pupil as nothing but a meaningless jumble of unrelated facts, can assume an unexpected significance under the scrutiny of the more mature mind. C.J. Colbert, *School Certificate History Notes: Book 2: New Zealand, 1837-1939*, Christchurch, Whitcombe and Tombs, 1962, p. Preface

188 The process for using a Gestetner was to cut letters into a soft stencils through which the machine pressed ink onto paper. For the Banda, information was written on appropriate paper and the machine used methylated spirits to transfer the information.

189 'For classes with teachers not very proficient in blackboard techniques, learning must have been pretty boring. One teacher of history I knew used dictation almost solely. . . . This may explain why history was not a popular subject at that school.' Teacher P, response to author's questionnaire

190 'When I introduced . . . history at F7 and WWII topics at F5 interviews were encouraged as part of the research.' Teacher R, response to author's questionnaire

191 Teacher Y, response to author's questionnaire

192 '[In the period from 1973] the students usually took their own notes under headings I supplied but at times I did dictate notes. There was plenty of practice in paragraph and essay writing. We had good text books and an excellent library. [In the later period] we always issued a marking schedule in order to prevent the students spending too much effort on fancy presentation at the expense of content.' Teacher J, response to author's questionnaire

193 Teacher M, response to author's questionnaire

discussion and debate. There was certainly in Forms 6 and 7 a sense that this was an “academic” subject and as such it was pretty “wordy”. [W]ith passing exams the priority it has to be said that methodology reflected the need to “learn the facts”.¹⁹⁴

Much of the teaching of history still had relied on note-taking and student research for homework. Chalk and talk still had played a major part in the teaching of facts, linking ideas and events together, etc.. From the late 1980s history teachers were encouraged to use wider methods of teaching, group work, games, puzzles, role-playing, trial by history, etc. One of the reasons for this change was that teacher-centred learning was bad and student-centred learning was good. The authority of a teacher to deliver what a teacher thought the truth was not as important as a student discovering truth by oneself. Discovery learning was put in opposition to learning “facts”. . . . The idea that a teacher should face a class and deliver a mini-lecture and demand note-taking struck many educationalists at the time, and now, as a display of unwelcome authoritarianism.¹⁹⁵

'When I first began [1968], I would get the class to take turns reading the textbook out loud, then note taking by dictation. However, by 1973 I was introduced to more student-oriented research coupled by field trips. By the time I became HOD at Central Hawke's Bay College, [1978-1988] every class of mine did field trips to local stations, homesteads, cemeteries, etc. Sometimes I had to battle to get these'.¹⁹⁶ 'When I began teaching my priority was to master the content as quickly as possible to ensure I had control in the classroom. I had to ensure that my students were confident that I knew my stuff and that they could succeed with the assessment. To a large extent it did not matter what that “stuff” was, so long as I knew it. The longer I taught this material the more it became second nature; I knew the assessment tasks backwards and became an expert. The security and confidence that this gave me as a teacher was not to be underestimated.¹⁹⁷

Teachers commented on changes or continuity in examinations and syllabus. One former teacher wrote that over the period he noted a gradual but not complete move from an emphasis on Britain and Europe to some 20th century topics such as the rise of

194 'If notes weren't copied from the board there was reasonable use of the old Banda machine to make sure kids had the content they needed for exams.' Teacher W. response to author's questionnaire

195 Teacher L, response to author's questionnaire

196 Teacher S, response to author's questionnaire

197 Steve Watters, Introduction to 'The role of school history',
[http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/classroom/the-classroom/teachers-toolbox/the role of school . . .](http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/classroom/the-classroom/teachers-toolbox/the_role_of_school...)
20/11/2010

the Nazis, the United Nations, Indian independence and Chinese revolution.¹⁹⁸ Another recalled that from the early 1980s New Zealand Social Welfare, Maori-Pakeha relations. The American Black Civil Rights movement, Ireland, and Palestine-Israel were being taught.¹⁹⁹ 'In the 1970s there was a great deal of 19th century European history concentrating on revolution and unification. I cannot remember if there was any NZ history taught at Senior level'.²⁰⁰ However commenting on the 1980s one noted 'less world and more New Zealand, particularly in foreign policy'.²⁰¹ 'There was certainly a move away from English History towards more NZ oriented history. In the late 70s or early 80s, School Certificate history moved to a thematic approach e.g. Maori-Pakeha relations, Social Welfare, NZ in the World. [However by the 1980s NZ history had been completely shut out] and any teaching of our discovery, development were dropped'.²⁰² '[One of the greatest changes to effect the teaching of history over this period was] the decrease in compulsory areas of study and increase of options'.²⁰³ 'The reality was that what I taught closely mirrored what I had been taught myself and there is something incredibly comforting/appealing for a teacher in doing the familiar'.²⁰⁴

While there was some adaptation in methods of teaching History the years, the blackboard and duplicated notes are often referred to by teachers. As technology developed, film-strips, movie films, and video recordings were used. 'The National Film Library ran a loan system for schools and films could be ordered on a fortnightly basis. But in every school I worked in, there was only one film projector and it could not be used unless the teacher was qualified'.²⁰⁵ 'I made a collection of old video tapes for a variety of history topics'.²⁰⁶ A text book referred to by many former teachers was *Our Country's Story*.²⁰⁷ '[This book] and so forth were dull, uninteresting and formal'.²⁰⁸ '[There was a] bland historical overview from Hittites to

198 Teacher R, response to author's questionnaire

199 Teacher Y, response to author's questionnaire.

200 Teacher J, response to author's questionnaire

201 Teacher M response to author's questionnaire

202 Teacher S, response to author's questionnaire

203 Teacher L, response to author's questionnaire

204 Teacher W, response to author's questionnaire

205 Teacher P, response to author's questionnaire

206 'All these and other different types of media were most suitable for stimulating students in their studies.' Teacher L, response to author's questionnaire

207 K.C. McDonald, *Our Country's Story*, Christchurch, Whitcombe and Tombs, 1963. There were earlier books with the same title.

208 Chapman-Taylor, in *Schooling* p. 13

Hitler, [the book *March of Civilisation*]²⁰⁹ was often around in schools.²¹⁰

'As far as reading is concerned, we make a plea for the use of real books – books written by people with a story to tell or with convictions to be expressed. - in contrast to the poorer sort of textbook with its colourless recital of predigested information. There is, of course, need for coordination of material and for reasonably accurate location of events in time and space, and it is here that a textbook summary . . . has an essential place, but such knowledge is empty apart from a vivid sense of the human significance of the facts and relationships concerned.²¹¹

'Historians played a major role in the writing of school texts at all levels. The New Zealand Topic books that supported the 1966 SC syllabus were all written by university academics . . . all writing on areas of their expertise'.²¹²

From 1971-1975 there was a 7% decrease in entries for School Certificate History compared with a 14% increase in overall-all entries with a 1% fall in University Entrance History against a 12% total increase in the Entrance examination. On the other hand entries in Scholarship History doubled over previous years. Students gave the reason for the trend 'in terms of "unimportance" of the subject', especially when related to career opportunities. 'A fifth of all pupils [surveyed] state[d] that the school option structure was a major factor in preventing their taking history, [and] a third . . . imagine[d] that historical studies would be boring'. When asked to state which areas of history they would like to study, 'there appears to be a 25% to 30 % demand . . . at all levels for a study of ancient history'. 'Among both history and non-history pupils, it is the sixth and seventh formers rather than the fifth who demonstrate a predilection for recent world history'.²¹³

209 George Guest, *The March of Civilisation*, London, G. Bell and Sons, 1948

210 Sage, in *Schooling* p. 41

211 Thomas Committee, p. 30

212 Keith Sorrenson, Russell Stone, Keith Sinclair, Michael Bassett [are listed] and John H. Jensen (Professor of History at Waikato University) edited the UE textbooks. . . Michael Graves and Robin Silcock published a textbook specifically for New Zealand students. Historians also were prominent in writing and advising for public history forums such as the popular magazine *New Zealand Heritage* that was used widely in schools'. Sheehan, *Defending the high ground*. 102

213 '[Pupils surveyed] tend not to perceive the significance of the relationship between social studies and history or geography, with history faring worse than geography in that respect. In large numbers, pupils note in supplementary comments . . . that history was an "irrelevant" study, yet frequently these same pupils had asserted social studies highly for the insights it gave into the process of change; they seemed unaware that a study of change presupposes a comparison between two points in time, and thus by definition presupposes a study of history.' 'Local history could prove beneficial to as pioneer society in the process of evolving its own culture. It could provide a constructive answer to the teenager who asserts that "New Zealand has no history".' D.S. Kean, 'History in Secondary Schools 1976: a year's survey', *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 11.2,

In 1981-82 the Department of Education undertook a survey of Social Studies subjects. In the Foreword to the results of the survey, the Director-General wrote, 'Not only are [Social Studies subjects] influenced by the rapid changes occurring in the New Zealand society and the world community, but they are increasingly responsible for helping children make sense of their world and particularly effective in it'.²¹⁴ Within the survey Social Studies students were asked to rank their perception of which topics were important to study. 59,323 students from 384 schools assessed each topic's importance as follows:

1. Saving energy	74%
2. Being a person, and Government, and how rules are made	70%
3. Famous people	60%
4. Law and order in society	84%
5. Family relationships	53%
6. Nineteenth century New Zealand	46%
7. Social life in Asian countries	45%
8. Community service, e.g. old peoples' homes	36%
9. Maori marae today	34%
10. People buying and selling goods	30% ²¹⁵

The summary of student expectation noted, among other things, that students 'had a mostly positive attitude towards [Social Studies]; they had well-defined views on topics which they felt were important; [as to the best ways of learning] students favoured film strips and films, classroom discussion and the teacher explaining ideas or problems; least support was given to individual work [reading and note taking]. About a fifth of the teachers [more secondary than primary] thought their class showed some degree of ethnocentricity and prejudice'.²¹⁶

Responding to a question about student reaction to the study of History, former teachers gave a variety of answers. 'Most of my students were quite positive about [it] and often mentioned that it helped them to understand the world in which they lived. History [at one girls' college] was always the most popular subject after English,

October 1977

214 *Report of the Social Studies Subjects Survey 1981-82*, p. 10

215 *Social Studies Survey*, p. 30

216 *Ibid* p. 101

Maths and Science which were compulsory subjects at SC level.²¹⁷ 'Sometimes the reaction was great but a lot of students took it as a simpler option to get SC or UE'.²¹⁸ 'History was regarded usually harder than say Geography mainly because of the essay writing that was involved in the exams and most students were worried about remembering dates'.²¹⁹ 'Students naturally love history. They like stories and they like understanding the big events. They like seeing themselves as part of the big picture. . . . Of all the areas of history the most popular were where the narrative was clearest: good guys v. bad guys and the good guys win'.²²⁰ 'I found the sense of wonder or surprise was more easily engendered by the geographer than the historian'.²²¹ 'As an optional subject we generally got kids who were already enthusiastic/motivated about the subject. In my experience we tended to attract what might be described as the brighter students. The academic nature of the course and the way it was promoted encouraged this'.²²²

Some who taught History during the period were asked to offer reasons for presenting it. 'It was always about helping develop a sense of "social literacy" and clichés about helping students become better informed about not only the world they lived in but specifically the place they lived'.²²³ '[M]y aim . . . did not change very much over the period. It is a subject which requires examination of facts, of looking at conflicting accounts and drawing reasonable conclusions. Such training carries over into multiple disciplines'.²²⁴ 'One of my purposes . . . was based on the idea that "those who forget their history are doomed to repeat it" . . . history teaches us important lessons. Another one was that students develop some critical thinking skills as well as practical skills, such as communicating clearly, that can be applied to other

217 Teacher J, response to author's questionnaire

218 Teacher S, response to author's questionnaire

219 'However those that chose it usually enjoyed it and achieved .' Teacher M, response to author's questionnaire

220 '[Students] are far more intelligent and capable than their teachers or parents think. They like lectures . . . ; they like having the main points dictated to them. They hate making notes and they don't like writing essays. . .' Teacher L

221 Teacher P

222 'Some topics were taught or retained because it was believed that they were popular which ensured greater buy-in from our students. I recall a decade later meeting quite hostile resistance in a new school when I announced the ditching of Tudor and Stuart England.' Teacher W

223 'I was interested in the past and how it had shaped me and my world and merely wanted to continue with that theme. I found history interesting and believed I could work with kindred spirits who also saw it interesting. I think over time my purpose for why I was teaching history matured as I grew as a teacher. I became less results driven and more comfortable with the notion of teaching students some of the important life skills'. Teacher W

224 'I think the main change that occurred was the use of primary sources'. Teacher J

subjects'.²²⁵ '[T]o impart an appreciation of history, teaching numerous historical skills and research techniques'.²²⁶ 'To teach students aspects of the world before their time and to learn the information so they could pass the examinations'.²²⁷ 'The love of the subject. Belief that students needed an understanding of the world and our place in it'.²²⁸ '[T]o give the student a perspective of where he fits into the human scheme of things to date. It seems reasonable to assume that this purpose is constant'.²²⁹

Former teachers report that for most of the period reviewed, the method of teaching History was a formal one of lecture, dictation, note taking and text-book study. Some new forms of technology such as video-tapes and television were used as these became available. Teachers recalled gradual changes in topics, with a little more emphasis being given to New Zealand history but, as one teacher put it, 'I taught what I had been taught'.²³⁰ There were varying opinions as to whether students enjoyed History. Some teachers acknowledged that because History was a subject at senior level, students found it interesting, but others noted that in their school the subject was for those who were not clever enough to take English, Mathematics and Science, consequently those in the History class often found it boring and irrelevant. As noted in Chapter Two, Geography and History teachers reported the concept of Social Studies as being unworkable, and many continued to teach their subjects separately. Many students and ex-students affirm that they found History boring, irrelevant and of no particular purpose.. In Social Studies students rated topics which reflected current life as being most interesting and helpful and New Zealand's past and race relation at the lower end of the scale. Though the official curriculum changed, some who taught during the period believed their purpose of teaching history largely unchanged, being the personal love of history or helping students to understand their world.

225 'I also believed that it was very important for New Zealand students to learn what has shaped their own country so that as adults they can be more aware and discerning citizens'. Teacher Y

226 Teacher S

227 'However, I realised later that by varying activities, using primary sources, cartoons and individual or group researches it made history come more alive for the students'. Teacher M

228 '[After international travel] I increasingly saw History as a preparation for life and leisure, an understanding of the background and culture of countries my students would increasingly find themselves in contact with'. Teacher L

229 'Aims change according to the period being taught. As New Zealanders, students need to be made aware of their own heritage so it is justified that NZ history takes a prominent place. . . . When I first started teaching I doubt that the curriculum was very different from that which I had been exposed to as a school student myself". Teacher P, response to author's questionnaire

230 Teacher W, response to author's questionnaire

CHAPTER FIVE: POST-1988: TOMORROW'S SCHOOLS, NCEA.

The main substance of this review was to consider History as taught between 1945 and 1988, noting continuity and/or change. Recommendations made in the 1987 Curriculum Review suggesting changing the way schools were administered and the student process of learning, were incorporated into *Tomorrows' Schools* with the National Certificate of Educational Achievement following soon after. As was the case with all subjects, teaching Social Studies and History became more student-centred. Students received credits by research activity during the year. The Ministry of Education direction for History continued to follow trends which were evident in the few years before 1988. In order to see if these changes had any continuing effect on Social Studies and History, this chapter briefly looks at the topics of History in the first decade of the 21st century, its aims, and methods of examination.

'*Tomorrow's Schools*' was the new direction for New Zealand education from 1989 while the National Certificate of Educational Achievement was phased in from 2002 with Level 1 replacing School Certificate from that date. University Entrance was replaced by Level 3 in 2004.²³¹ History was included among Socials Sciences. By Level 8 'Students will be required to understand the causes, consequences and explanations of historical events that are significant to New Zealanders are complex and how and why they are contested, and to understand how trends over time reflect social, economic and political forces'.²³²

A survey undertaken by the New Zealand History Teachers' Association showed that at March 2005 the percentage of schools which taught the following topics:::

<u>Year 13:</u>	
Tudor- Stuart	58%
Nineteenth century New Zealand	40%
Both	2%.
<u>Year 12:</u>	
Vietnam, Russian Revolution, Origins of world War One	85%+
<u>Year 11:</u>	
Origins of World War Two, Black	

231 [Http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/qualifications](http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/qualifications), 28/06/2011

232 *The New Zealand Curriculum: for English-medium teaching and learning in years 1-13*, Wellington, Ministry of Education 2007.

The NCEA 2010 Level 3 History examination paper was in three parts, each providing five credits and each with one hour allowed for writing an essay. Each paper had two optional topics, either England 1558-1667 or New Zealand in the nineteenth century. The first paper required examination of significant historical situations in the context of change, the second required the candidates to analyse and evaluate evidence in given historical sources, and the third to examine a significant decision made by people in history. In the first paper six optional questions were provided in the New Zealand section, covering Maori/Pakeha race relations 1800-1840, waves of Pakeha immigration 1840-1900, government purchase of Maori land 1860-1900, pastoral development in the nineteenth century, the Long Depression 1880s and 1890s, and the experience of women in nineteenth century New Zealand. Questions in the New Zealand option in the third paper related to reasons for Maori signing the Treaty of Waitangi, reasons for British migration 1840 and 1850, New Zealand self-government, the 1863 military invasion of Waikato, Vogel's plans for development, and reasons for the Education Act 1877.²³⁴

Scholarship 2010 History had the same two optional topics as Level 3 History. Candidates were required to use six history skills: effectively communicate a sophisticated argument, demonstrate informed and perceptive judgment about the nature of historical evidence and/or historical research, critically evaluate historical narrative, demonstrate a thorough and perceptive understanding of historical relationship in selected contexts and setting, synthesise, with perception and insight, ideas relevant to the historical context and setting, demonstrate an understanding of the critical underpinning and scope of a historical question/context. The Assessment Report on candidates in 2010 stated that those who attained Outstanding Scholarship and Scholarship results displayed the skills very well, but 'The majority of candidates who did not attain Scholarship were unable to develop a logical argument and failed to organise their ideas into a structured narrative.'²³⁵

The 2011 syllabus for History for the Cambridge IGCSE used in some New Zealand

233 Sheehan, 'The role'

234 New Zealand Qualification Authority 2010

235 New Zealand Qualification Authority 2010

schools required students to study 'the whole of either the 19th century or 20th century Core Content, and at least one of the Depth Surveys'. The Core Contents were: Option A, The development of Modern Nation States 1848-1914; Option B, International Relations since 1919. For the Depth Study at least one of the following must be studied: Germany 1918-45, Russia 1905-41, the USA 1919-41, China 1945-c.1990, Southern Africa in the 20th century, Israel and Palestine 1945-c.1994, the Creation of Modern Industrial Society, and the Impact of Western Imperialism in the 19th century (to 1914).²³⁶

Two particular emphases can be seen in the curriculum for History from 1989. The first is presenting the past in the context of current social, racial, economic and political issues which are relevant to young people of the day. The second is to move away from learning history as a series of dates, facts and names, instead helping students to understand and use the skills of studying primary sources, questioning statements, and developing arguments. Specific New Zealand concerns are readily found for students prior to Scholarship examinations. But, at that senior level, while the skills of historiography are still central, the examination - like pre-1988 Scholarship examinations - continue concentrating on Great Britain and nineteenth century New Zealand. Meanwhile the Cambridge examinations have little or no relation to New Zealand's current concerns, maintaining the earlier classroom emphasis of 'world civilisation'. For the majority of students New Zealand current social, political and racial concerns are part of their Social Studies and History curriculum. However students staying longer at secondary school and likely to attend a tertiary institute, continue, as pre-1989, to study New Zealand history that is based upon its British and pioneer past.

236 University of Cambridge International Examinations, 2010

CONCLUSION

In the period between 1945 and 1988 New Zealand as a nation was affected by many economic, political, social, demographic and racial debates and controversies. It took some time, and not always satisfactorily, for History taught in New Zealand post-primary schools to reflect those community issues. In particular, national examinations were slow, and in some instances failed, to include such topics in their questions. Reasons for teaching History changed in wording if not in intent. The needs of students became more central in official reports but these were not necessarily demonstrated in teaching method.

The reason for teaching History in New Zealand post-primary schools can be followed through three streams, patriotism, developing a questioning mind, and in the classroom teaching. Though expressed in differing terms, the inculcation in young people of pride in, and loyalty to, New Zealand's form of democracy inherited from its English forebears, can be seen as the official purpose of teaching History. From the statement of the Chief Inspector of primary schools (1921),²³⁷ through those of Governmental Reviews, the purpose for teaching History was to develop good, patriotic citizens who would defend democracy as expressed in 'the New Zealand way of life'. By understanding the nation's past which was seen as bringing New Zealanders from different cultural and racial backgrounds into a continuing relationship with each other, a common pride in New Zealand would be developed. Bursary students were criticised because it appeared they did not value their literary heritage and their civilisation, both of which were deemed essential to making sense of the past.²³⁸ Even stating that the purpose of learning history was to help develop understanding of other people and thus assist in developing commercial opportunities for the country, involved citizenship. Over the period, as the call remained to study History in order to develop patriotic citizens, the idea of 'patriotism' changed from 'saving democracy' to 'developing the economy'.²³⁹ In particular it was suggested that the lament of some young people that Pakeha had no culture,²⁴⁰ could be corrected if they learned the history which was all around them, again linking into 'patriotism'. Examples from post- Second World War Germany, Japan, and twentieth century United States, equally

237

Openshaw, *New Zealand Social Studies*, p. 19

238 University Bursary Examination – History, Chief Examiner's Report, 1975, p 1

239 Knight 'Social Studies as Part of Today's Curriculum' p. 20

240 Wells, p. 10

expressed History teaching in patriotic terms, to overcome the guilt or horror young people might feel at their nations' past, or to re-enforce national unity.²⁴¹ Not all agreed with the purpose of History teaching being 'patriotism', warning that, because moral training and social values are themselves contentious, instilling them in the young by classroom History is ineffective and can be indoctrination.²⁴² Teachers particularly were aware of the danger of appearing to be guilty of indoctrinating their students politically and were therefore careful in presenting contentious issues.

The second stream of purpose for teaching History was to help young people assess, analyse, question and present ideas coherently. The interest of pupils began to become more central in educational policy as they were to learn how people act and organise socially, and thus the students themselves were prepared for their part in society. By the mid-1970s, rather than repeating 'facts' in examinations – dates, names, places – students were required to consider primary sources, who wrote them, why they were written and how they had been used in 'writing history'. Students should understand causes, consequences and explanations of historical events, their complexity and differing opinions on them and be able to make a judgment on all those matters. Examiners emphasised that it was no longer sufficient to repeat the views of others, students must now assess them and argue alternatives. While these were the aims, it is evident many students were not able to meet them.

The third stream is the classroom itself to which teachers brought their own purpose. For some it was love of History which they wished their students to capture. Others wanted to help student understand their world and play an active part in it. Some wanted students to develop critical thinking faculties which they could later use to assess future alternative propositions. One purpose was very direct – to help students pass examinations!

For whatever purpose History was taught, that which was taught was always subject to criticism and/or challenge from parents, society and politicians, as they judged how information young people receive complied with what the critics believe to be 'the facts of history' – those which the young need to learn. Consequently, if what was taught did not equate reasonably closely to that which was assumed to be the version

241 Foster/Crawford *What Shall We Teach the Children?*

242 Diorio, p. 98

of history which contained the myths, legends, 'facts' and collective memory – the 'authorised version' - of the nation's heritage, teachers might be accused of failing to provide young people with the education necessary to become productive citizens. Every country, whether it be post-Second World War Germany, Israel/Palestine, or New Zealand, has parts of its past they'd prefer to remain in the past and which they prefer their young not to be involved with. Classroom History must therefore satisfy three criteria – what a community believes is important historically for the young to know; what a community believes is not valid from its past and therefore does not need to be taught in schools; and the presentation of the past which the community wants remembered. Teachers were expected to satisfy each part of the criteria in an ethical and accurate manner.

The young also receive 'history' from moving about in their community, from being alive, and from being involved - as are all citizens - in the consequences of the debates and fresh interpretations which change attitudes. Part of the purpose of this study was to see if, during the period studied, teaching History in the classroom acknowledged that other dimension in students' lives. According to evidence presented, the judgment is that this challenge was not fully or adequately met and classroom History remained an academic subject – a subject which students saw as largely irrelevant to their present and their future.

When the subject 'Social Studies' was introduced into the core curriculum of post-primary schools in 1945, it was intended to be more than an amalgam of Civics, Economics, Geography and History. Its planners saw it as a way in which students would receive instruction, and undertake research, in the way their community had been shaped by its land, rivers, coast and climate and had used those geographic elements, together with its first settlers and later citizens, to become the present community. Students in the Third and Fourth Forms were to begin learning methods of research.²⁴³ Because the subject as planned was not one which could be appropriately made part of external examinations, it was not generally extended beyond those Forms.²⁴⁴ It was also not compulsory, schools given the right to decide whether or not to include it in their timetable. Some did, but other continued to teach Geography and History as separate subjects in Forms Three and Four. The

243 Thomas Report, p. 27

244 Low-Beer, p. 121

Department of Education did not provide a national syllabus and schools which taught Social Studies developed their own pattern, with some teachers doing this imaginatively. However there was not universal acceptance of the subject. Some History teacher saw it as a negation of the whole idea of 'History', while some Geography teachers appeared to see it as a way to increase the acceptance of Geography as a study.²⁴⁵ Because students appeared to find learning about government and political organisation difficult, and as few Geography or History teachers were skilled in Economics, there was little emphasis on Civics and Economics. Other reasons offered by those who saw Social Studies as a 'failure' were teacher conservatism,²⁴⁶ a lack of clear direction from the Department, the lack of apparent substance to the subject, as well as practical issues such as the number of students in the class, shortage of equipment to help make the subject interesting, and parent resistance.

Parent resistance was a particularly strong factor because Social Studies was not included in the School Certificate examination, a qualification which many parent thought important for their children to achieve. There was parental pressure to provide students as early as possible in their post-primary years with the 'facts' which would help them gain passes in later in the Geography and History examinations, and Social Studies appeared to be a barrier to this. Some schools offered Social Studies in tandem with Geography and History as an alternative for students considered unlikely to remain at school beyond the age of fifteen and/or unlikely to proceed to university. Consequently these factors made it appear that Social Studies was a subject which could hamper examination success, and was only appropriate to 'fill in time' for the less bright students until they were able to leave school and get a job.

Social Studies was established without a fixed syllabus, schools being free to work out courses appropriate to their local community. As the subject was not compulsory some school continued to have separate course in Geography and History.

Though not providing a syllabus the Department of Education did set guidelines which remained reasonably constant and defined the purpose of the subject as seeking to prepare effective citizens by providing an understanding of human affairs. Students were to be assisted to undertake research which would help them develop analytical

245 *Schooling*, p. 10

246 Couling, p. 120

skills. Like the subject itself, there were no compulsory sections but, in 1977, the Department did suggest optional ways in which society organised itself which could be studied. Many parts of the world were listed, with some special emphasis on New Zealand in general and Maori in particular. But Maori study was mainly concerned with the time immediately after European contact.²⁴⁷ A survey in the early 1980s of areas actually taught showed that while 'New Zealand Today' received a major emphasis, 'New Zealand Past', 'the Pacific', and 'Maori' barely registered.²⁴⁸ This was despite growing community attention in the previous decade to race relations and the Treaty of Waitangi.

On the other hand questions in the School Certificate History examination began to show more connection with community concerns. But this did take some time because, for the first decade of the period, there was still a very strong requirement for students to 'know the facts' – dates, names, places – particularly of British history. Any questions during the period on Maori activity were about Maori 'rebellions'. Even in the 1960s questions about Maori related to their 'hostile actions', or to how well Maori lived following the arrival of British settlers when compared with their earlier existence. Questions about New Zealand's welfare policy also appear at the end of the 1960s, but again as an optional topic. From early in the 1970s onward New Zealand race relations and Maori grievances regarding the operation of the Treaty of Waitangi received increasing attention. This meant that Fifth Form students did appear to be studying matters relevant to their own time and community concerns. Another feature of School Certificate examinations from 1969 onward was the expectation that students were moving from 'regurgitating facts' to writing essays based on critical analysis and their own assessment of the past.

For the first eighteen years from 1945 of the University Entrance examination, students were required to answer questions by writing essays, which again required analysis and personal judgment. The essays were not always well done. For the most part questions were related to the world beyond New Zealand, with an emphasis on Britain and the Commonwealth, the most up-to-date question being one on causes of World War Two, asked in 1961.

247 'Social Studies Syllabus Guidelines' 1977

248 *Social Studies Survey*, p. 17

Analysis of University Bursary and University Scholarship examinations show that history taught to senior students reflected the same topics as those taught pre-1945, namely New Zealand's British heritage from the Tudors and the Stuarts, and the development of New Zealand by her pioneers in the nineteenth century. This was justified by there being a lack of primary sources which would allow adequate teaching on other aspects of New Zealand's past,²⁴⁹ However others maintain that the reason for the history of England continuing to be a major topic in the History curriculum was the influence of the Universities where the main topic of lecturers was English History, with lecturers passing on their enthusiasm for the Tudors, the Stuarts and England's gift of political democracy, to those being trained to be History teachers in post-primary schools.²⁵⁰ Whether the reason for English Elizabethan and Elizabethan history being central in the curriculum was the lack of alternative New Zealand primary sources, the influence of those whose primary lecturing subject was English history, the conservatism of secondary school teachers 'teaching what they had been taught', or a continuing society collective memory that - 'England made us and our young people need to learn that' - continues to be a matter of debate. Added to those factors was a reluctance of politicians, society and parents, to have students study controversial events in New Zealand history, the cause of then current social tension, particularly regarding Maori-Pakeha race relations, the role of the Treaty of Waitangi, and the demands of equality by second-wave feminist. In the face of these pressures, it may have been 'safer' for both the Department of Education and teachers themselves to offer 'distant' British history upon which most could agree. Being aware of the fallacy of a single cause, and with a variety of 'pre-judged evidence', it is impossible to make a final judgment as to why it took so long and with such minimum result for matters relevant to students every-day life to become part of History in post-primary schools. .

Efforts to encourage the young to study and assess fresh interpretations of New Zealand's past as those interpretations were being debated and dividing their community²⁵¹ did mean that classroom preparation to pass examinations had a certain irrelevancy for those same young people with their encouraged reading. This dichotomy may be seen in the feeling of alienation and rejection of their country

249 Gwynne interview

250 Sheehan p. 92-93

251 University Bursary Examination – History 1987, Chief Examiner's Report, p. 9-10

apparently evident in examination answers produced by some candidates in the mid-1980s.²⁵² This was at a time when there was increasing debate and dissension in society on the country's past treatment of Maori, again emphasising the importance of recognising that History is not only taught in the classroom but absorbed by the young (often without wise counsel) from community debate.

Questions asked on the role of women in New Zealand's past and the country's record of welfare legislation were not usually favoured by students, even though these matters were coming under increasing community attention. By the mid-1980s there was reflection of the nation's race relations controversy, with reference being changed from 'Maori Wars' to 'Civil Wars', 'Anglo-European Wars' and 'New Zealand Wars'. One thing evident from the Bursary and Scholarship examinations is that students were expected to read current writings on New Zealand's past, to critically assess them and to write logical answers using analytical skills and literary accuracy. From Examiners' reports it appears many students did not do this well, suggesting they had not grasped the need to both absorb information but also to interpret it.

It would appear that the School Certificate examination which was taken by many Fifth Form students more reflected societal concerns and division than did University Entrance, Bursary and Scholarship examinations, the domain of students more likely to attend university and therefore considered likely to be commercial and political leaders. These three examinations retained a fairly close connection to the tradition of New Zealand history being based on the nation's British heritage and achievements of the country's pioneer settlers. But again it must be said that the Chief Examiner, at least, did encourage teachers to pay attention to current reinterpretations of New Zealand's own past. Those reinterpretations of Maori pre-European history, of the Crown's record on the Treaty of Waitangi, and of a renewal of Maori culture and tradition, were the cause of division in New Zealand society, and if the fact that

252 University Bursary Examination – History, 1986, Chief Examiner's Report, p. 1-11

examination questions did not always highlight that connection, meant that every-day debates of which students were aware were being by-passed or ignored in the History classroom History.

Some who taught during the period reflected what has been noted previously; that it could be necessary for teachers to develop their own Social Studies programmes, and often this was taught as History while a colleague taught Geography at another time to the same class. There was regret by some former teachers that Social Studies negated the idea of History having pattern and narrative. Some fresh topics were introduced by individual teachers without them becoming part of any formal direction from the Department, topics such as comparative religion, Maori pronunciation, and the American Civil Rights Movement.

Meanwhile teachers reported the importance of maintaining discipline, due to the increase in class numbers, and, in History classes, the problem of some students the subject without any real feeling for it making it 'safer' to teach 'the familiar'. Some teachers believed students found History boring and irrelevant with no connection to possible future employment, and this is backed up by surveys of students which indicate a number felt that. In comparison with other examination subjects, particularly in Bursary and Scholarship, History struggled to attract candidates, particularly those who had a reasonable hope of success - again emphasising its apparent irrelevancy. Other teachers suggested that they found their students took a real interest in discovering their past. Some of the difference may be because in some schools 'brighter' students were required to take History, while in some other schools students who were deemed unsuitable for 'higher' subjects were placed in the History class.

The way History was taught may have made it boring and difficult for some students. For much of the period reviewed, not only was the past presented as a series of dates, names and places – the 'facts' to be remembered in the proper order without connection to cause or consequence – but the method of teaching was stodgy. 'Chalk and talk' was recalled by many teachers, using dictation, readings from text-books (themselves boring and unexciting in print), students required to make their own notes from the 'lectures', or study duplicated notes. There were probably several reasons for these methods but among them was the need to maintain discipline, the lack of

sufficient teaching resources, class size, shortage of preparation time, the need to satisfy parent expectations for their children to pass examinations, and principals who sought good publicity for their schools through a high examination pass rate. For some teachers the History they had been taught seemed the best History to teach and to do it in the manner they had been taught. Preparation time was always short and therefore 'doing it as we had done it' was possibly a reasonable expectation as long as students received the information they needed to pass examinations, the examinations themselves being fairly predictable in topic year by year.

While some surveys suggest that New Zealand's past was not a topic students found either important or exciting, some teachers felt too much emphasis was placed on British or European history, and not enough on Maori and New Zealand pioneer history, and analysis of examination questions goes some way to support this contention.

A review of History teaching since 1988 indicates that syllabus prepared by the Ministry of Education have continued moves made in the 1980s to relate classroom History somewhat more closely to community concerns and, at the same time, develop in students skills to analyse, criticise, question and evaluate primary sources, to read and assess new or alternative interpretations of the past, and to make judgment on differing presentations. Despite fresh interpretations of New Zealand's past, there remains an emphasis in school History on the same topics of British history, and New Zealand in the nineteenth century. Schools using the Cambridge curriculum follow topics more related to those of past years, suggesting there is still in some schools (and in their parent communities) a view that New Zealand's heritage is based on Europe/Britain and their civilising and governance traditions, which settlers from those countries used to pioneer New Zealand as it is today, and that controversies over, for example, race relations and Treaty of Waitangi history, are not as important for the young to study and make judgment on.

It is evident that the purpose for teaching History in schools, the topics which were taught, the community in which students lived, the methods used to teach History and the students' reaction to the subject, all changed during the period examined. In particular the community had become more aware of race relations, and educationalists in planning for History teaching had moved from a fact-oriented

subject to one in which students were meant to learn skills that would allow them to become historiographically literate, and thereby become more useful citizens of both their nation and the wider world. That change was slower in coming in examination questions but by the end of the period some progress could be seen.

What is not so evident is whether New Zealanders prefer their young to continue studying the past with the traditional emphasis on its British and pioneer heritage, or the young to study it as it is reflected in the community's re-evaluation of its past and the debates arising from that re-evaluation. Are teachers and educationalists to be innovative in providing students with information and skills which will enable the young to both see the relevance of History and to use that understanding as they become active participants in their community? Or are political fears about controversial topics being studied by the young, and the preference of some community members for History to be taught 'as we remember it and as we want it to be' (our collective memory) to again make History boring and irrelevant for each generation? Will, as happened between 1945 and 1988, the culture of classroom History and examinations, continue to be rather out of keeping, and slow to catch up, with the societal changes and concerns that flow through New Zealand society, thus hindering the young from learning in the classroom what they need for living outside it?

APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE

THE STUDY OF HISTORY IN NEW ZEALAND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. What is your name and what are your preferred personal contact details?

SCHOOL INFORMATION

2. What is your experience as an History teacher in New Zealand?
3. Which secondary schools will this response cover?
4. When were you teaching history there?
5. Which form levels did you teach?

DEVELOPMENT OF HISTORY STUDY

6. During the period 1945-1988, please state the areas of history e.g. world, Pacific, New Zealand taught. Please be as specific as possible.
7. Were there any changes in areas taught during the period? e.g. less world, more New Zealand, different periods of New Zealand? If possible, please give the year in which the study changed.
8. What are your thoughts on Forms 3-4 Social Studies. Was there a balance between geography and history?

TEACHING METHODS

9. What teaching methods were used? e.g. note taking, student research. Did the method change over the period? What was the reason for the change?
10. What text books, other media (film, radio, newspaper, etc.) were used? Were there changes in the media used over the period?

HISTORY PURPOSE

11. What was your purpose (or aim) in teaching history? Did the purpose or aim change over the period? Can you give reasons for the change?

STUDENT REACTION

12. What was the reaction of students to the study of history?
13. Was there any difference in popularity of history as a subject between the sexes?
14. In general, what was the nature of the school e.g. multi-cultural, bi-cultural, mono-cultural?

FURTHER HELP

15. If you still have any of the text-books used, (or can remember the details of them), it would help me if you could list the title, author, publisher, date of publication, place of publication, chapter headings. [Any of these details would be gratefully appreciated.]

Please send your response to:
E.W. [Ted] Body,

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

INTERVIEWS

In 2011 the author interviewed the following people:

Dr. Robin Gwynn, 16.8.2011

Group of six Napier residents 29.7.2011

THE FOLLOWING RESPONDED TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE: :

(See Appendix I)

Teacher C, teacher 1988-1995, replied 3.8.2011

Teacher J, teacher 1954-1962, replied 18.7.2011

Teacher M, teacher 1981-1999 replied 22.7.2011

Teacher L, teacher 1973-2005 replied 30.5.2011

Teacher P, teacher 1957-1989 replied 23.5.2011

Teacher R, teacher 1972-2008 replied 23.5.2011

Teacher A, teacher 1957-1998 replied 17.8.2011

Teacher S, teacher 1968-1989 replied 14.5.2011

Teacher W, teacher 1987-2004 replied 9.6.2011

Teacher Y, teacher 1981-2009 replied 30.7.2011

OTHER CORRESPONDENCE:

The Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia (re Three Tikanga constitution) 13 April 2011

PAPERS OF ORGANISATIONS

Presbyterian Church of Aotearoa New Zealand, *Proceedings of the General Assembly*, (Statistics Bible Class attendance 1945, 1955, 1965, 1975, 1985)

University Entrance Board, *Newsletter to Schools*, 30 November, 1981

OFFICIAL GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS:

NEW ZEALAND:

Education Act 1964, Clause 82

History in the Schools: Report to the Director General of Education, by the Department of History of New Zealand Universities, 1987

Inquiry into the Setting of National Certificate of Educational Achievement examination questions: Report of the Education and Science Committee, New Zealand House of Representatives, August 2005

Ministry of Education *The New Zealand Curriculum for English-medium teaching and learning in years 1-13*, Wellington, 2007

Report of the Commission on Education in New Zealand, Wellington, July 1962

Report on the Social Studies Subject Survey 1981-82, Wellington, Department of Education, 1987

Strong, T.B, 'The Inculcation of Patriotism', *Education Gazette*, 1921, quoted in Openshaw, Roger,(ed.) *New Zealand Social Studies: Past, Present and Future*, Palmerston North, the Dunmore Press, 1992
Report on the Social Studies Subject Survey 1981-82, Wellington, Department of Education, 1987
The Curriculum Review: Report of the Committee to Review the Curriculum for Schools, Wellington, Department of Education 1987
The New Zealand Education Gazette, 1 July 1944
The New Zealand Education Gazette, 1 November 1945
The New Zealand Education Gazette, 15 November 1945
The New Zealand Education Gazette, vol. XXIV.12, 1 December, 1945
The New Zealand Education Gazette, vol. XXV.2 (supplement), 15 February 1946
The Post-Primary School Curriculum: Report of the Committee appointed by the Minister of Education in November, 1942, Wellington, Government Printer, 1959
Towards Partnership: The Report of the Committee on Secondary Education, Wellington, Department of Education, 1976

AUSTRALIA:

The Future of the Past: Final Report of the Report of the National Inquiry into School History, Monash University, May 2000

NEWSPAPERS:

Daily Telegraph, Napier, 12 November, 1945
Daily Telegraph, Napier, 26 April, 1980
Manawatu Evening Standard, 19 July 1974

SYLLABUSES AND EXAMINATIONS:

Colbert, C.J., *School Certificate History Notes: Book 2: New Zealand, 1837-1939*, Christchurch, Whitcombe and Tombs, 1962
Department of Education, *The Education (Post-primary instructions) Regulations: syllabus of instructions and Prescription for the School Certificate examination*, 1945, 1949, 1955, 1958, 1962
Department of Education, *Social Studies Syllabus Guidelines, Social Studies Forms 1-4*, 1977
McLachlan, B.H., *University Entrance History Questions: classified by topics from examination papers 1951-1962*, Christchurch, Whitcombe and Tombs, 1963
NZQA Level 3 History Examination Papers 90657, 90658, 2010
NZQA Scholarship History Examination Papers 2010
NZQA Scholarship History Assessment Report 2010
Proficiency Examination Paper History 1933
Public Service Examination Paper History, 1930
St. Cuthbert's College, Auckland Half-yearly Examination Papers History, Fifth Form 1969,
St. Cuthbert's College, Auckland, Term 2 Form Seven History Examination papers, July 1991
School Certificate History Examination Papers 1945-1956, 1958, 1960-1975, 1977-1979
School Certificate History Examination Prescription 1958

University Bursary History Examination Chief Examiner Report 1971-1989
 University Entrance History Examination Papers 1950-51
 University Scholarship History Examination Chief Examiner Report 1967, 1969-1971,
 1973-1989
 University of Cambridge International Examinations History Papers
 October/November 2010
 University of Cambridge IGCE History Syllabus for Examinations June/November
 2010

SECONDARY SOURCES

BOOKS

- Barber, Laurie, *New Zealand: A Short History*, Auckland, Century Hutchinson, 1989
 Ewing, J.L., *Development of the New Zealand Primary School Curriculum 1877-1970*,
 Wellington, New Zealand Council for Educational Research, 1970
 Gorrie, A.M., *The Teaching of Geography and History: with special reference to the
 concept of Social Studies*, Christchurch, Whitcombe and Tombs, 1964
 Foster, J, Crawford, Keith A., (eds) *What Shall We Tell the Children: International
 Perspectives on School History Textbooks*, Greenwich Connecticut,
 Information Age Publishing, 2006
 King, Michael, *The Penguin History of New Zealand*, Auckland, Penguin Books
 2004
 McCulloch, Gary (ed.) *The School Curriculum in New Zealand: History, Theory,
 Policy and Practice*, Palmerston North, Dunmore Press, 1992
 McKenzie, David, Lee, Gregory, Lee, Howard, *The Transformation of the New
 Zealand Technical High School*, Palmerston North, Massey University, 1990
 McLintock, A.H. (ed.) *An Encyclopaedia of New Zealand*, vols 1-3, Wellington,
 Government Printer, 1966
New Zealand Official Year Book, Wellington, Government Printer, 1945, 1955, 1965,
 1975, 1985, 1990
 Olssen, Mark and Matthews, Kay Morris (edss), *Education Policy in New Zealand:
 the 1990s and Beyond*, Palmerston North, the Dunmore Press, 1997
 Openshaw, Roger (ed.), *New Zealand Social Studies: Past, Present and Future*,
 Palmerston North, Dunmore Press, 1992
 Openshaw, Roger (ed.), *Schooling in the 40s and 50s: An Oral History: Social
 Studies, Reading, Mathematics*, Palmerston North, Massey University 1991
 Palenski, Ron, *On This Day in New Zealand*, Auckland, Hodder Moe, 2010
 Pascoe, John (ed.) *Oxford New Zealand Encyclopaedia: Companion volume to Oxford
 Junior Encyclopaedia*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1965
 Shallcrass, Jack, *Educating New Zealanders: Essays in Education*, Wellington, Reed,
 1967
 Southgate, Beverley, *Why Bother with History: Ancient, modern and post-modern
 motives*, Harlow England, Pearson Education, 2000
 Sinclair, Keith, *A History of New Zealand*, Auckland, Penguin, 1991
 Ward, Alan, *A Show of Justice: Racial "amalgamation" in nineteenth century New
 Zealand*, Auckland University Press/Oxford University Press, 1978
 Webster, Alan C., Perry, Paul E., *The Religious Factor in New Zealand Society: A
 Report of the New Zealand Study of Values*, Palmerston North, Alpha
 Publishing, 1989
 Wells, Peter, *Somebody's Darling: Stories from the Napier Cemetery 1857-1917*,

Napier, the Hawke's Bay Museum & Art Gallery, 2008
Zinn, Howard, *A People's History of the United States*, London, Longman, 1980

ARTICLES

- Archer, Eric and Openshaw, Roger, 'Citizenship and Identity as "Official" Goals in Social Studies' in Openshaw, Roger (ed.), *New Zealand Social Studies: Past, Present and Future*, Palmerston North, Dunmore Press, 1992
- Austin, Lydia, 'Up the Down Escalator: The Introduction of Achievement Standards in the National Certificate of Achievement' *Waikato Journal of Education*, 6.2000
- Codd, J.A., 'Knowledge, Qualification and Higher Education: a Critical View' in Mark Olssen and Kay Morris Matthews (eds), *Education Policy in New Zealand: the 1990s and Beyond*, Palmerston North, the Dunmore Press, 1997
- Davis, O.L., 'Preface' in Stuart J. Foster, and Keith A. Crawford (eds), *What Shall We Tell the Children? International Perspectives on School History Textbooks*, Greenwich Connecticut, Information Age Publishing, 2006
- Diorio, Joseph A., 'The Decline of History as a Tool of Moral Training', *History of Education Quarterly*, vol. 25, 1-2 Spring-Summer 1985
- Evison H.C., 'History of Social Studies: Difficulties of Integration', *N.Z. P.P.T.A. Journal*, June 1963
- Fairbairn, Miles, 'The Rural Myth and the New Urban Frontier: An Approach to New Zealand Social History, 1870-1940', *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 9
- Falk, Pingall, 'From Evasion to a Critical Tool of Moral and Political Education: teaching National Socialism and the Holocaust in Germany' in Stuart J. Foster and Keith A. Crawford (eds), *What Shall We Tell the Children? International Perspectives on School History Textbooks*, Greenwich Connecticut, Information Age Publishing, 2006
- Foster, Stuart, 'Whose History? Portraits of Immigrant Groups in U.S. History Textbooks, 1800-Present' in Stuart J. Foster and Keith A. Crawford, *What Shall We Tell the Children? International Perspectives on School History Textbooks*, Greenwich Connecticut, Information Age Publishing, 2006
- Keen, D, 'Decline and Fall', *Education*, vol. XXVIII, Issue 6, 1979
- Keen, D.S., 'History in Secondary Schools 1976' *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 11.2, October 1977
- Keen, David., 'The Condition of History in our Secondary Schools', *SET 77*, vol. 2
- Knight, Colin, 'Social Studies as a Part of Today's Curriculum', *Social Studies Observer*; vol. 17.1, June 1984
- Lane, M.S., 'A New Learning Approach in Social Studies' in Shallcrass, Jack, *Secondary Schools in Change: papers collected by Jack Shallcrass*, Wellington, Price Milburn for the New Zealand Post-Primary Teachers' Association, 1973
- Levitsky, Linda, 'Crossing the Empty Space: Perspectives Taking in New Zealand Adolescents' Understandings' in Davis, O.L. Jnr, Yeager, Elizabeth Ann, Foster, Stuart J., (eds) *Historical Empathy and Perspectives in Social Studies*, Lanham Maryland, Rowan and Littlefield, 2001
- Low-Ber, Ann L., 'The Eclipse of History in New Zealand Schools', *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, vol. 21.3 1981
- Making New Zealand: Pictorial Survey of a Century*, vols. 1-2,, Wellington, Department of Internal Affairs, 1940
- Malone, E. P., 'The New Zealand School Journal and the Imperial Identity', *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. VII, Issue 1, 1973
- Marshall, James A., 'The New Vocationalism' in Mark Olssen and Kay Morris

- Matthews, (eds), *Educational Policy in New Zealand: 1990s and Beyond*, Palmerston North, the Dunmore Press, 1997
- Meikle, Phoebe C. 'What is Social Studies? Opening Address at South Island Refresher Course, August, 1959', *New Zealand Post-primary Teachers' Association Journal*, vol; VI Issue 4, May 1960
- Meikle, Phoebe C., 'What is Social Studies? *New Zealand Post-primary Teachers' Association Journal*, July 1960
- Openshaw, Roger, 'The Battle for Social Studies in the New Zealand Secondary Schools 1945-1964' in Openshaw, Roger (ed.), *New Zealand Social Studies: Past, Present and Future*, Palmerston North, Dunmore Press, 1992
- Porat, Dan, 'Reconstructing the Past, Constructing the Future in Israeli Textbooks', in Stuart J. Foster and Keith A. Crawford, *What Shall We Tell the Children? International Perspectives on School History Textbooks*, Greenwich Connecticut, Information Age Publishing, 2006
- Pownall, L.L., 'Third Form Social Studies', *The New Zealand Education Gazette*, vol. XXV, Issue 2 (Supplement), 15 February 1946
- Shallcrass, Jack, 'A New Learning Approach to Social Studies', in Shallcrass, Jack, *Secondary Schools in Change: papers collected by Jack Shallcrass*, Wellington, Price Milburn for the New Zealand Post-primary Teachers' Association, 1973
- Sheehan, Mark, 'The place of "New Zealand" in the New Zealand history curriculum', *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, vol 42.5, 2010
- Shuker, Roy, 'The Failure of Social Studies, 1946-66: A New Zealand Case Study in Curriculum Change', *Journal of Educational Administration and Development*, vol. XIII Issue 2, 1981
- Shuker, R. and Wilkes, C.D., 'History From the High Wire: The Relationship Between Sociology and History in New Zealand', *New Zealand Sociology*, vol. 2.1 May 1987
- Simmonds, D.D., 'A New Zealand Myth', *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 3.1, April 1969
- Snook, Ivan, 'Democracy, Education and the New Right', in Mark Olszen and Kay Morriss Matthews (eds), *Educational Policy in New Zealand: 1990s and Beyond*, Palmerston North, the Dunmore Press, 1997
- Stenson, Marcia, 'History in New Zealand Schools', *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 24.2 1990
- Tosh, John, 'A Great Degree of Value' *History Today*, January 2010

SCHOOL HISTORY TEXT BOOKS:

- Aylmer, G.E., *The Struggled For the Constitution: England in the Seventeenth Century: 1601-1689*, London, Blandford Press,
- Brooking, Tom, and Enright, Paul, *Milestones: Turning Points in New Zealand History*, Lower Hutt, Mills, 1988
- Farland, Bruce, *Gordon Coates*, Wellington, Reed, undated
- Guest, George, *The March of Civilisation*, London, G. Bell and Sons, 1948
- Kelly, Daniel, *Peter Fraser*, Wellington, Reed, 1968
- McDonald, K.C. *Our Country's Story: An Illustrated History of New Zealand*, Christchurch, Whitcombe and Tombs, 1964
- Miller, John, *Early Victorian New Zealand: A Study of Racial Tension and Social Attitudes 1839-1852*, Wellington, Oxford University Press, 1974
- Peacock, Herbert L., *A History of Modern Britain 1915 to 1968*, London Heinemann Educational Books,

- Penney, Sarah E.W., Ash, Graeme G., *The European States System 1814-1856: The States System and Origin of the First World War*, Christchurch, Penney Assh, 1972
- Prothero, Ernest, *The Story of Empire: The Homeland: The Cradle of the Race*, London, Epworth Press, undated
- Sharp, Andrew, *The Welfare Tradition: Social Welfare New Zealand since 1891*, Auckland, Heinemann Educational Books, 1976
- Sinclair, Keith, *The Liberal Government, 1891-1912: First Steps Towards a Welfare State*, Auckland, Heinemann Educational Books, 1967
- Spear, Percival, *A History of India*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1978
- Strong, C.F., *The Early Modern World: From the Age of Discovery in the Fifteenth Century to the Eve of the War of American Independence in the Eighteenth Century*, London, University of London
- Swanney, R.N. (Comp.), *The First Pakeha*, Wellington, Reed, 1959
- Treaty Package: Resource Management Seminar: The Treaty of Waitangi – a Historical Overview*, (Place of publication, author, date, all unrecorded)
- Trevelyan, G.M., *Illustrated English Social History: Chaucer's England and the Early Tudors*, Vol.1, London, Longmans, Green, 1949
- Wood, June A., *Victorian New Zealanders*, Wellington, Reed, 1974
- Wright, Harrison M., *New Zealand, 1769-1840: Early Years of Western Contact*, Cambridge Massachusetts, Harvard University, 1967

THESIS:

- Campion, M.A., *The Teaching of History in New Zealand Schools*, Victoria University, MA. thesis, 1947
- Couling, D.F., *The Secondary School Teacher in New Zealand 1945-2000: Teacher Identity and Education Reform*, Massey University, MA. thesis, 2005,
- McGregor, Colin, *Schooling and Socialisation in New Zealand: 1890-1914*, Canterbury University, PhD. thesis, 1985
- Selwood, Stuart James, *Progress or Paradox: NZQA: The Genesis of a Reconstruction of Qualification Policy in New Zealand*, M.Ed.Admin. thesis, 1991
- Sheehan, (William) Mark, *'Defending the High Ground': The transformation of the discipline of history into a senior secondary school subject in the late 20th century: A New Zealand curriculum debate*, Massey University, PhD. thesis 2008
- Shuker, Roy Gordon, *History in the New Zealand Secondary School: A Study in Aspects of Curriculum Development*, Victoria University, PhD. thesis, 1978

FILM

- One Hundred Crowded Years*, New Zealand National Film Unit, 1941

WEBSITES

- <http://sspol.tki.org.nz/history>, *history/Social Science Online-eZSSO, Teaching and Learning* 3/10/2011
- <http://ohta.ac.nz/>?, *Teaching History*, 31/12/2010
- <http://en.wikipedia.org>, *Japanese history textbook controversy*, 3/01/2011
- <http://www.stats.govt.nz>, *Demographics of New Zealand Pacific Population*, 24/03/2011

<http://www.populstat.info/Oceania/newzealand>, *New Zealand: historical demographical data of the urban centres*, 31/03/2011

<http://nzhta.org.nz>, *New Zealand History Teachers' Association Programme Development, Curriculum*, 31/12/2010

<http://www.nzhistory.net.nz>, *Brain food – Teachers-Toolbox*, 6/01/2011

<http://www/tki.org.nz>, *Social Studies in the New Zealand Curriculum: The Aim of Social Studies: Social Science curriculum achievement objectives: The structure of the Social Studies curriculum*, 15/01/2011

<http://www.nzhistory.net.nz> Sheehan, Mark, *'The role of school history in a meaningful education'*, 20/11/2010

<http://www.acsnz.org.nz/acsnzschols.cf>, 15/04/2011

www.scoop.co.nz 15/04/2011, Don Brash, *Leader of the National Party in a speech at Orewa Rotary Club 27 January, 2004*

<http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/qualifications-standards-/results-2secondary-schools-qualifications> 20/06/2011

http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/classroom/the_classroom/ *teachers-toolbar//the_role of schools . . . 2011/2010*

Watters, Steve, *Introduction to 'The role of school history' 'Teaching emotive and controversial History.*
URL <http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/classroomteachingmotive-and-controversial-history>, Ministry for Culture and History, updated 31- July-2007.